

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: Windy Hill Middle School | District Name: Lake |
| Principal: Dr. Janice Boyd | Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley |
| SAC Chair: Tracy Everett | 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 | Dr. Janice Boyd | BS – History, Florida Southern College; MS Degree – Mathematics, Nova University; Ed.S. Degree – Educational Leadership, Nova University; Ed.D. Degree- Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida; Certified by the State of Florida in School Principal, Educational Leadership, Mathematics 6-12, History 6-12 and has a middle school endorsement | 0 | 19 | <p>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)</p> <p>Principal of Gray MS in 2011-2012: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 64%, Math Proficiency: 58%, Science Proficiency: 66%, Writing Proficiency: 80%. AMO: Asian, Hispanic, ELL, and SWD did not meet the AMO target in reading. Asian, Hispanic, ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet the AMO target in math.</p> <p>Principal of Gray MS in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 71%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 59%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AYP: 82%, Total and Hispanic did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Principal of Gray MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 68%, Science Proficiency: 56%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: 82%, Total, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Principal of Gray MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 68%, Science Proficiency: 56%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: 82%, Total, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Principal of Gray MS in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 70%, Math Proficiency: 73%, Science Proficiency: 55%, Writing Proficiency: 91%. AYP: 77%, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> |

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

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|--|---|----|---|
| Assistant Principal | Michael Haack | BS – Physical Education, Florida State University; MS Degree – Educational Leadership, Nova University; Certified by the State of Florida in School Principal, Physical Education 6-12, Physical Education k-8, and Athletic Trainer | 3 | 16 | <p>Assistant Principal of Windy Hill MS in 2011-2012: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency: 56%, Math Proficiency: 57%, Science Proficiency: 47%, Writing Proficiency: 81%. AMO: Asian, White, ELL, and Economically Disadvantage did not meet the AMO target in reading. Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, ELL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage did not meet the AMO target in math.</p> <p>Assistant Principal of Windy Hill MS in 2010-2011: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 70%, Science Proficiency: 50%, Writing Proficiency: 78%. AYP: 67%, Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Assistant Principal of Windy Hill MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 71%, Math Proficiency: 71%, Science Proficiency: 53%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AYP: 77%, Total, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Assistant Principal of South Lake HS in 2008-2009: Grade: D, Reading Proficiency: 43%, Math Proficiency: 71%, Science Proficiency: 32%, Writing Proficiency: 67%. AYP: 67%, Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>Assistant Principal of South Lake HS in 2007-2008: Grade: D, Reading Proficiency: 45%, Math Proficiency: 67%, Science Proficiency: 32%, Writing Proficiency: 82%. AYP: 69%, Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> |
| Assistant Principal | Keith Hunt | BS –Elementary Education, University of Central Florida; MS Degree–Educational Leadership, National | 1 | 1 | Assistant Principal of Windy Hill MS in 2011-2012: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency: 56%, Math Proficiency: 57%, Science Proficiency: 47%, Writing Proficiency: 81%. AMO: Asian, White, ELL, and Economically Disadvantage did not meet the AMO target in reading. Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, ELL, SWD, |

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

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | Louis University; Certified by the State of Florida in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education 1-6, and Math 5-9. | | | and Economically Disadvantage did not meet the AMO target in math. Achievement Liaison at East Ridge HS in 2010-2011: Grade: B, Reading Proficiency: 47%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 33%, Writing Proficiency: 77%. AYP: 72%, Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, White, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math. |
| Assistant Principal | Laine Obando | BS – Elementary Education, Oklahoma State University; MS Degree–Educational Leadership, National Louis University; Certified by the State of Florida in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education k-6, and has an endorsement in ESOL. | 0 | 0 | Fourth Grade Teacher at Pine Ridge ES in 2011-2012: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 69%, Math Proficiency: 65%, Science Proficiency: 60%, Writing Proficiency: 83%. AMO: Black, White, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet the AMO target in reading. All students meet the AMO target in math. |

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) |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Literacy Coach | Allison Black | Bachelor's/Elementary Ed | 0 | 4 | No available data since she was not attached to a school. |

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. Windy Hill New Teacher Orientation | Laine Obando, Asst. Principal | August 8, 2011 |
| 2. Mentor Teachers for teachers new to the profession, or new to the school. Provides answers to questions and concerns related to day to day operations and curriculum needs. Assists in the successful completion of the Teacher Orientation Program/portfolio and professional development. | Laine Obando, Teacher Quality and Retention Administrator | August 2011 |
| 3. Review Applications posted on District Employment Website | Dr. Janice Boyd, Principal | On- going |

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 |
|---|--|
| There are 8 teachers who are either out-of-field. The data is not available to determine which teachers are not highly effective. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will take the necessary subject area tests to receive the required certification Teachers will take the required ESOL in-service classes Teachers will take the require Reading Endorsement classes |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 78 | 14%(11) | 23%(18) | 32%(25) | 31%(24) | 38%(30) | Data Unavailable | 13%(10) | 0%(0) | 27%(21) |

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 |
|---------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Carlos Lantes | Kimberly Breeding | Mr. Lantes is an experienced teacher and is located across from Ms. Breeding’s classroom for convenience and accessibility. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |

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

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Denise Elliott | Logan Connor | Ms. Elliott is an experienced language arts teacher and is trained to mentor and support new teachers. She is located near Mr. Connor for convenience and accessibility. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Laura Lindsay-Zahn | Laura Glenn Fagan | Mrs. Lindsay-Zahn is an experienced teacher and is trained to mentor and support new teachers. She is also the department chair with a great depth of knowledge related to curriculum and guidelines in social studies. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Mary Ellen Barger | Tracey Mansfield | Mrs. Barger is the department chair for language arts and is a trained, veteran teacher. Mrs. Barger is eager to help make Ms. Mansfield's year a success. She is located nearby for convenience and accessibility. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Pamela Burden | Monica Perez | Mrs. Burden is the department chair for reading and is a trained, veteran teacher. Mrs. Burden is eager to help make Ms. Perez's year a success. She is located nearby for convenience and accessibility. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Devendra Ramphal | Roberta Reale | Mr. Ramphal is an experienced teacher and has mentored teachers in previous years. His proximity to Mrs. Reale makes his mentor assignment even more convenient. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Jason Lancy | Carol Rose | Mr. Lancy is an experienced teacher and has mentored teachers in previous years. His proximity to Mrs. Rose makes his mentor assignment even more convenient. Mr. Lancy is eager to assist Ms. Rose with her math support needs. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Alicia Polen | Ashley Treadwell | Ms. Polen is an experienced language arts teacher and is located near Ms. Treadwell for convenience and accessibility. Her curriculum support will help ensure a successful first year for Ms. Treadwell. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and |

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

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | Professional Development needs. |
| Amanda Baker | Natassia Walker | Ms. Baker is an experienced ID teacher whose knowledge of ESE services, curriculum guidelines will help Ms. Walker during her first year of teaching. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Brian Williams | Logan Allred | Mr. Williams is an experienced teacher and is trained to mentor and support new teachers. He has a great depth of knowledge related to curriculum and guidelines in social studies. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Stephanie Thompson-Scholer | Reshonda Scott | Mrs. Thompson-Scholer is an experienced teacher and is trained to mentor and support new teachers. She has a great depth of knowledge related to curriculum and guidelines in language arts. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs. |
| Jessica Woods | Shelly Back | Mrs. Woods is an experienced, knowledgeable math teacher and will Ms. Back in her first year of teaching. She has a great depth of knowledge related to curriculum and guidelines in math. | Weekly meetings with mentee to coach and assist where needed; monthly new teacher meetings with TQR Administrator to assist with Instructional, Curriculum, and Professional Development needs |

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Janice Boyd, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Laine Obando, Assistant Principal: Assists the principal in ensuring that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducting assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensuring implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensuring adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicating with parents regarding school-based RtI plans.

Mary Ellen Barger, Jason Lancy, Dennis Doherty, Laura Zahn, General, and Pam Burden, General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with members of their departments to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for their departments.

Connan Rutledge, Exceptional Student Education Specialist: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education and ESE inclusion teachers.

Allison Black, Literacy Coach: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and assistance to teachers regarding research based reading strategies, supports implementation of Tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans.

Caroline O'Connor, Samantha Moberg, and Steve Bonomo, Guidance Counselors: Provides services to support the academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success to the students. Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data and facilitates in the development of intervention plans.

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?

During the school year, the RtI Leadership team will meet on a monthly basis to review relevant data and link to instructional decisions, identify students who are at risk for not meeting benchmarks, identify professional development and resources for teachers, and evaluate implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Leadership Team met with members of the SAC. The team helped set clear expectations, defined areas of need, and facilitated in the development of a systemic approach to teaching.

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

| MTSS Implementation |
|--|
| <p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Baseline Data: FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test), Lake County Benchmark Assessments, FAIR (Florida Assessment of Instruction in Reading)</p> <p>Pre-Test: FAIR, Lake County Benchmark Assessments</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: READ 180, Curriculum Texts (Pre/Post Chapter Tests, Tiered Curriculum Progress)</p> <p>Frequency of Data: From once a week to once a month</p> <p>Mid-Year: FAIR, Lake County Benchmarks</p> <p>Post-Test: FAIR, Lake County Benchmarks, End of Course Exams (EOC)</p> <p>Behavior: Positive Behavior Support (PBS)</p> |
| <p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time. The RtI team will also evaluate staff PD needs during the monthly RtI leadership team meetings. District staff will provide on-going support and training as needed.</p> |
| <p>Describe the plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>Administration will work with the school's psychologist, guidance counselors and teachers to provide on-going support for MTSS.</p> |

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

Literary Leadership Team

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). |
| Janice Boyd, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures the implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support the implementation of the LLT's goals, and communicates with parents regarding the school's literacy plan. |
| Laine Obando, Assistant Principal: Assists the principal in ensuring the implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support the implementation of the LLT's goals, and communicates with parents regarding the school's literacy plan. |
| Mary Ellen Barger, Jason Lancy, Dennis Doherty, Laura Zahn, General, and Pam Burden, General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers literacy instruction/intervention, collaborates with members of their departments to implement literacy strategies. |
| Connan Rutledge, Exceptional Student Education Specialist: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into literacy instruction, and collaborates with general education and ESE inclusion teachers. |
| Allison Black, Literacy Coach: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection, assists in data analysis, provides professional development and assistance to teachers regarding research based reading strategies, supports implementation of the school's literacy plan. |
| Caroline O'Connor, Samantha Moberg, and Steve Bonomo, Guidance Counselors: Provides services to support the academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success to the students. Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data and facilitates in the development of intervention plans. |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). |
| The LLT meets once each month. The focus of the meetings: Review relevant data and link to instructional decisions, identify students who are at risk for not meeting benchmarks, identify professional development and resources for teachers, and evaluate implementation. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? |
| To provide appropriate staff development in Content Area Reading to ensure that teachers are implementing before, during, and after reading strategies |

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To ensure that all teachers are implementing before, during, and after reading strategies, we will:

1. Provide professional development in PLC's
2. Provide training in NGCAR-PD for all language arts teachers during the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year
3. Provide training in NGCAR-PD for all social studies teachers during the second semester of the 2012-2013 school year
4. Provide training in CRISS strategies for all math teachers during the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year
5. Provide training in CRISS strategies for all science teachers during the second semester of the 2012-2013 school year
6. Monitor IFC's and lesson plans
7. Conduct CWT's

****High Schools Only***

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS Reading Goals

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

| Reading Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: To increase the Level 3 and above reading scores by 5% | | | 1A.1. Not all teachers have been trained in DBQ | 1A.1. Social Studies Teachers will incorporate the Data Based Inquiry (DBQ) Method | 1A.1. LLT, Administration, Social Studies Department Chair | 1A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s, Additional professional development as needed | 1A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s Logs, Student Artifacts |
| Reading Goal #1A: To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in FCAT Reading from 56% to 61%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Based upon FLDOE data, Grades: 56% (631) students scored at or above Level 3 | | 61% (735) students are expected to score at or above Level 3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Not all teachers have been trained in AVID | 1A.2. AVID Strategies will be implemented | 1A.2. LLT, LA Department Chair, Administration, | 1A.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s, Additional professional development as needed | 1A.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s Logs, Student Portfolios |
| | | | 1A.3. Not all teachers have been trained in CRISS | 1A.3. CRISS Strategies will be implemented in the math and science classrooms | 1A.3. LLT, Administration, Math and Science Department Chairs | 1A.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s, CRISS professional development for the math and science teachers | 1A.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT’s Logs, Student Artifacts |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |

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. To increase the Level 4 and above reading scores by 3% | | | 2A.1. Not all teachers have been trained in DBQ | 2A.1. Social Studies Teachers will incorporate the Data Based Inquiry (DBQ) Method | 2A.1. LLT, Administration, Social Studies Dept Chair | 2A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 2A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| Reading Goal #2A: To increase the percentage of students scoring Levels 4 & 5 in FCAT Reading from 27% to 30%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE data, 27% (302) students scored Level 4 or Level 5 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30% (361) students are expected to score Level 4 or Level 5 | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Not all teachers have been trained in AVID | 2A.2. AVID Strategies will be implemented | 2A.2. LLT, LA Department Chair, Administration, | 2A.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 2A.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Portfolios |
| | | | 2A.3. Not all teachers have been trained in CRISS | 2A.3. CRISS Strategies will be implemented in the math and science classrooms | 2A.3. LLT, Administration, Math and Science Department Chairs | 2A.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, CRISS professional development for the math and science teachers | 2A.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 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. To increase the students making learning gains in reading by 5% | | | 3A.1. Not all teachers have been trained in Content Area Reading Strategies | 3A.1. NG-CARPD for all language arts and social studies teachers | 3A.1. Language Arts Department Chair, Administration | 3A.1. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 3A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |
| Reading Goal #3A: To increase the students making learning gains in reading by 5% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 62% (698) students made learning | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 67% (806) students are expected to make learning gains in FCAT | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | gains in FCAT Reading | Reading | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. | 3A.2. Level 1 and low to middle Level 2 reading students will be scheduled into a 2 period block of intensive reading where READ 180 and centers will be implemented. Mid-Level 2 reading students will be scheduled into at least a one period reading class on a daily basis | 3A.2. Literacy Coach, Reading Department Chair | 3A.2. Assessment of student progress every 20 days | 3A.2. FAIR RCA's OPM data |
| | | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. Teachers will use data to drive instruction | 3A.3. Department Chairs, Literacy Coach, Administration | 3A.3. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 3A.3. FAIR RCA's OPM data |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |
| 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. To increase the students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 5% | | | 4A.1. Not all teachers have been trained in Content Area Reading Strategies | 4A.1. NG-CARPD for all language arts and social studies teachers | 4A.1. Language Arts Department Chair, Administration | 4A.1. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 4A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |
| Reading Goal #4A: To increase the students in the lower quartile making learning gains in reading by 5% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 63% (177) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in FCAT Reading | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 68% (204) students in the lowest 25% are expected to make learning gains in FCAT Reading | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 4A.2. | 4A.2. Level 1 and low to middle Level 2 reading students will be scheduled into a 2 period block of intensive reading where READ 180 and centers will be implemented. Mid-Level 2 reading students will be scheduled into at least a one period reading class on a daily basis | 4A.2. Literacy Coach, Reading Department Chair | 4A.2. Assessment of student progress every 20 days | 4A.2. FAIR RCA's OPM data | |
| | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. Teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 4A.3Administration, Department Chairs | 4A.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 4A.3 CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans | |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | |
| 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 Based upon FLDOE AMO Data 56% of all students were performing satisfactorily in Reading | White:65% Black:45% Hispanic:46% Asian:75% American Indian:N/A ELL:25% SWD:26% Econ Disadvantaged:47% | White:74% Black:50% Hispanic:51% Asian:80% American Indian:N/A ELL:33% SWD:32% Econ Disadvantaged:53% | White:77% Black:55% Hispanic:56% Asian:82% American Indian:N/A ELL:39% SWD:39% Econ Disadvantaged:57% | White:79% Black:60% Hispanic:61% Asian:84% American Indian:N/A ELL:46% SWD:45% Econ Disadvantaged:62% | White:82% Black:65% Hispanic:66% Asian:86% American Indian:N/A ELL:53% SWD:52% Econ Disadvantaged:67% | White:85% Black:70% Hispanic:71% Asian:88% American Indian:N/A ELL:60% SWD:59% Econ Disadvantaged:72% |
| Reading Goal #5A: Increase the percent of all students meeting the AMO Target in reading from 56% in 2012 to 78% by 2017. | | | | | | | |

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 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: Not all teachers have been trained in Content Area Reading Strategies Black:N/A Hispanic:N/A Asian: Not all teachers have been trained in Content Area Reading Strategies trained in DBQ American Indian:N/A | 5B.1. Before, during, and after reading strategies in all content area classes | 5B.1. Literacy Coach, Department Chairs, Administration | 5B.1. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 5B.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |
| Reading Goal #5B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| To increase the percentage of White students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Reading from 65% to 74%. To increase the percentage of Asian students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Reading from 75% to 80%. | White:65% Black:45% Hispanic:46% Asian:75% American Indian:N/A | White:74% Black:50% Hispanic:51% Asian:80% American Indian: N/A | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2. White: Not all teachers have been trained in DBQ Strategies Black:N/A Hispanic:N/A Asian: Not all teachers have been trained in DBQ American Indian:N/A | 5B.2. Social Studies Teachers will incorporate the Data Based Inquiry (DBQ) Method | 5B.2.. LLT, Administration, Social Studies Dept Chair | 5B.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 5B.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| 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. Not all teachers have been trained in CRISS | 5C.1. CRISS Strategies will be implemented in the math and science classrooms | 5C.1. LLT, Administration, Math and Science Department Chairs | 5C.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, CRISS professional development for the math and science teachers | 5C.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| Reading Goal #5C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| To increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Reading from 25% to 33%. | <i>Based upon FLDOE data,</i> Grades: 25% of ELL students scored at or above Level 3 | 33% of ELL students are expected to score at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. Teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 5C.2. Administration, Department Chairs | 5C.2.. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5C.2. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. Before, during, and after reading strategies in all content area classes | 5C.3. Literacy Coach, Department Chairs, Administration | 5C.3. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 5C.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |

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 |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> N/A: SWD met the AMO. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | | | | | |
| 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. Not all teachers have been trained in CRISS | 5E.1. CRISS Strategies will be implemented in the math and science classrooms | 5E.1. LLT, Administration, Math and Science Department Chairs | 5E.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, CRISS professional development for the math and science teachers | 5E.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| <u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> To increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Reading from 47% to 53%. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Based upon FLDOE data, Grades: 47% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Level 3</i> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 53% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. Teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 5E.2. Administration, Department Chairs | 5E.2.. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5E.2. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| | | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. Before, during, and after reading strategies in all content area classes | 5E.3. Literacy Coach, Department Chairs, Administration | 5E.3. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 5E.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |

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

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 |
| NG-CARPD | All language arts teachers and all social studies teachers | Literacy Coach, LA Department Chairs, and AVID Teacher | All language arts and social studies teachers | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Literacy Coach, Language Arts and Social Studies Department Chairs |
| CRISS | Math and Science Teachers | LRC Staff at the District Level | Math and Science Teachers | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Literacy Coach, Math and Science Department Chair |
| AVID | All Teachers | AVID Teacher and AVID Coordinator | All Instructional Staff | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, AVID Coordinator, Department Chairs |
| Integrated Reading & CTE | CTE Teachers | District CTE Staff | CTE Teachers | June 2011 – June 2012 | Student Progress Monitoring and Classroom Visitations | District CTE Staff |

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

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. To increase the students scoring proficient in listening/speaking by 5% CELLA Goal #1: To increase the students scoring proficient in listening/speaking by 5% | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: Based upon FLDOE data, 44% (32) students scored proficient | 1.1. Not all reading and language arts teachers are ESOL endorsed | 1.1. Rosetta Stone | 1.1. Intensive Reading Teachers | 1.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, | 1.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Rosetta Stone Usage Reports |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. iPad Apps during homeroom/ X Block | 1.2. ESOL TA, Administration, Literacy Coach | 1.2. CWT's | 1.2. CWT's |
| 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. To increase the students scoring proficient in reading by 5% CELLA Goal #2: To increase the students scoring proficient in reading by 5% | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: Based upon FLDOE data, 14% (10) students scored proficient | 2.1. Not all teachers have been trained in Content Area Reading Strategies | 2.1. Before, during, and after reading strategies in all content area classes | 2.1. Literacy Coach, Department Chairs, Administration | 2.1. Monitoring of lesson plans, monitoring of PLC's , CWT's | 2.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. iPad Apps during homeroom/ X Block | 2.2. ESOL TA, Administration, Literacy Coach | 2.2. CWT's | 2.2. CWT's |
| | 2.3. | 2.3. iPad Apps during homeroom/ X Block | 2.3. ESOL TA, Administration, Literacy Coach | 2.3. CWT's | 2.3. CWT's | |
| | 2.4. Parents may not be fluent in English and/or able to help student at home | 2.4. Spanish version of telephone messages, ESOL Parent Night | 2.4. ESOL Counselor, ESOL TA, Reading Teachers, Administration | 2.4. Monitor outgoing phone messages, Attendance at ESOL Parent Night | 2.4. Attendance at ESOL Parent Night, Rosetta Stone Usage Reports | |

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. To increase the students scoring proficient in writing by 5% | | 3.1. Not all teachers have been trained in DBQ | 3.1. Social Studies Teachers will incorporate the Data Based Inquiry (DBQ) Method | 3.1.. LLT, Administration, Social Studies Dept Chair | 3.1.. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 3.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Artifacts |
| CELLA Goal #3: To increase the students scoring proficient in writing by 5% | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : Based upon FLDOE data, 22% (16) students scored proficient. | | | | | |
| | | 3.2. | 3.2.IPad Apps during homeroom/ X Block | 3.2.ESOL TA, Administration, Literacy Coach | 3.2.CWT's | 3.2.CWT's |

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

End of CELLA 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. To increase the Level 3 and above math scores by 5% | | | 1A.1. | 1A.1. Develop Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) for FCIM bell ringers that gives extra time to areas where data shows weaknesses or where the percentage of coverage has increased on FCAT 2.0 | 1A.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 1A.1. Data Chats, Monitoring of student progress | 1A.1. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing |
| Mathematics Goal #1A: To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in FCAT math from 57% to 62%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 57% (642) students scored at or above Level 3 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 72% (746) students are expected to score at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. Develop Instructional Focus Lessons that go more in-depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage FCAT 2.0 strands | 1A.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 1A.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 1A.2. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 1A.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 1A.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 1A.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 math scores by 3%</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A: To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 math scores by 3%</td> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 30% (326) students scored Level 4 or Level 5</td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30% (361) students are expected to score Level 4 or Level 5</td> </tr> </table> | | | <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A: To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 math scores by 3% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 30% (326) students scored Level 4 or Level 5 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30% (361) students are expected to score Level 4 or Level 5 | 2A.1. | 2A.1. Incorporate POMISE modules into curriculum map to provide in-depth teaching | 2A.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 2A.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry based activities, how math process standards and higher order thinking was used in the lesson. | 2A.1. Increased rigor of FCAT 2.0 Benchmarks |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A: To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 math scores by 3% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 30% (326) students scored Level 4 or Level 5 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30% (361) students are expected to score Level 4 or Level 5 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. | 2A.2. Honors and Advanced math teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 2A.2.. Administration, Math Department Chair | 2A.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 2A.2.. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans | | | |
| <p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B: Providing this data violates student confidentiality.</td> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality.</td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality.</td> </tr> </table> | | | <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B: Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| <u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B: Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|
| <p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. To increase the students making learning gains in math by 3%</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A: To increase the percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT math from 64% to 67%.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 64% (721) students made learning gains in FCAT Math</td> <td>67% (806) students are expected to make learning gains in FCAT Math</td> </tr> </table> | | | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 64% (721) students made learning gains in FCAT Math | 67% (806) students are expected to make learning gains in FCAT Math | 3A.1. Middle school teachers may not be proficient in student centers | 3A.1. Increase the use of math centers | 3A.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 3A.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 3A.1. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 64% (721) students made learning gains in FCAT Math | 67% (806) students are expected to make learning gains in FCAT Math | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. | 3A.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction | 3A.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 3A.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 3A.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs | | | | |
| | | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 3A.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 3A.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 3A.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans | | | | |
| <p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B: Providing this data violates student confidentiality</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Providing this data violates student confidentiality.</td> <td>Providing this data violates student confidentiality.</td> </tr> </table> | | | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | | | | | | |

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. To increase the students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math by 5% | | | 4A.1. Middle school teachers may not be proficient in student centers | 4A.1. Increase the use of math centers | 4A.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 4A.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plan, data chats | 4A.1. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| Mathematics Goal #4A: To increase the percentage of students making learning gains in FCAT Math from 56% to 61%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 56% (157) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in FCAT Math | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 61% (183) students in the lowest 25% are expected to make learning gains in FCAT Math | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2. | 4A.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction | 4A.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 4A.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 4A.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs |
| | | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 4A.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 4A.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 4A.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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 Based upon FLDOE AMO Data 57% of all students were performing satisfactorily in Math | White:67% Black:44% Hispanic:45% Asian:81% American Indian:N/A ELL:25% SWD:20% Econ Disadvantaged:67% | White:73% Black:50% Hispanic:53% Asian:90% American Indian:N/A ELL:38% SWD:38% Econ Disadvantaged:53% | White:76% Black:55% Hispanic:57% Asian:91% American Indian:N/A ELL:44% SWD:45% Econ Disadvantaged:58% | White:79% Black:60% Hispanic:62% Asian:92% American Indian:N/A ELL:50% SWD:51% Econ Disadvantaged:63% | White:81% Black:65% Hispanic:67% Asian:93% American Indian:N/A ELL:56% SWD:57% Econ Disadvantaged:67% | White:84% Black:70% Hispanic:72% Asian:94% American Indian:N/A ELL:63% SWD:63% Econ Disadvantaged:72% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5A: Increase the percent of all students meeting the AMO Target in math from 57% in 2011 to 79% 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: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5B.1. Increase the use of math centers | 5B.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5B.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plan, data chats | 5B.1. CWT's, benchmark testing | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B: To increase the percentage of White students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 67% to 73%. To increase the percentage of Black students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 44% to 53%. To increase the percentage of Hispanic students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 45% to 53%. To increase the percentage of Asian students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 81% to 90%. | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> <th style="width: 50%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th style="width: 50%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White:67%</td> <td>White:73%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:44%</td> <td>Black:50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:45%</td> <td>Hispanic:53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:81%</td> <td>Asian:90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian:N/A</td> <td>American Indian: N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | White:67% | White:73% | Black:44% | Black:50% | Hispanic:45% | Hispanic:53% | Asian:81% | Asian:90% | American Indian:N/A | American Indian: N/A | 5B.2. 5B.3. | 5B.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction 5B.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 5B.2. Administration, Math Department Chair 5B.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5B.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats 5B.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5B.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs 5B.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White:67% | White:73% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black:44% | Black:50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic:45% | Hispanic:53% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian:81% | Asian:90% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| American Indian:N/A | American Indian: N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | 5C.1. | 5C.1. Increase the use of math centers | 5C.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5C.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plan, data chats | 5C.1. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: To increase the percentage of ELL students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 25% to 33%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Based upon FLDOE data, Grades: 25% of ELL students scored at or above Level 3</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 33% of SWD students scored at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction | 5C.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5C.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 5C.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 5C.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5C.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5C.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| 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. Not all teachers have been trained to use math centers | 5D.1. Increase the use of math centers | 5D.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5D.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plan, data chats | 5D.1. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| Mathematics Goal #5D: To increase the percentage of SWD students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 20% to 32%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Based upon FLDOE data, Grades: 20% of SWD students scored at or above Level 3</i> | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 32% of SWD students scored at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction | 5D.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5D.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 5D.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs |
| | | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 5D.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5D.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5D.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |

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. Increase the use of math centers | 5E.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5E.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plan, data chats | 5E.1. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| #5E: To increase the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at or above Level 3 in FCAT Math from 46% to 53%. | <i>Based upon FLDOE data, Grades: 46% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Level 3</i> | 53% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. Increase the use of math manipulatives and computer assisted instruction | 5E.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5E.2. Monitoring of student progress and monitoring of lesson plans, Data Chats | 5E.2. CWT's, benchmark testing, computer software programs |
| | | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. Implement Accelerated Math to use as a remediation tool within the math classes | 5E.3. Administration, Math Department Chair | 5E.3. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 5E.3. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |

End of Middle 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. To increase the Level 3 and above Algebra 1 scores by 1% | | | 1.1. | 1.1. Incorporate POMISE modules into curriculum map to provide in-depth teaching | 1.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 1.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry based activities, how math process standards and higher order thinking was used in the lesson. | 1.1. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| Algebra 1 Goal #1: To increase the Level 3 and above Algebra 1 scores by 1% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 95% (116) students scored Level 3 and above | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 96% (141) students are expected to score Level 3 and above | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. Algebra teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 1.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 1.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 1.2. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3.AVID Strategies will be implemented | 1.3.LLT, LA Department Chair, Administration, | 1.3.Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 1.3.Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Portfolios |
| 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. To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 Algebra 1 scores by 5% | | | 2.1. | 2.1. Incorporate POMISE modules into curriculum map to provide in-depth teaching | 2.1. Administration, Math Department Chair | 2.1. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry based activities, how math process standards and higher order thinking was used in the lesson. | 2.1. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| Algebra Goal #2: To increase the Level 4 and Level 5 Algebra 1 scores by 5% | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 59% (71) students scored Level 4 or Level 5 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 63% (93) students are expected to score Level 4 or Level 5 | | | | | |

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

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----------|
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. Algebra teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 2.2. Administration, Math Department Chair | 2.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 2.2. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3.AVID Strategies will be implemented | 2.3.LLT, LA Department Chair, Administration, | 2.3.Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 2.3.Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Portfolios | |
| 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 | All: 95% | All: 96% | All: 97% | All: 98% | All: 99% | All: 100% |
| | <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> N/A: All subgroups made satisfactory progress in Algebra. | | | | | | |
| 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. | <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> N/A: All subgroups made satisfactory progress in Algebra. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | 3B.1 | 3B.1 | 3B.1 | 3B.1. |
| | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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. |
| <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3C:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | | | | | |
| 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. |
| <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3D:</u> N/A | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | | | | | |
| 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. |
| <u>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</u> N/A: Economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in Algebra. | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A | | | | | |

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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 |
| CRISS | Math Teachers | LRC Staff at the District Level | Math Teachers | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Literacy Coach, Math Department Chair |
| AVID | All Teachers | AVID Teacher and AVID Coordinator | All Instructional Staff | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, AVID Coordinator, Department Chairs |

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

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. To increase the percentage of 8 th grade students scoring at or above Level 3 by 6% Science Goal #1A: To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in FCAT Science from 47% to 53%. | | | 1A.1. | 1A.1. Develop Instructional Focus Calendars (IFC) for FCIM bell ringers that gives extra time to areas where data shows weaknesses | 1A.1. Administration, Science Department Chair | 1A.1. Data Chats, Monitoring of student progress | 1A.1. CWT's, Mini-Assessments, Benchmark Testing |
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 47% (172) students scored at or above Level 3 | 53% (206) students are expected to score at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. Develop Instructional Focus Lessons that go more in-depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage FCAT strands | 1A.2. Administration, Science Department Chair, Secondary Science Program Specialist | 1A.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of student progress | 1A.2. CWT's, Mini-Assessments, Benchmark Testing |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. Computer-Assisted Instruction using iPads, Cooperative Groups, Vocabulary | 1A.3. Science Department Chair | 1A.3. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, data chats | 1A.3. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1B: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |

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. To increase the percentage of 8 th grade students scoring at or above Level 4 by 6% | | | 2A.1. | 2A.1. AVID Strategies will be implemented | 2A.1. LLT, Avid Coordinator, Administration, | 2A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 2A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's Logs, Student Portfolios |
| Science Goal #2A: To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 4 in FCAT Science from 14% to 20%. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 14% (51) students scored at or above Level 4 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 20% (77) students are expected to score at or above Level 4 | 2A.2. | 2A.2. Develop Instructional Focus Lessons that go more in-depth and concentrate more time on higher percentage FCAT strands | 2A.2. Administration, Science Department Chair | 2A.2. Data Chats, Monitoring of student progress | 2A.2. CWT's, Mini-Assessments, Benchmark Testing |
| | | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. Incorporate PROMiSE lessons and inquiry based labs into tiered instruction | 2A.3. Administration, Science Department Chair, Secondary Science Program Specialist | 2A.3. Teachers incorporate new strategies in lesson plans. Student writing activities explain inquiry based activities, how higher order thinking was used in the lesson. Lab doc form & Lab Write Up. | 2A.3 CWT's, Mini-Assessments, Benchmark Testing, Student Artifacts |
| | | | 2A.4. | 2A.4. Computer-Assisted Instruction using iPads , Cooperative Groups, Vocabulary | 2A.4. Science Department Chair | 2A.4. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, data chats | 2A.4. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| | | | 2A.5. | 2A.5. Honors and Advanced science teachers will plan collaboratively in PLC sharing effective strategies | 2A.5.. Administration, Science Department Chair | 2A.5. Data Chats, Monitoring of lesson plans | 2A.5.. CWT's, mini-assessments, benchmark testing, Lesson Plans |
| | | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| | | | | | | | |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| CRISS | Science Teachers | LRC Staff at the District Level | Science Teachers | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Literacy Coach, Science Department Chair |
| AVID | All Teachers | AVID Teacher and AVID Coordinator | All Instructional Staff | Selected Dates throughout the school year | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, AVID Coordinator, Department Chairs |
| Technology in the Science Classroom | All Science Teachers | ILC and/or Tech Con | All Science Teachers | Tuesday PLC's | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Literacy Coach, ILS, Department Chair |
| PROMiSE Lessons | All Science Teachers | Dept Chair Secondary Science Program Specialist | All Science Teachers | Tuesday PLC's | Lesson Plans, CWT's, Peer Coaching, Observation | Administration, Department Chair |

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

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. To increase the percentage of 8 th grade students scoring at or above Level 3 by 2% | | | 1A.1. | 1A.1. Writing activities across all content areas | 1A.1. Literacy Coach, Administration | 1A.1. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 1A.1. Benchmark tests, student portfolios |
| Writing Goal #1A: To increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in FCAT Writes from 81% to 83%. <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Based upon FLDOE School Grades: 81% (293) Students scored at or above Level 3 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 83% (322) students are expected to score at or above Level 3 | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Not all content area teachers are trained in the FCAT Writes Rubric | 1A.2. Train teachers on FCAT Writes | 1A.2. Literacy Coach, Language Arts Department Chair, Administration | 1A.2. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's, Additional professional development as needed | 1A.2. CWT'S |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. Use Write Score in Language Arts classes to get unbiased feedback on students' writing to prompts | 1A.3. Language Arts Department Chair, Administration | 1A.3. Monitor Lesson Plans, CWT's | 1A.3. Write Score Reports |
| 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: Providing this data violates student confidentiality | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Providing this data violates student confidentiality. | | | | | |

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 |
| FCAT Writes Rubric | All | Literacy Coach | All Instructional Staff | During PLC as needed | LLC Meetings, Reflection Prompts | Literacy Coach LA Department Chair |

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

| Civics EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Civics Goal #1: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| 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: | <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |

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

End of Civics Goal

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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |
| 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: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> | | | | | |

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| 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 To increase the average daily attendance rate by 1.5% | | | 1.1. | 1.1. Formation of an attendance committee at each grade level made up of team leaders, guidance counselor, social worker, and an assistant principal that will meet at least once each month | 1.1. Each grade level Assistant Principal | 1.1. Collection and analysis of attendance data | 1.1. Attendance Data |
| Attendance Goal #1: To increase the average daily attendance rate from 94.55% to 95.95% | <u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u> | <u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u> | | | | | |
| | The average daily attendance rate was 94.55%. | The average daily attendance rate is expected to be 95.95%. | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 15% (170) students had 10 or more unexcused absences | 10% (120) are expected to have 10 or more unexcused absences | | | | | |
| | <u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u> | | | | | |
| | 3% (37) students had 10 or more unexcused tardies | 2% (24) are expected to have 10 or more unexcused tardies | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. Referral to School's Social Worker for Excessive Absences | 1.2. Grade level Assistant Principal | 1.2. Collection and analysis of attendance data | 1.2. Attendance Data |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. Referral to School's RtI Team | 1.3. Grade level Assistant Principal | 1.3. Collection and analysis of attendance data | 1.3. Attendance Data |

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>1. Suspension To decrease the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions by 5%</p> <p>Suspension Goal #1: To decrease the number of students receiving in-school suspensions from 53 to 50 and the number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions from 154 to 146</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>The total number of in-school suspensions was 58</td> <td>The expected number of in-school suspensions is 55</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>53 students were suspended in-school</td> <td>50 students are expected to be suspended in-school</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>The total number of out-of-school suspensions was 258</td> <td>The expected number out-of-school suspensions is 245</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>154 students were suspended out-of-school</td> <td>146 students are expected to be suspended out-of-school</td> </tr> </table> | | | <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | The total number of in-school suspensions was 58 | The expected number of in-school suspensions is 55 | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | 53 students were suspended in-school | 50 students are expected to be suspended in-school | <u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | The total number of out-of-school suspensions was 258 | The expected number out-of-school suspensions is 245 | <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | 154 students were suspended out-of-school | 146 students are expected to be suspended out-of-school | 1.1. Inconsistency exists between staff members on disciplinary procedures | 1.1. Single School Culture will be reinforced school-wide to clearly define Tier 1 expectations for staff and students to ensure that staff and students understand what is expected of them | 1.1. Leadership Team, Administration | 1.1. Discipline data will be reviewed each quarter to determine if suspensions are decreasing | 1.1. Discipline referral data |
| <u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The total number of in-school suspensions was 58 | The expected number of in-school suspensions is 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 students were suspended in-school | 50 students are expected to be suspended in-school | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The total number of out-of-school suspensions was 258 | The expected number out-of-school suspensions is 245 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | <u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 154 students were suspended out-of-school | 146 students are expected to be suspended out-of-school | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Students are not clear on school expectations | 1.2. Homeroom teachers will go over the Lake County Code of Student Conduct and WHMS Single School Culture | 1.2. Leadership Team, Administration | 1.2. Discipline data will be reviewed each quarter to determine if suspensions are decreasing | 1.2. Discipline referral data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. Students experiencing discipline problems will be referred to guidance for individual and small group counseling | 1.3. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Team Leaders | 1.3. Discipline data will be reviewed each quarter to determine if suspensions are decreasing | 1.3. Discipline referral data |
| | | 1.4 Not all teachers have been trained in PBS | 1.4. Implement PBS (Positive Behavior Support) school-wide | 1.4. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Team Leaders, RTI Leadership Team | 1.4. Discipline data will be reviewed each quarter to determine if suspensions are decreasing | 1.4. Discipline referral data |

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 |
| New Teacher Induction | All | Assistant Principals/ Mentors | Teachers New to WHMS | Pre-Planning and one Wednesday each month | CWT's, Discipline Referrals | TQR |
| Single School Culture | All | Admin/ Depart. Chairs | Instructional Staff | Pre-Planning and as needed in Faculty Meetings each month | CWT's, Discipline Referrals | Administration |
| PBS | All | PBS Leadership Team | Instructional Staff | Pre-Planning and as needed in Faculty Meetings each month | CWT's, Discipline Referrals | Administration |

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

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

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

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. |
| <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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: |

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

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

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| 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 To increase the number of volunteer hour by 5% | | | 1.1. | 1.1. Encourage parents to volunteer more at school through the Newsletter, Website, Marquee, and Call Out System | 1.1. Volunteer Coordinator | 1.1. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey | 1.1. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets |
| <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> To increase the number of volunteers hours from 672 to 706 | <u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> The number of volunteer hours is 672 | <u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> The expected number of volunteer hours is 706 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. Post Parent Newsletter on School's Website to keep parents up-to-date | 1.2. Newsletter Coordinator, Web Manager, AP in charge of Technology | 1.2. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey | 1.2. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. Post up-coming events on School's Webpage | 1.3. Techcon | 1.3. Collect Participation Data, Climate Survey | 1.3. Parent/Volunteer Sign In Sheets |

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

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: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| 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: To Increase Student Achievement through the STEM | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| STEM Goal #1: To increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and above in math and science. | 1.1. | 1.1. Determine core instructional needs by reviewing baseline data and benchmark assessments. Plan differentiated instruction using research based strategies and interventions with the classrooms | 1.1. Department Chairs, Administration | 1.1. Monitoring of lesson plans, CWT's, Analysis of relevant student data | 1.1. Lesson plans, CWT's, Student Data |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. Computer-Assisted Instruction using iPads in the science classrooms | 1.2. Science Department Chair | 1.2. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, data chats | 1.2. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. Cooperative Groups, Vocabulary Development | 1.3. Science and Math Department Chairs | 1.3. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, data chats | 1.3. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| | 1.4. | 1.4. Integrate STEM across disciplines to improve math and science scores | 1.4. Department Chairs, Administration | 1.4. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, PLC's | 1.4. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| | 1.5. | 1.5. DBQ's and complex text in core subjects used to reinforce important science and math concepts used in engineering | 1.5. Department Chairs, Administration | 1.5. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, PLC's | 1.5. CWT's, benchmark testing |

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: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: To implement at least one CAP Academy | | | | | |
| CTE Goal #1: To plan for the implementation at least one CAP Academy | 1.1.Lack of knowledge regarding the requirements of CTE academies in the middle school | 1.1.Meet with the district CTE staff to what CAP academies are age appropriate for middle school aged students, the equipment required for the academies | 1.1.Administration, District CTE personnel | 1.1.If the information is obtained | 1.1.A list of CAP academies that are appropriate for middle school students |
| | 1.2.Vocational teachers may not have the required State certification | 1.2.Determine which areas of certification are required for the vocational programs currently offered at the school | 1.2. Administration, District CTE personnel | 1.2.If the information is obtained | 1.2.Teacher certifications |
| | 1.3.Will enough middle school aged students be interested in pursuing the CTE certifications to fill the class(es) | 1.3.Survey the students | 1.3.Counselors, Administration | 1.3.Survey results | 1.3.Survey Results |

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: To implement at least one CAP Academy | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| CTE Goal #2: To increase the number of industry certified CTE teachers | 2.1. Some vocational teachers may have a lack of knowledge regarding the required industry certification exams | 2.1. Workshops in the summer along with industry certification exams | 2.1. District CTE personnel | 2.1. Increased number of industry certified CTE teachers | 2.1. Increased number of industry certified CTE teachers |

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: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| 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) | | | Anti-Bullying Program (Required by Lake County School Board) | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 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 To decrease discipline problems related to bullying | | | 1.1. | 1.1. Guidance Department will continue to implement lessons in pro-social skills | 1.1. Assistant Principals | 1.1. Collect and Analyze Discipline Data | 1.1. Collect and Analyze Discipline Data, Climate Survey Data | |
| Additional Goal #1: To decrease the overall discipline problems related to bullying | | 2012 Current Level :* | | | | | | 2013 Expected Level :* |
| There was 1 documented incident of bullying | | The expected number of incidences of bullying is zero | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2.Enroll students in anger management or conflict resolution small groups as warranted | 1.2.Guidance Counselors | 1.2. Collect and Analyze Discipline Data | 1.2. Collect and Analyze Discipline Data | |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. Continue implementation of PBS (Positive Behavior Support) school-wide | 1.3. Administration, Guidance Counselors, Team Leaders, RTI Leadership Team | 1.3. Discipline data will be reviewed each quarter to determine if suspensions are decreasing | 1.3. Discipline referral data | |

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Instructional Technology | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 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. Computer-Assisted Instruction using iPads within the 8 th grade science classes | 1.1. Science Department Chair | 1.1. Monitoring of student progress, monitoring of lesson plans, data chats | 1.1.. CWT's, benchmark testing |
| Increase the use of instructional technology in our science classes and with our CELLA students | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.1. Computer-Assisted Instruction using iPads within the X-Block for Cella Students | 1.1. AP in charge of ELL and Guidance | 1.1. Monitoring of student progress | 1.1.. CWT's, benchmark testing |

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 |
| | | | |

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

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

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | | Total: |

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| CTE Budget | |
| | Total: |
| Additional Goals | |
| | Total: |
| | |
| | Grand Total: |

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 | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent |
| | | |

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

- To meet on a regularly scheduled basis
- To assist the principal in the development of the SIP
- To assist the principal in the development of the school's budget
- To advise the principal of any areas of concern

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount \$3577.27 |
| To fund 6 th grade orientation – Wolf Camp | \$400 |
| To purchase printers for math classrooms for AM | \$2100 |
| Other | \$1077.27 |