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: Connerton Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Anna Falcome	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair:	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Anna Falcome	BA Elementary Ed. MA Ed Leadership	2	8	COES 2012 – A; AYP - ? COES: 2011 – A; AYP - No SES: 2010 - C; AYP - No PVES; 2009 - A; AYP – No PVES; 2008 - A; AYP – No PVES; 2007 - A; AYP – No PVES; 2006 – A; AYP – No PVES: 2005 - A; AYP - No

Assistant Principal	Claudia Steinacker	BA Elementary Ed MA Ed Leadership	0	5	ODES: 2012 - A; AYP - ? ODES: 2011 – A, AYP-No GSES: 2010 -C, AYP -No GSES: 2009 -B, AYP -No GSES: 2008 -C, AYP -No

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)

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Hire Highly Qualified teacher	Administration	On-going
2. On-going, Job-Embedded Staff Development	Administration, Coaches, Lead Teachers	On-going
3.		
4.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
65	**12% (8)**	**38% (25)**	**37% (24)**	**12% (8)**	**23% (15)**	**100%**	**3% (2)**	**0%**	**42% (27)**

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
Julie Arguelles Kim Beal Sarah Aycrigg Jenna Henry Peggy McDonald Sheila Nero Steven Garrett	Meagan Brinkman Katie Donnelly Randi Rowan Lauren Crosby Deanna Sharp Meghan Maciarelli Jenna Whitting	Based on individual teacher need	Monthly beginning teacher meetings. Weekly Reading Staff Development, Student Progress Meetings, Weekly Grade Level Problem Solving Meetings within Instructional Teams

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Administration Basic Education Support Facilitator Guidance Counselor ESE Support Facilitator K-5 Classroom Teachers School Psychologist Speech Pathologist ESE Staffing & Compliance Teacher
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 Leadership Team meets monthly to do the following: • Review Progress Monitoring data and/or universal screenings • Assess the school staff's practices and skill development through the use of surveys • Assess the RtI implementation progress (SAPSI) • Reflect upon the impact of professional development provided
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? • Analyze relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation. • Analyze school wide and grade-level data to identify student achievement trends • Analyze disaggregated data to identify trends and groups in need of interventions • Identification of critical RtI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity. • Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars. • Review of Progress Monitoring data. • Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self- Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI).
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. • Data will be monitored through grade level weekly meetings, TBIT meetings, weekly SBIT meetings, and quarterly student progress reviews. • Tier I data will be assessed through FAIR in reading, quarterly prompt writing, CORE K-12 in math and science. • Tier II and Tier III data will be monitored more frequently based on student need using assessments that match the areas of concern. Weekly assessments will be utilized for progress monitoring
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. • Staff will be trained to look at data disaggregation for the 2012 FCAT Data • The RtI leadership team will attend trainings or be involved in monthly podcast offered by our district RtI coach • All grade level teachers will use problem solving steps to determine levels of intervention.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). • Administration • Literacy Coach • Media Specialist • Technology Specialist • ESE Support Facilitators • Basic and special education teachers • Team Leaders
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation -Analysis of school wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends -Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention -Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment) -Development of data review plans, support systems and calendars -Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity -Review of Progress Monitoring data -Planning for interventions
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? • The focus of the Literacy Leadership Team will be on differentiating reading instruction through the core curriculum • Monitoring implementation of professional develop and ensuring that teachers utilizes I PICK with students self-selecting texts for independent reading, along with daily conferences between teachers and students. • Focus on conferring with students and gradual release of responsibility model • Focus on responding to reading all curricular areas

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. Instructional staff members are not always afforded ample time to understand the standards being taught in order to develop rigorous instruction aligned to research based strategies.	1A.1. Provide Professional Development in the area with a focus on Common Core Standards to better understand the expectation for students at each grade level.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher District Support Basic Education Support Facilitator	1A.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments		

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

Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase from 32% to 45% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32%	45%					
		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. Time allotted to develop plan that support the multi-grade level setting, Individual Education Plans, and student matrices.	1B.1. Teacher will analyze data in order to organize flexible groupings within the team to better meet the needs of ESE students.	1B.1. ESE Teachers ESE Chair District ESE supports	1B.1. Progress toward IEP goals ESE team meetings	1B.1. Formal/Informal assessments		
Reading Goal #1B: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4, 5, and 6 on FAA reading will increase by 1.5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	11.5%	13%					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Instructional staff members are not always afforded ample time to understand the standards being taught in order to develop rigorous instruction aligned to research based strategies.	2A.1. Provide Professional Development in the area with a focus on Common Core Standards to better understand the expectation for students at each grade level.	2A.1. Classroom Teacher District Support Basic Education Support Facilitator	2A.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	2A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments		
Reading Goal #2A: The The percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 reading will increase from 39% to 45% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	39%	45%					

		2A.2. Limited monitoring and feedback is given to students about the books self selected for independent reading times.	2A.2. Teacher/student conferencing to ensure self selected books are chosen to match independent reading level.	2A.2. Classroom Teacher	2A.2. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	2A.2. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments	
		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. Time allotted to develop plan that support the multi-grade level setting, Individual Education Plans, and student matrices.	2B.1. Teacher will analyze data in order to organize flexible groupings within the team to better meet the needs of ESE students.	2B.1. ESE Teachers ESE Chair District ESE supports	2B.1. Progress toward IEP goals ESE team meetings	2B.1. Formal/Informal assessments		
Reading Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring a Level 7 on FAA reading will increase by 1.5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	4.2%	5.7%					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Students do not independently apply reading skills and strategies taught to help them understand the text.	3A.1. Regularly conferring with students in guided reading and independently to provide feedback on using effective reading strategies.	3A.1. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator	3A.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	3A.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12		
Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 71% to 85% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71%	85%					
		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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Instructional staff members are not always afforded ample time to understand the standards being taught in order to develop rigorous instruction aligned to research based strategies.	4A.1. Provide Professional Development in the area with a focus on Common Core Standards to better understand the expectation for students at each grade level.	4A.1. Classroom Teacher District Support Basic Education Support Facilitator	4A.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	4A.1. FAIR, MMH Unit Assessments		
Reading Goal #4: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that make learning gains in reading will increase from 66% to 80% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66%	80%					
		4A.2. Students often choose books that do not fall into their zone of proximal development. They are too challenging or easy.	4A.2. Provide Professional Development in the area of teaching children to choose books that are "Just Right " for themselves.	4A.2. Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach	4A.2. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	4A.2. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12	

		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading is 29% (117).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading decrease to 24% (97).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading decrease to 21% (85).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading decrease to 17% (68).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading decrease to 15% (60).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading will be maintained at 15% (60) or lowered.
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in reading is 29% (117). Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring Level 1 or 2 by 15%.							
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. Students need immediate feedback based on their fluency and comprehension checks.	5B.1. Provide Professional Development in the area of using Garage Band as a tool for checking fluency and comprehension.	5B.1. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator Technology Specialist	5B.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5B.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12		

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

Reading Goal #5B: The percentage of students in our ethnic subgroup of Hispanic that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress is 35%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Hispanic: 35% (35)	Hispanic: 25%					
		5B.2. Students often lack access to reading materials outside of school.	5B.2. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day. Family Language Arts Evenings will be held each semester focusing on Home To School language arts connections.	5B.2. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator Media Specialist	5B.2. Grade Level Meetings Parent Surveys	5B.2. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		5B.3. Students often lack a variety of technology resources	5B.3. iPads will have a variety of reading apps available for student use	5B.3. Technology Specialist Classroom Teacher	5B.3. Technology Professional Dev. Plan	5B.3 FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12.	

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.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*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		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Students need immediate feedback based on their fluency and comprehension checks.	5D.1. Provide Professional Development in the area of using Garage Band as a tool for checking fluency and comprehension.	5D.1. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator Technology Specialist	5D.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5D.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12		
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of students in our SWD subgroup that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress is 57%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (34)	47%					
		5D.2. Students often lack access to reading materials outside of school.	5D.2. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day. Family Language Arts Evenings will be held each semester focusing on Home To School language arts connections.	5D.2. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator Media Specialist	5D.2. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5D.2. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		5D.3. Students often lack a variety of technology resources	5D.3. iPads will have a variety of reading apps available for student use	5D.3. Technology Specialist Classroom Teacher	5D.3. Technology Professional Dev. Plan	5D.3 FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Students need immediate feedback based on their fluency and comprehension checks. Students often lack the fluency skills needed to comprehend the text.	5E.1. Provide Professional Development in the area of using Garage Band as a tool for checking fluency and comprehension. Students will receive explicit instruction on how to choose good fit books.	5E.1. Classroom Teacher Literacy Coach Technology Specialist	5E.1. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5E.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12		
Reading Goal #5E: The percentage of students in our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress is 40%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	40% (66)	30%					

		5E.2. Students often lack access to reading materials outside of school.	5E.2. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day. Family Language Arts Evenings will be held each semester focusing on Home To School language arts connections.	5E.2. Classroom Teacher Basic Education Support Facilitator Media Specialist	5E.2. Reading Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	5E.2. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		5E.3. Students often lack a variety of technology resources	5E.3. iPads will have a variety of reading apps available for student use	5E.3. Technology Specialist Classroom Teacher	5E.3. Technology Professional Dev. Plan	5E.3 FAIR MMH Unit Assessments CORE K-12.	

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
Utilizing the Gradual release model to teach skills and strategies in reading	K-5	Basic Education Support Facilitator	School-wide	On-going	Grade Level Meetings, Coaching cycle, walkthroughs, 5x5's	Basic Education Support Facilitator, Administration
Conferring with students, using Assessment Checks for understanding and Think Alouds with modeling during instruction	K-5	Basic Education Support Facilitator	School-wide	On-going	Grade Level Meetings, Coaching cycle, walkthroughs, 5x5's	Basic Education Support Facilitator, Administration

Increase a variety of technology resources for our sub group of economically disadvantaged students	K-5	Technology Specialist	School-wide	On-going	Grade Level Meetings, Coaching cycle, walkthroughs, 5x5's	Technology Specialist Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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.	1.1. Lack of understanding/exposure to the instructional language	1.1. Students will have access to additional instructional vocabulary practice and listening/speaking opportunities	1.1. Classroom Teachers ESOL teacher and instructional assistant	1.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	1.1. Cella Exam	
CELLA Goal #1: The percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the listening/speaking portion of the Cella Exam will increase by ____%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2. Pacing of content may not allow enough time for students to process the new content	1.2. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom	1.2. Classroom teachers ESOL teacher and instructional assistant	1.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	1.2. Cella Exam Running Records/FAIR Unit Tests
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Lack of understanding/exposure to the instructional language	2.1. Students will have access to additional instructional vocabulary practice and listening/speaking opportunities	2.1. Classroom Teachers ESOL teacher and instructional assistant	2.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.1. Cella Exam	
CELLA Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the reading portion of the Cella Exam will increase by ____%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.					
		2.2. Pacing of content may not allow enough time for students to process the new content	2.2. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom	2.2. Classroom teachers ESOL teacher and instructional assistant	2.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.2. Cella Exams Running Records/FAIR Unit tests
		2.3. Lack of exposure to English based texts	2.3. Increase exposure and practice opportunities for reading	2.3. Classroom teachers ESOL teacher and instructional assistant	2.3. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.3. Cella Exams

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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #3: The percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the writing portion of the Cella Exam will increase by ____%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *Enter numerical data for current 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.

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Lack of time for teachers to plan effectively as grade level groups.	1A.1. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level math planning. Teachers will be provided with a K-U-D Organizer as they look at the standards and plan for the upcoming units.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher Administration	1A.1. Math PLC Grade level Meetings	1A.1. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12		

Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 28% to 55% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	28%	55%					
		1A.2. Teachers are not familiar with how to make connections with student data and the standards being assessed.	1A.2. Teachers will use Pre-test data and Math Planning Graphic Organizer to guide their planning based on student needs. Teachers will use Post-test data to plan for standards needing to be retaught	1A.2. Classroom Teacher Administration	1A.2. Math PLC Grade level Meetings	1A.2. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		1A.3. Students lack real-world connections to math standards	1A.3. Friday Math Lab incentives and Family Math nights will be planned and aligned with key math standards.	1A.3. Classroom Teacher Administration	1A.3. Math PLC Grade level meetings	1A.3. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #1B: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4, 5, and 6 on FAA will increase by 1.4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9.6%	11%					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Lack of time for teachers to plan effectively as grade level groups.	2A.1. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level math planning. Teachers will be provided with a K-U-D Organizer as they look at the standards and plan for the upcoming units (including centers)	2A.1. Classroom Teachers Administration	2A.1. Math PLC Grade level meetings	2A.1. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12		

Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Math will increase from 24% to 35% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24%	35%					
		2A.2. Teachers are not familiar with how to make connections with student data and the standards being assessed.	2A.2. Teachers will use Pre-test data and Math Planning Graphic Organizer to guide their planning of lessons, centers and differentiated activities based on student needs. Teachers will use Post-test data to plan for standards needing to be retaught.	2A.2. Classroom Teachers Administration	2A.2. Math PLC Grade level meetings	2A.2. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		2A.3. Teachers not having a strong understanding of how to develop strong enrichment activities that stretch students' learning of the standards	2A.3. Teachers will provide students with enrichment opportunities through differentiated center activities and by providing students with multiple opportunities to problem solve. Math journal will be used to support writing across the curriculum	2A.3. Classroom Teachers Administration	2A.3. Math PLC Grade level meetings	2A.3. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring a Level 7 on FAA math will increase by 1.3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	3.2%	4.5%					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Lack of time for teachers to plan effectively as grade level groups.	3A.1. Teachers will meet weekly for grade level math planning. Teachers will be provided with a K-U-D Organizer as they look at the standards and plan for the upcoming units (including centers)	3A.1. Classroom Teacher Administration ESE Support Facilitator	3A.1. Math PLC Grade level meetings	3A.1. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12		

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

Mathematics Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase from 64% to 80% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	64%	80%					
		3A.2. Teachers are not familiar with how to make connections with student data and the standards being assessed.	3A.2. Teachers will use Pre-test data and Math Planning Graphic Organizer to guide their planning of lessons, centers and differentiated activities based on student needs. Teachers will use Post-test data to plan for standards needing to be retaught.	3A.2. Classroom Teachers Administration ESE Support Facilitator	3A.2. Math PLC Grade level meetings	3A.2. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		3A.3. Teachers are not familiar with the resources available through the Go Math series to support struggling learners	3A.3. Teachers will investigate and implement on-line resources to support students needing time to master foundational math skills	3A.3. Classroom Teachers Administration ESE Support Facilitator	3A.3. Math PLC Grade level meetings	3A.3. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*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.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Students often lack access to math manipulatives or materials outside of school.	4A.1. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day.	4A.1. Classroom teachers Administration	4A.1. Math Professional Learning Community Meetings, Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	4A.1. Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12		
Mathematics Goal #4: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that make learning gains will increase from 62% to 85% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62%	85%					
		4A.3. Students lack real-world connections to math standards	4A.3. Friday Math Lab incentives and Family Math nights will be planned and aligned with key math standards.	4A.3. Classroom Teacher Administration	4A.3. Math PLC Grade level meetings	4A.3. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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**	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in math is 45% .	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics will decreased to 30% (120/400)	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics will decreased to 25% (100/400)	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics will decreased to 20% (80/400)	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics will be maintained or reduce from 20% (80/400).	The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics will be maintained or reduce from 20% (80/400
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of student not achieving proficiency (score a Level 1 or 2) in grades 3, 4, & 5 in mathematics is 45% (180/400). Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring Level 1 or 2 by 25%.							
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. Hispanic: Students often lack access to math manipulatives or materials outside of school.	5B.1. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day.	5B.1. Classroom teachers Administration	5B.1. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5B.1. FCAT Math Unit Assessment CORE K-12		
Mathematics Goal #5B: The percentage of students in our ethnic subgroup of Hispanic that did not make satisfactory progress is 57%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Hispanic: 55% (54)	Hispanic: 45%					
		5B.2. Teachers are not familiar with how to make connections with student data and the standards being assessed.	5B.2. Teachers will use Pre-test data and Math Planning Graphic Organizer to guide their planning of lessons, centers and differentiated activities based on student needs. Teachers will use Post-test data to plan for standards needing to be retaught.	5B.2. Classroom Teachers Administration	5B.2. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5B.2. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	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. Students with disabilities need more time to practice with manipulatives.	5D.1. Support Facilitators will provide small group assistance for students to practice with manipulatives.	5D.1. Support facilitators	5D.1. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5D.1. FCAT Math Unit Assessment CORE K-12		
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of students in our SWD subgroup that did not make satisfactory progress is 73%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	73% (43)	63%					
		5D.2. Teachers need more time to practice with using a document camera when modeling for students.	5D.2. Teachers will use document cameras to model and practice with manipulatives.	5D.2. Classroom teachers Technology Specialist	5D.2. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5D.2. FCAT Math Unit Assessment CORE K-12	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Students often lack access to math manipulatives or materials outside of school.	5E.1. Students will be invited to attend Extended School Day.	5E.1. Classroom teachers Administration	5E.1. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5E.1. FCAT Math Unit Assessment CORE K-12		
Mathematics Goal #5E: The percentage of students in our Economically Disadvantaged that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress is 61%. We will decrease this number to 10% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	61% (101)	51%					

		5E.2. Teachers are not familiar with how to make connections with student data and the standards being assessed.	5E.2. Teachers will use Pre-test data and Math Planning Graphic Organizer to guide their planning of lessons, centers and differentiated activities based on student needs. Teachers will use Post-test data to plan for standards needing to be retaught.	5E.2. Classroom Teachers Administration	5E.2. Math PLC Grade level meetings	5E.2. FCAT Go Math Unit Assessments CORE K-12	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Meet with leaders of the school to problems solve and create a plan for improving the school's math program	Math coach School data reports	Stipend paid by money approved from SAC committee	15000.00
Subtotal: 15000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Teachers are not familiar with the essential components of the science series that support students learning.	1A.1. Teachers will implement the 5 E's of Science Instruction Model (engage, explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate) through the use of the newly adopted "Fusion" science series.	1A.1. Administration Classroom teachers	1A.1. Grade level planning Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1A.1. CORE K-12		

Science Goal #1A: The percentage of students performing at a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Science will increase from 35% to 50% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35%	50%					
		1A.2. Students are not exposed to the multiple purposes of note taking.	1A.2. Teachers investigate ways to use science notebooks to support students inquiry based learning and writing across the curriculum.	1A.2. Administration Classroom teachers	1A.2. Grade level planning Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1A.2. CORE K-12	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: he percentage of students scoring a Level 4, 5, and 6 on FAA science will increase by 1.5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	1 %	2.5 %					
		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. Teachers are not familiar with the science standards and rely on the resources to guide them through the curriculum	2A.1. Teachers will meet as grade level groups to plan with the end in mind. They will plan for extended projects to increase the students inquiry thinking skills.	2A.1. Administration Classroom teachers	2A.1. Grade level planning Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	2A.1. CORE K-12		
Science Goal #2A: The percentage of students achieving level 4 and 5 in science will increase from 11% to 20% by 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	11%	20%					
		2A.2. Students are not exposed to the multiple purposes of note taking.	2A.2. Teachers investigate ways to use science notebooks to support students inquiry based learning and writing across the curriculum.	2A.2. Administration Classroom teachers	2A.2. Grade level planning Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	2A.2. CORE K-12	

		2A.3. Teachers have limited activities planned which allow for application of what has been learned	2A.3. Teachers will utilize a science lab activity monthly to promote application and theory practices.	2A.3 Administration Classroom teachers	2A.3. Grade level planning Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	2A.23 CORE K-12	
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: The percentage of students scoring a Level 7 on FAA science will increase by 1.5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<1%	2.2 %					
		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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Planning with the end in Mind. Using the standards	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	On-Going	Walkthroughs, 5x5's, Student Progress Reviews	Administration
NoteBook Training	K-5	District Office Personnel	Classroom teachers interested	On-Going	Walkthroughs, 5x5's, Student Progress Reviews	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Science Goals

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**						

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		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Teachers need time to plan with writing pacing guide. Common language and expectations are not emphasized school-wide	1A.1. Teachers (K-5) will collaborate and review various ways to integrate resources in order to develop a strong writing curriculum. A writing emphasis in all subject areas will be expected.	1A.1. Classroom Teacher Writing Facilitators	1A.1. Writing Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1A.1. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments		
Writing Goal #1A: The percentage of students proficient in writing will increase from 80% to 85% by 2012.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2. Teachers have many resources and tend to use one over another.	1A.2. Teachers will be provided with a curriculum guide to teach writing from a variety of sources	1A.2. Classroom Teacher Writing Facilitators	1A.2. Writing Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	1A.2. FAIR MMH Unit Assessments	

		1A.3. It is difficult to get students to write if they aren't motivated to do so.	1A.3. Teachers will provide students with a variety of technology tools to peek their interest in writing. They will be able to create and share stores with technology.	1A.3. Technology Specialist	1A.3. Writing Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	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.	

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
Using the writing pacing guide along with resources to meet the writing standards.	K-5	Grade Level Teacher Facilitators	Classroom Teachers K-5	On-Going	Writing Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	Administration
Using a variety of technology resources to teach writing. (Ex: iPad, iPod Nano) Graphic organizers, Exemplar writing samples	K-5	Technology Specialist	Classroom Teachers K-5	On-Going	Writing Professional Development Meetings Grade Level Meetings Quarterly Student Progress Reviews	Administration

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Attendance Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					

	Enter numerical data for current attendance rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected attendance rate in this box.*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	Enter numerical data for current number of absences in this box	*Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

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

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Suspension Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	Enter numerical data for current number of in-school suspensions	*Enter numerical data for expected number of in-school suspensions*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended in-school	*Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended in- school*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out- of- school	*Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out- of- school*					

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out- of- school	*Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out- of- school*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*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

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)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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)

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: *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.

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

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)

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

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)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total:
Writing Budget
Total:
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

Grand Total:

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

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

▫ Yes ▫ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
• Discuss school-wide initiatives • Regularly inform committee of student progress • Continuously gather input to continually increase home, school, and community connections

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Tentatively discuss utilization of funds for stipends, workshops, and professional development.	$3400.00