

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: Fort Caroline Middle	District Name: Duval
Principal: Shawn Shackelford	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Terri Allen	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
----------	------	--------------------------------	---	---	---

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

Principal	Shawn Shackelford	BA English, JD, M.Ed Educational Leadership	0	7	<p>Mr. Shawn Shackelford is in his first year at Fort Caroline Middle School. In 2011-2012 , Mr. Shackelford served as principal at Northwestern Middle School where he lead to the school to an overall 35 point gain. In 2010 – 2011 he served as a vice principal at Nathan B. Forrest High Schools where he worked to make significant gains in Writing (19 points) and Science (9 points), helped to increase the graduation rate, and worked with the school community to improve the school culture and climate.</p> <p>Mr. Shackelford was an administrator in Southfield, MI. He served as a principal at Fred D. Leonhard Elementary School where he led the school through Application A of the International Baccalaureate Programme and posted gains in the State’s MEAP testing. He also served as principal of Alice M. Birney Middle School where he led the school through the transition from middle school to a K-8 school, and developed and implemented an accelerated program at the school.</p>
-----------	-------------------	--	---	---	--

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

Assistant Principal	Jo Ann Walker	B.S. Political Science M.Ed. Ed. Leadership	11	13	<p>2012 Fort Caroline Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 41%, Math 37%, Writing 77%, Science 25% % Showing Gains: Reading 59%, Math 54%, Lowest Performing Readers 64%, Lowest Performing Math 54%, Algebra 1 74% School Grade: D AYP: No</p> <p>2011 Fort Caroline Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 50%, Math 51%, Writing 76%, Science 33% % Showing Gains: Reading 59%, Math 65%, Lowest Performing Readers 72%, Lowest Performing Math 73% School Grade: C AYP: No</p> <p>2010 Fort Caroline Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 54%, Math 48%, Writing 92%, Science 34% % Showing Gains: Reading 61%, Math 65%, Lowest Performing Readers 71%, Lowest Performing Math 65% School Grade: C AYP: No</p> <p>2009 % High Achieving: Reading 57%, Math 45%, Writing 91%, Science 30% % Showing Gains: Reading 60%, Math 61%, Lowest Performing Readers 65%, Lowest Performing Math 62% School Grade: C AYP: No</p>
---------------------	---------------	--	----	----	---

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

Assistant Principal	Mark Wilhelm	<p>B.S. Communications</p> <p>M.Ed. Ed Leadership</p> <p>Current Doc Student UF</p>	0	7	<p>2012 Arlington Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 39%, Math 42%, Writing 72%, Science 19% % Showing Gains: Reading 58%, Math 61%, Lowest Performing Readers 65%, Lowest Performing Math 51%, Algebra 1 83% School Grade: C AYP: No</p> <p>2011 Arlington Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 56%, Math 52%, Writing 90%, Science 33% % Showing Gains: Reading 60%, Math 67%, Lowest Performing Readers 72%, Lowest Performing Math 75%, School Grade: B</p> <p>2010 Arlington Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 54%, Math 54%, Writing 83%, Science 31% % Showing Gains: Reading 58%, Math 70%, Lowest Performing Readers 67%, Lowest Performing Math 70%, School Grade: C AYP: No</p>
---------------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

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

<p>Assistant Principal of Curriculum</p>	<p>Susan Price</p>		<p>7</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>2012 Fort Caroline Middle School % High Achieving: Reading 41%, Math 37%, Writing 77%, Science 25% % Showing Gains: Reading 59%, Math 54%, Lowest Performing Readers 64%, Lowest Performing Math 54%, Algebra 1 74% School Grade: D AYP: No</p> <p>Fort Caroline Middle School 2011 % High Achieving: Reading 50%, Math 51%, Writing 76%, Science 33% % Showing Gains: Reading 59%, Math 65%, Lowest Performing Readers 72%, Lowest Performing Math 73% School Grade: C AYP: No</p> <p>Fort Caroline Middle School 2010 % High Achieving: Reading 54%, Math 48%, Writing 92%, Science 34% % Showing Gains: Reading 61%, Math 65%, Lowest Performing Readers 71%, Lowest Performing Math 65% School Grade: C AYP: No</p> <p>Fort Caroline Middle School 2009 % High Achieving: Reading 57%, Math 45%, Writing 91%, Science 30% % Showing Gains: Reading 60%, Math 61%, Lowest Performing Readers 65%, Lowest Performing Math 62% School Grade: C AYP: No</p>
--	--------------------	--	----------	----------	---

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)
	N/A				
	N/A				
	N/A				

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruitment	Principal	June 30, 2013
2. HR placements		
3. Retention: mentors,	Judith Williams, Media Specialist	June 30, 2013
4. Retention: teacher support and site-based professional development	IB Coordinator, Tikila Shakespeare	June 30, 2013

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with Effective ratings or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---	--	-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	-----------------------------

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

						gh er			
43	18. 6	30	26	26	23	10 0	26	0	33

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
Patricia Bell	Megan Amaro	6 th grade Teammates (ELA/Math) /Opposite planning times	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback
Tammy Hines	Meghann Mueller-Collier	6 th grade Teammates (ELA/Math) /Opposite planning times	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback
Sean Kiernan	Anthony Pocopanni	6 th grade Teammates (Soc/ Science) Opposite planning times	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback

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

Mr. Gainers	Desiree Green	Content area match (math) Mr. Gainers is a veteran teacher	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback
Pam Taylor	Richard Jones	Content area match (ESE)	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback
Tina Johnston	Brittany Chancey	Content area match (Reading)	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback
Thomas Mezzano	Irene Bryson	Content area match (Counseling)	Mentee/ Mentor class observing and feedback

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

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

Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Mark Wilhelm: Assistant Principal, Pamela Taylor: ESE support, Patricia Bell: Math, Lisa Corprew: Humanities,

Charles Windsor: Science, Tina Johnston: ESOL/Reading, Sean Kiernan: Humanities, and Andrea Miranda: Reading

Ft Caroline Middle School's RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the school mission and promote student achievement. The RtI team will implement ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. It is anticipated that this will be a continuing process of building the foundation and incorporating RtI into the culture of school.

Ft Caroline Middle School has identified the following staff members to be a part of the RTI team: Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Academic Coach, Math Coach, and Department Chairs. The team will provide leadership in the following areas: use of data-based decision-making, 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 and activities.

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The RTI team is composed of teachers from each subject area, guidance, and administration. Currently the team is receiving training on how to best implement RTI school wide. The RTI team meets monthly with interdisciplinary teams to discuss students and instructional support needed.

The support team will meet regularly and will develop a calendar for meeting dates and times. The agenda for each meeting will center around DuFour's (1998) guiding questions:

- What do students need to know?
- How will we know when they have learned?
- What will we do when they have/ not learned?

The team will analyze the progress being made by students. Each student will be given a reading, math, writing, and science (8th grade) target. The targets will be based on the students' FCAT score from the previous year. The targets will reflect a 10 point gain in the student's developmental scale score. The team will analyze the data from the assessments given (benchmark, LSA, Bi-weekly, and FCAT practice tests) and note the students that are and are not making progress in reaching their targets. The team will recognize students who are making targets and plans for RTI support will assist students not making target.

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

The RTI team is engaged in developing and reviewing the SIP to make data-based and research-based suggestions to better meet student instructional needs.

Members of the SIP team are also members of the MTSS Leadership team. The mission of the school, the goals for the year as presented by the MTSS Team, this year's theme, and the process of progress monitoring were major factors in developing the SIP. The use of data driven instruction is crucial to the monitoring of student progress. Using frequent, targeted, formative assessment (formal and informal), analyzing what the data from these assessments say, and planning instruction according to this analysis is what drives the RTI process. When students are not demonstrating growth or benchmark mastery, then the RTI process demands focus lessons, small group instruction, and more practice in benchmark acquisition through tutoring opportunities and concentrated support from partner content area teachers (ELA: Reading and Social Studies; Math: Science, Art, and Music).

MTSS Implementation

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

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.

A variety of data sources will be used....teachers' formative and summative assessments, district benchmark tests, interdisciplinary meetings, and district data system (Pearson inform and limelight). In addition Team Meetings will be held quarterly with an administrator and support personnel to identify students that need Tier 2 Interventions. Tier 2 Intervention effectiveness will be monitored at weekly team meetings and results reported to House Administrator.

2012 FCAT data was used to determine the initial school and student goals. Students were given targets in reading and math based on their score from the 2012 test. Students scoring at level 1 or 2 in math and/or reading were given a target of 60%. Students scoring at level 3 were given targets of around 70%. Students scoring at level 4 were given targets of about 84% and students scoring at level 5 were given targets of about 91%. Based on FCAT raw data, if these targets are maintained by students on average for all of the progress monitoring assessments that are given, students have a 95% or better chance of maintaining or exceeding their FCAT score from the previous year. Throughout the year, benchmark, FCTA practice, bi-weekly assessments, LSA's, and district writing prompts will be used to monitor student progress in reading, math, science, and writing. The foundations team will meet monthly to review data collected on student discipline referrals, suspensions, and other discipline reports.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS Leadership Team will provide on-going staff training and support throughout the school year. Professional development will be provided during Professional Learning Communities and Early Release meetings. Topics will include discussing the problem solving process through the use of domains, creating effective interventions, differentiation in the classroom, documentation and accountability, as well as strengthening the core (behavior management/academic rigor). Teachers will have additional opportunities to discuss RtI implementation during team's common planning time. The RtI team will evaluate additional staff PD needs, based on observations and weekly meetings with teachers during the monthly RTI Leadership Team meetings

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The principal and administrators plans to support the MTSS Leadership Team by addressing the professional development needs as it relates to RtI. The administrators will assist in the development of a systematic approach to ensure that the team is functioning with integrity.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Principal: Shawn Shackelford

I.B. Coordinator: Tikila Shakespeare

Media Specialist: Judy Williams

Teachers: Andrea Miranda, Tammy Hines, Maryanne Senese, Jennifer Stultz, and Venetta Oglesby

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

In support of the district's reading goals and our school based reading goals, the literacy team meets on Early Release day and during planned Action Team Meetings to review data to assist us in aligning with DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan. Team members review current and longitudinal data to ensure that the needs of all AYP sub-groups are met in the core reading series and research-based strategies are examined and recommended for supporting students in the core curriculum.

Also, the team meets to assess teacher professional development needs in order to formulate plans for effective implementation of targeted reading goals. Our main goal is to focus on meeting the needs and examining implementation of reading instruction for all sub-groups and levels in our reading curriculum then providing suggestions for next-steps.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Administration will monitor FCMS Reading Instructional Focus and the LLT team will review data and adjust reading strategies

as needed to meet the reading targets to improve performance for all AYP groups and grade levels. Reading strategy implementation will be monitored via lesson plans and classroom observation to insure that strategies are being

implemented with fidelity.

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.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

Fort Caroline Middle reading focus will mirror Duval County's Read it Forward Initiative. Reading Strategy training will be continuous and ongoing early release and planning. In addition, those teachers not CAR-PD trained will be encouraged to gain this certification. The implementation of Reading Strategies will be monitored by teacher documentation of strategies in lesson plans and administrative observation of evidence during classroom observations. The school Literacy Leadership Team will monitor FAIR testing and Benchmarks as well. The TEAM UP afterschool program will push Reading, giving enrollment priority to students with a Reading deficiency as identified by FCAT proficiency level.

****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?

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

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		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p>	<p>1A.1. Core teachers who are not Reading teachers may not have the level of expertise in teaching reading through the content area necessary to help students increase reading scores.</p> <p>Ensuring teachers provide rigorous bell-to-bell instruction connected to a research based instructional delivery model.</p> <p>Effectively incorpor</p>	<p>1A.1. Core teachers to use collaborative planning time to set learning expectations, develop assessments, create exit slips, and compare outcomes to allow for student performance based on differentiation.</p> <p>Pull Targeted Small Groups for reading strategies practice.</p> <p>Provide real-time data analysis based on Learning Schedule assessments and District</p>	<p>1A.1. Subject area administrators, reading & instructional coaches, teachers</p>	<p>1A1. Outcomes of formative and Summative assessments.</p> <p>Analyze LSAs and monitor student s' progress to determine student proficiency levels. Develop next steps with students and conduct data chats</p>	<p>1A.1. Formative Assessments:</p> <p>Benchmark</p> <p>LSA Assessments</p> <p>Bi-Weekly Assessments</p> <p>FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

	<p>ating all elements of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.</p> <p>Providing students an opportunity to fully demonstrate learning through rigorous tasks and assessments.</p>	<p>Benchmark data.</p> <p>Train teachers how to prepare lessons and use instructional tools to increase critical thinking. Tools include but are not limited to: scaffolding approach, think-alouds, questioning, and authentic writing assessments</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 41% of students were proficient in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 44% will make learning gains.	41%	44%					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
	1A.4. None	1A.4.	1A.4.	1A.4.	1A.4.		
	1A.5. None	1A.5.	1A.5.	1A.5.	1A.5.		

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		
---	---------------------	----------	--	---	-----------------	--	--

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

<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</p>	<p>2A.1. Students may reach complacency after reaching level 4 or 5 in reading. Providing students an opportunity to fully demonstrate learning through rigorous tasks and assessments.</p>	<p>2A.1. These students have been identified and placed in classes with rigorous class work. Students will be encouraged to continue to raise their score through Data Chats and FCAT goal setting. Administrators will hold small group meetings with students to assess the needs of these students. Students will be recognized through FCAT</p>	<p>2A.1. Administration Homeroom Teachers</p>	<p>2A.1. Ongoing progress monitoring of student work through PLC</p>	<p>2A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

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

		<p>Superstars program for continuous gains on Benchmarks and FAIR.</p> <p>Incorporate IB Unit Planning reviewing the NGSSS, learning modules, objectives, demonstrate of learning, and the MYP unit question.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>These students have been placed in rigorous coursework through advanced classes. In addition, Benchmark data will be used to differentiate instruction.</p>							
	<p>6th grade 5% 7th grade 3% 8th grade 7%</p>	<p>6th grade 10% 7th grade 8% 8th grade 12%</p>					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

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

<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</p>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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		
---	---------------------	----------	--	--	-----------------	--	--

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

<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>3A.1. Lack of motivation to reach Reading Proficiency</p>	<p>3A.1 ELA and Reading teachers will provide all content areas with Reading Strategies to implement. Teacher implementation and documentation of School wide Reading Strategies in daily lesson plans are evidenced. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats with students. Teacher implementation</p>	<p>3A.1. Language Arts and Reading Teachers Administration Team-Up Teachers</p>	<p>3A.1. On-going Progress Monitoring. Student shows evidence of reading strategies in daily class work and assessments. Teacher Developed assessments to test proper use of strategies Enrollment in Team-Up</p>	<p>3A.1. Journals, documentation of participation Exit Tickets Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--

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

		and documentati on of School wide Reading Strategies such as scaffolding approach, think- alouds, questioning, and authentic writing assessments in daily lesson plans					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 51% of students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 61% will make learning gains.</p>							
	51%	61%					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							
	<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>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4A.1. Students' inability to answer higher level/complex questions</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will script higher level questions into lesson plans. Use of Reading Strategies such as scaffolding approach, think-alouds, questioning, and authentic writing assessments in all core area classes</p>	<p>4A.1. Administrators ELA and Reading Teachers Team-up Teachers</p>	<p>4A.1. Ongoing progress monitoring Enrollment in Team-up</p>	<p>4A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		

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

<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 63% of students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 73% will make learning gains.</p>							
	63%	73%					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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	47 %	52%	57%	61%	66%	71%
	2010-2011						
	42%						
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>							
The level of proficiency in reading will increase by 24% over the next 6 years.							
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		

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

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. Cultural Differences Students ability to interpret their current scores and set realistic goals to reach proficiency.</p>	<p>5B.1. Cultural Awareness initiatives through the International Baccalaureate MYP program Train teachers how to prepare lessons and use instructional tools to increase critical thinking. Tools include but are not limited to: scaffolding approach, think-alouds, questioning, and authentic writing assessments.</p>	<p>5B.1. All Teachers Administrators</p>	<p>5B.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5B.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, white students were 57% satisfactory in reading, black students were 31%, and Hispanic students were 8%.</p> <p>During the 2012-2013 school year, white students will increase to 67%, black students to 41%, and Hispanic to 18%.</p>							
	<p>White: 57%</p> <p>Black: 31%</p> <p>Hispanic:8%</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>	<p>White: 67%</p> <p>Black: 41%</p> <p>Hispanic:18%</p> <p>Asian:</p> <p>American Indian:</p>					

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

		5B.2. Complexity of text without sensitivity to cultural differences	5B.2. 90 minutes of daily instruction in Language Arts	5B.2. Language Arts teacher	5B.2. Language Arts Teacher documentation	5B.2. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments, and district benchmarks	
		5B.3.	5B.3. Cultural awareness through professional development workshops	5B.3. IB Coordinator	5B. Evaluation of IB cultural PD workshops	5B.3. Culturally diverse lesson plans	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Language Barrier	5C.1. Use of Rosetta Stone software to increase the English Language	5C.1. ELL teachers	5C.1. Ongoing Assessments	5C.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests Rosetta Stone progress assessment		

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 9% of ELL students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 15% will make learning gains.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>9%</p>	<p>15%</p>					
		<p>5C.2. Inability to provide ESE Co-teacher in all classes</p>	<p>5C.2. Vocabulary Study of prefixes, suffixes and root word</p>	<p>5C.2. Teachers</p>	<p>5C.2. Ongoing progress monitoring</p>	<p>5C.2. Language Assessments</p>	
		<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	<p>5C.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1. Cultural Differences Complexity of grade level text</p>	<p>5D.1. Vocabulary Study of prefixes, suffixes and root words</p>	<p>5D.1. Content Area Administrator and Language Arts Teachers</p>	<p>5D.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5D.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> During the 2011-2012 school year, 24% of our SWD students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 30% will make learning gains.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>24%</p>	<p>30%</p>					

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

	-	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Lack of student school supplies	5E.1. Connect parents with community partners: Communities in School, Full Service Schools, Achievers for Life.	5E.1. Community Partners and Administrative staff	5E.1. On-going progress monitoring	5E.1. Monitoring student supplies		

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

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>During the 2011-2012 school year, 36% of our Economically Disadvantaged students made learning gains in reading. During the 2012-2013 school year, 40% will make learning gains.</p>	36%	40%	<p>5E.2. Complexity of FCAT level vocabulary</p> <p>5E.2. Vocabulary Study of prefixes, suffixes and root Words</p>	<p>5E.2. Administrative Staff</p>	<p>5E.2. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5E.2. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>	

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

		5E.3. Limited access to reading materials	5E.3. All students will be involved in the district Read it Forward Jax initiative	5E.3. Language Arts teachers	5E.3. On-going progress monitoring	5E.3. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments, and district benchmarks	
--	--	--	---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

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	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
School Wide Reading Strategies	6-8	PLC Leader Teachers and Assistant Principal	School-wide	Early Release (Yearlong)	Documentation through Lesson Plans	Principal, Administrative Staff
FCAT Focus Calendars	6-8	Department Chairs	School-Wide	Early Release (Yearlong)	Common Lesson Plans with Focus Calendar lessons	Principal, Administrative Staff

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

Benchmark Data
Disaggregation

6-8

Department Chairs

School-Wide

Early Release, Morning Planning

Benchmark Data Summary

Department Chairs, Principal,
Administrative Staff

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>						
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u></p> <p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p> <p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #3:</u></p> <p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u></p> <p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<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>					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<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>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

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

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

<p>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

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

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						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal 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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of</u> <u>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> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
	-	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1A.1. Time limitations for intensive planning Lack of student knowledge of their current level of achievement (where they are vs. where they should be) Student ownership of data and progress towards reaching goals</p>	<p>1A.1. Core Teachers to use collaborative planning time to set learning expectations, develop assessments, create exit slips, and compare outcomes to allow for student performance based differentiation Using Mathematics FCAT Goal Sheets to set goals. Data Chats with students</p>	<p>1A.1. Math Teachers Administration</p>	<p>1A.1. Outcomes of Formative and Summative Assessments Ongoing monitoring of progress through Benchmarks Students ability to verbalize information discussed in Data Chats</p>	<p>1A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	---	---	---	--	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 37% of students were proficient in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 40% will be proficient.							
	37%	40%					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
NA							
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2A.1. Student complacency once reaching levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Lack of adequate individual instructional time</p>	<p>2A.1. New goal setting with Math FCAT Goal sheets. Reward System for Level 4 and 5 through FCAT Superstars Red Carpet event After school enrichment, homework assistance, tutoring Referral to Team-Up</p>	<p>2A.1. Math Teachers Team Up Liaison</p>	<p>2A.1. On-going progress Monitoring Team-up lesson tracking, on-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>2A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests Team-Up Logs</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 13% of students were Levels 4 and 5 in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 15% will be Levels 4 and 5 in math.							
	13%	15%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<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>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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.</p>	<p>3A.1. Students inability to multiply and divide. Need for more instructional time to master benchmarks. Lack of student ability to work independently.</p>	<p>3A.1. Devise a plan to embed this practice into the lesson that will include, but not limited to, daily review and skill practice. Small group instruction model based on the assessments with teacher serving as "guide on the side". Gradual Release Model</p>	<p>3A.1. Math teachers and Administrators</p>	<p>3A.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>3A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests Informal Classroom visits</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 55% of students made learning gains in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 65% will make learning gains.							
	55%	65%					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<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>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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		
---	---------------------	----------	--	--	-----------------	--	--

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

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4A.1 Students' acquisition of Basic math skills like multiplication and division. Students needing more instruction time and practice opportunities Loss of instructional opportunities due to None Attendance</p>	<p>4A.1. Pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology--Scholastic Math Inventory---to target student deficiencies. Small group instruction model based on the assessments Refer students with over 10 days absent to Team-up or before school tutoring, or</p>	<p>4A.1. Math teachers Administrators Team Up Liaison Achievers for Life Coordinator</p>	<p>4A.1. On-going progress monitoring Team-up Enrollment</p>	<p>4A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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

		Achievers for Life					
Mathematics Goal #4:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> .*	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> .*					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. During the 2012-2013 school year, 66% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains.							
	56%	66%					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 41%	46%	51%	56%	61%	66%	71%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Student proficiency in math will increase by 25% in 6 years.							
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		

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

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5B.1. Students' acquisition of basic skills such multiplication and division.</p>	<p>5B.1. Analyze pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology---Scholastic Math Inventory--- to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments. Provide intensive math instruction for students performing at level one or two.</p>	<p>5B.1. Math teachers and subject area administrator Intensive Math Teachers</p>	<p>5B.1. On-going progress Monitoring. Teachers will coordinate with the regular math teachers to provide extra support in benchmarks as indicated by the data.</p>	<p>5B.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>Neither White or Black made the AYP targets in math. The goal is to increase both sub groups by 10%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	White: 48%	White: 58%					
	Black: 27%	Black: 37%					
	Hispanic: 55%	Hispanic: 65%					
	Asian: 72%	Asian: 82%					
	American Indian:	American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		None					
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5C.1. Students' acquisition of basic skills such as multiplication and division.</p>	<p>5C.1. Analyze pre and post assessment data with the use of technology--Scholastic Math Inventory---to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments . Provide intensive math instruction for students performing at level one or two.</p>	<p>5C.1. Math teacher and subject area administrator</p>	<p>5C.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5C.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, ELL students were 13% satisfactory in Math. During the 2012-2013 school year, ELL students increase to 23% satisfactory.							
	13%	23%					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5D.1. Students' acquisition of basic skills such as multiplication and division.</p>	<p>5D.1. Analyze pre and post assessment data with the use of technology--Scholastic Math Inventory---to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments . Provide intensive math instruction for students performing at level one or two.</p>	<p>5D.1. Math teachers and subject area administrator</p>	<p>5D.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5D.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, SWD students were 22% satisfactory in Math. During the 2012-2013 school year, SWD students increase to 32% satisfactory.	22%	32%					
-		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

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

<p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5E.1. Students' acquisition of basic skills such as multiplication and division. Lack of student school supplies</p>	<p>5E.1. Analyze pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology--Scholastic Math Inventory---to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments. Provide intensive math instruction for students performing at level one or two.</p>	<p>5E.1. Math teachers and subject area administrator Community Partners and Administrative staff</p>	<p>5E.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>5E.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

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

		<p>Small-group instruction model based on the assessments</p> <p>Connect parents with community partners:</p> <p>Communities in School,</p> <p>Full Service Schools,</p> <p>Achievers for Life.</p>				
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u></p> <p>During the 2011-2012 school year, Economically Disadvantaged students were 42% satisfactory in Math. During the 2012-2013 school year, Economically Disadvantaged students will increase to 52% satisfactory.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>				
	42%	52%				

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

		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
		None					

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals **N/A**

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

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

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

	<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>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2:	<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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

N/A

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. Pre-requisite skill level is lacking. Need for greater instructional time to understand benchmarks and provide additional practice	1.1. Incorporate skill practice into daily classroom routine. Incorporate small group instruction into work time, targeting students and needs.	1.1. Classroom Teachers; Administrative Team; Math Coach	1.1. Brief, frequent knowledge checks (formal and informal) to check for level of skill acquisition. Continuous, frequent formal and informal assessment of student progress	1.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p><i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 56% of Algebra 1 students were proficient. During the 2012-2013 school year, 62% will be proficient.</i></p>	56%	62%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
<p>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:</p>	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</p>	<p>2.1. Lack of student knowledge of their current level of achievement (where they are vs. where they should be)</p>	<p>2.1. Using Mathematics FCAT Goal Sheets to set goals that will allow for dialogue on specific concepts that students are not grasping. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments</p>	<p>2.1. Math Teachers, Administrators, Math Coach</p>	<p>2.1. Ongoing monitoring of progress through Benchmarks</p>	<p>2.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 10% of Algebra 1 students were Level 4 and Level 5. During the 2012-2013 school year, the number will increase to 13%.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	10%	13%					
		2.2. None	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	5E.3.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	46%	51%	56%	61%	66%	71%
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> Student proficiency in math will increase by 25% in 6 years							
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		

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

<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</p>	<p>5B.1. Basic skill acquisition such as multiplication and division Instructional time devoted to math</p>	<p>5B.1. Incorporate skill practice into daily classroom routine. Incorporate small group instruction into work time, targeting students and needs.</p>	<p>5B.1. Administrative Team; Teachers; Math Coach</p>	<p>5B.1. Analyze all formative assessment data (Benchmark, LSA's, Bi-Weekly Assessments, FCAT Practice Test) and relate the data to each students' target score</p>	<p>5B.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
<p><u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> <i>Neither White or Black made the AYP targets in math. The goal is to increase both sub groups by 10%</i> <i>White 76% (157)</i> <i>Black 38% (161)</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: 48% Black: 27% Hispanic: 55% Asian: 72% American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: 58% Black: 37% Hispanic: 65% Asian: 82% American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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 I Goal #3C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		3D.2	3D.2	3D.2	3D.2	3D.2	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		3E.2.	5E.2	5E.2	5E.2	5E.2	
		3E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
		None					

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	I.1. Pre-requisite skill level is lacking. Need for greater instructional time to understand benchmarks and provide additional practice	I.1. Incorporate skill practice into daily classroom routine Incorporate small group instruction into work time, targeting students and needs	I.1. Classroom Teachers; Administrative Team; Math Coach	I.1. Brief, frequent knowledge checks (formal and informal) to check for level of skill acquisition	I.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests		

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

<p><u>Geometry Goal #1:</u></p> <p><i>During the 2012-2013 school year, Geometry students will score 70% at level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>NA</p>	<p>70%</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</p>	<p>2.1. Lack of student knowledge of their current level of achievement (where they are vs. where they should be)</p>	<p>2.1. Using Mathematics FCAT Goal Sheets to set goals and identify concepts that students are not grasping.</p>	<p>2.1. Math Teachers, Administrators, Math Coach</p>	<p>2.1. Ongoing monitoring of progress through Benchmarks</p>	<p>2.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
<p><u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> <i>During the 2012-2013 school year, 30% of Geometry students will score at level 4 or level 5 on the Geometry EOC</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>NA</p>	<p>32%</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
--	--	------	------	------	------	------	--

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012	46%	51%	56%	61%	66%	
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> Student proficiency in math will increase by 25% in 6 years							
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		

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

<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>	<p>5B.1. Basic skill acquisition such as multiplication and division</p> <p>Instructional time devoted to math</p>	<p>5B.1. Using Mathematics FCAT Goal Sheets to set goals and identify concepts that students are not grasping.</p>	<p>5B.1. Administrative Team; Teachers; Math Coach</p>	<p>5B.1. Analyze all formative assessment data (Benchmark, LSA's, Bi-Weekly Assessments, FCAT Practice Test) and relate the data to each students' target score</p>	<p>5B.1. Formative Assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests 		
<p><u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u></p> <p><i>Neither White or Black made the AYP targets in math. The goal is to increase both sub groups by 10%</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	White: 48%	White: 58%					
	Black: 27%	Black: 37%					
	Hispanic: 55%	Hispanic: 65%					
	Asian: 72%	Asian: 82%					
	American Indian:	American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1	3C.1	3C.1	3C.1	3C.1		
Geometry Goal #3C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1	3D.1	3D.1	3D.1	3D.1		
<u>Geometry Goal #3D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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>					
		3D.2.	3D.2	3D.2	3D.2	3D.2	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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		
--	---------------------	----------	--	--	-----------------	--	--

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

<p>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>	<p>3E.1 Basic skill acquisition such as multiplication and division Instructional time devoted to math Lack of student school supplies</p>	<p>3E.1 Pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology--Scholastic Math Inventory-- to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on the assessments Connect parents with community partners: Communities in School, Full Service Schools, Achievers for Life.</p>	<p>3E.1 Math teachers and subject area administrator Community Partners and Administrative staff</p>	<p>3E.1 On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>3E.1 Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
During the 2012-2013 school year, Economically Disadvantaged making satisfactory progress in math will increase by 10%	N/A	70					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	
		None					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each

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

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

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 Math Department Chair	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) 6-8 Math Teachers	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 Focus Calendars	6-8	Math Department Chair	6-8 Math Teachers	Early Release (Yearlong)	Math Lesson Plans	Principal, Administrative Team
Benchmark Data Disaggregation	6-8	Math Department Chair	6-8 Math Teachers	Early Release, Common Planning	Benchmark Data Summary	Math Department Chair, Principal, Administrative Team
Data Driven Lessons	6-8	Math Department Chair	6-8 Math Teachers	Early Release, Common Planning	Lesson Plan with Data Driven lessons reflecting the Gradual Release model	Principal, Administrative Team

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

						Evaluation Tool
--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------

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		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</p>	<p>1A.1. Inability to answer moderate to high level content area questions. Student inability to develop inquiry through self motivation/ individual learning. Lack of continuity from one Science class to another.</p>	<p>1A.1. Unit Pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology to target student deficiencies. Small-group instruction model based on assessments Core teachers to use collaborative planning time to set learning expectations, develop assessments, create exit slips, and compare outcomes</p>	<p>1A.1. Science teachers and subject area administrator</p>	<p>1A.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>1A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

		to allow for student performance based differentiation. Teachers will use the 5-E Model and labs to drive instruction.					
<u>Science Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u>					
During the 2011-2012 school year, 8 th grade students achieved 25% proficiency.	25%	35%					
During the 2012-2013 school year, 8 th grade students will achieve 35%.			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.

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

		1A.3	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: NA	<u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> .* _	<u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance</u> .* _					
	<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>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

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

<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p>	<p>2A.1. Inability to answer moderate to high level content area questions</p>	<p>2A.1. Unit Pre and post assessment data with the use of instructional technology to target student deficiencies. Small group instruction model based on the assessments Implementation of the Design cycle and IB MYP Inquiry tasks</p>	<p>2A.1. Science teachers and subject area administrator</p>	<p>2A.1. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>2A.1. Formative Assessments: Benchmark LSA Assessments Bi-Weekly Assessments FCAT Practice Tests</p>		
---	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

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

<p>Science Goal #2A: The number of FCMS 8th. Grade students who achieve a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT will increase to 5% .</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>1.6% (4/252)</p>	<p>5% (12/235).</p>					
		<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	<p>2A.2.</p>	
		<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3.</p>	<p>2A.3</p>	
<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</p>	<p>2B.1.</p>	<p>2B.1.</p>	<p>2B.1.</p>	<p>2B.1.</p>	<p>2B.1.</p>		
<p>Science Goal #2B: NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					

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

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

Science Goal #1:	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>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Science 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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						

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		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 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>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Biology 1 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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT Focus Calendar	6-8	Science Department Chair	6-8 Science Teachers	Early Release	Lesson plans with evidence of following Focus Calendars to guide instruction	Principal, Administrative Team
Formative/Summative Development	6-8	Science Department Chair	6-8 Science Teachers	Common Planning (Yearlong)	Formative and Summative Assessments aligned with FCAT benchmarks	Principal, Administrative Team

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1.Lack of higher level vocabulary	1A.1.Quarterly Writing Pre-Assessments and vocabulary instruction	1A.1.Language Arts teachers and subject area administrator	1A.1.On-going progress monitoring	1A.1.Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments and district benchmark.		

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

Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
<i>45% (188/235) of eighth graders will surpass the score of a level 3 on the FCAT Writes and obtain a score of level 4 for proficiency.</i>	.*	.*					
	<i>76% (188/247) of students achieved a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes.</i>	<i>45% (103/228) will achieve a 4 or higher on the FCAT Writes.</i>					
		1A.2. Inability to understand what t focus and purpose are necessary for writing situations	1A.2. Break down the elements of a writing situation based on pre - assessment	1A.2. Language Arts teachers and subject area administrator	1A.2. On-going progress monitoring	1A.2. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments and district benchmark.	

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

		1A.3. Inability to supply purposeful support	1A.3. Small group focused instruction using research-based strategies for developing support	1A.3. Language Arts teachers and subject area administrator	1A.3. On-going progress monitoring	1A.3. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments and district benchmark.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1. Lack of higher vocabulary and sentence structure variety	1B.1. Administer Quarterly Writing Pre-Assessments share results with ALL faculty. Use school wide of AVID pre-writing materials. 8th grade use of elaboration techniques FRESKA or FRIESS	1B.1. Administrative Staff Curriculum and Instruction action team	1B.1. On-going progress monitoring	1B.1. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments, and district benchmarks		

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

Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance					
<p><i>80% (188/235) of eighth graders will surpass the score of a level 3 on the FCAT Writes and obtain a score of level 4 for proficiency.</i></p>	<p>.* _</p>	<p>.* _</p>					
	<p><i>76% (188/247) of students achieved a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes.</i></p>	<p><i>80% (188/235) will achieve a 4 or higher on the FCAT Writes</i></p>					

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

		<p>1B.2. Inability to develop support accurately</p>	<p>1B.2. Focused Writing Instruction based on pre-assessment</p> <p>Use school wide of AVID pre-writing materials.</p> <p>8th grade use of elaboration techniques</p> <p>FRESCA or FRIESS</p>	<p>1B.2. Administrative staff</p>	<p>1B.2. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>1B.2. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments, and district benchmarks</p>	
		<p>1B.3. Impaired understanding of organization</p>	<p>1B.3. Small-group focused instruction using research-based strategies</p> <p>School wide implementation of 4 paragraph structured format</p>	<p>1B.3. Administrative staff</p>	<p>1B.3. On-going progress monitoring</p>	<p>1B.3. Student work samples, teacher common formative assessments, and district benchmarks</p>	

Writing Professional Development

Professional

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

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

**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
---	-------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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.		
<u>Civics Goal #1:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
---	-------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

	<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>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2:	<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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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

**U.S. History Professional Development
Professional
Development
(PD) aligned with
Strategies through
Professional
Learning
Community (PLC)
or PD Activity**

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
---	-------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Lack of Parent Involvement	1.1. Parent Contact and AIT meetings for excessive tardy and attendance issue	1.1. Attendance Clerk	1.1. Evaluation of Student Attendance	1.1. Official Attendance Records		

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

<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u></p> <p>During the 2012-2013 school year, FCMS will experience a 10% increase in the percentage of students who attend school regularly.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	90%	100%					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	201	181					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	73	65					

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

		1.2. Lack of parental support regarding attendance.	1.2. Achievers For Life resource personnel will provide support to students with excessive absences.	1.2. Achievers for Life Coordinator	1.2. Evaluation of Student Participation	1.2. Student Tracking through Achievers for Life	
		1.3. Lack of parental support regarding attendance.	1.3. Work with faculty to increase parent contact concerning excessive absences and tardies	1.3. Administrative Staff	1.3. Compare Attendance and Tardy Data from previous year	1.3. Student Tardy and 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 Response to Intervention PD	Grade Level/ Subject 6-8 6-8 6-8	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader RTI Chair	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) RTI Committee	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) Designated Early Release Days	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
--	--	---	--	--	-----------------------------------	---

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	Implementation of the strategy.	Implement CHAMPs and Foundations strategies before suspensions	Administrative Staff	Compare the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions from the previous year	School Discipline Referrals.		

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

<p>Suspension Goal #1: <i>During the 2012-2013 school year, FCMS will experience a decrease the number of suspensions by 10% (140).</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	634	571					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u></p> <p><u>In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u></p> <p><u>In-School</u></p>					
	634	571					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	492	443					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended</u></p> <p><u>Out-of-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended</u></p> <p><u>Out-of-School</u></p>					
	492	443					

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

		Implementation of the strategy.	Work with faculty who use referrals leading to suspensions a frequent consequence to find new alternatives for interventions	Administrative Staff	Compare the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions from the previous year	School Discipline Referrals.	
		Implementation of the strategy.	Refer students to Guidance, Communities in Schools, etc. for behavioral interventions	Administrative Staff	Compare the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions from the previous year, as well as compare students the recidivism of students receiving interventions with students who did not receive the interventions.	School Discipline Referrals.	

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CHAMPS and Foundations	6-8 all subjects	District led	Through-out the school year	District Training Schedule	Monitoring, observations, Student Discipline Referrals	Principal and Grade-Level Administrators
Student Interventions	6-8 all subjects	Site-Based Administrators	School-wide	Team Meetings, Early Release Days	Monitoring, observations, Student Discipline Referrals	Principal and Grade-Level Administrators

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with

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

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

**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

Grade Level/
Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>1. Parent Involvement</p>	<p>1.1. Lack of Parent Interest</p>	<p>1.1. The Community and Family Action team will Plan parent/community Events each quarter to engage parents in student learning. The nights will focus on Student/Parent needs and I.B. Learner profiles. Refer students to Guidance, Communities</p>	<p>1.1. Jo Ann Walker, Administrator Committee Co-chairs Administrative Staff</p>	<p>1.1. Parent participation and feedback Compare Attendance and Tardy Data from previous year</p>	<p>1. Parent Sign-In sheets, Parent Surveys Student Tardy and Attendance Data.</p>		
-------------------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	--	--

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

		in Schools, etc. for interventions.					
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
During the 2012-2013 school year, parent involvement will increase by 10%							
	9%	10%					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)			

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
--	------	------	------	------	------

STEM Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
---	-------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
--	------	------	------	------	------

CTE Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
---------------------------------------	-------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes

No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount