

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: E. H. Miller school	District Name: Putnam
Principal: Mary Wood Piazza	Superintendent: Tom Townsend
SAC Chair: Cathy Campbell	Date of School Board Approval: TBA

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	Mary Wood Piazza	MA-Educational Leadership BA-English <u>Certifications:</u> English 6-12 Educational Leadership	1	11	E. H. Miller is a Center School for students with significant cognitive disabilities and severe emotional and behavior disorders. It is a non-graded school. The 2010-11 AYP report showed that E.H. Miller met 67% of the AYP criteria. We are awaiting the 2011-12 disaggregated AYP data. During School years 2008-09, 2009-10, & 2010-11 Mrs. Piazza served as Director of Secondary Ed for Putnam County schools. The Putnam County School District had a performance record as follows: 2010-11 79% R, 80% M, 94% W; AYP -N 64% of AYP criteria met 2009-10 72% R, 74% M, 94% W; AYP -N 59% of AYP criteria met 2008-09 65% R, 68% M, 92% W; AYP -N 64% of AYP criteria met
Assistant Principal	Jane N. Ford	MA-Early Childhood Education MA-Educational Leadership BA-Elementary Education <u>Certifications:</u> Elementary Education; Educational Leadership	7	9	E. H. Miller is a Center School for students with significant cognitive disabilities and severe emotional and behavioral disorders. It is a non-graded school. The 2010-11 AYP report showed that E.H. Miller met 67% of the AYP criteria. We are awaiting the 2011-12 disaggregated AYP data. YR R M W AYP 08 EHM 54 44 57 N 62% 09 EHM 40 34 31 N 62% 10 EHM 42 48 37 N 97% 11 EHM 62 63 56 N 67%

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)
none					<i>E. H. Miller School is the ESE Center School for Putnam County that serves students with significant cognitive disabilities whose curriculum and instruction is based on the Access Points. Instructional Coaches are not utilized at Lake Hills. Additionally, the school serves a population of K-12 students with severe emotional and behavioral disorders. As such, the environment for these students is that of a therapeutic day school.</i>

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. Utilize the district human resource system to advertise for qualified applicants. We advertise for and only interview applicants who have ESE certification. Additionally we seek applicants who have specialized certification such as ASD and reading endorsement.	Mary Wood Piazza, Principal	ongoing
2. Provide customized staff development for teachers to address the unique learning needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Professional development includes but is not limited to, writing IEPs, providing related and support services, and professional crisis management.	Mary Wood Piazza, Principal Jane Ford, TOSA; Rena Carney, Speech & Language, Judy Hendrickson, Vision, OT/PT team, etc.	ongoing

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

<p>3. Provide support to teachers from each department and school support staff (i.e., Behavior, OT/PT, Speech/Language, Assistive Technology) to address challenges they may have experience with students in the classroom. Additionally, we are implementing weekly EBD Support Team Meetings to foster a sense of teamwork and to keep awareness of pressing issues.</p>	<p>Mary Wood Piazza, Principal Jane Ford, TOSA Carrie Lacayo, Mental Health Counselor</p>	<p>ongoing</p>
--	---	----------------

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/or 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
<p>0 who received less an effective rating 3 who are teaching out of field for more than one subject: Mary Rhea, William Stroman & Brian Godfrey 2 who are teaching out of field for an ESOL Reading ESE class: Donna Moore, Lucie Little.</p>	<p>Mrs. Rhea is certified in Elementary Education & K-12 ESE Mr. Stroman is certified in Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum 5-9, 6-12 Social Science, 6-12 Business Education, and K-12 ESE. Since these 2 teachers provide instruction in a self-contained setting to EBD students, it would be implausible for them to be certified in all content areas. Mr. Godfrey is new to us and is teaching under a temporary certificate in 6-12 Social Science. Again, because each teacher delivers 6 different courses to the same group of secondary students, it is implausible for any teachers to be highly effective in all the courses they are teaching. Mrs. Rhea is currently completing her Reading Endorsement and Mr. Stroman and Mr. Godfrey will be encouraged to get NGCAR-PD training or Reading Endorsement in the coming years. In an attempt to reduce “out of field” and non-highly qualified teaching, last year we rotated students in the department so teachers could deliver instruction in the area in which they are certified. This did not work, our EBD students could not function with the transitions, and we had severe discipline issues during transition. So we made the critical decision to accept the out of field and not highly qualified coding so that we could better offer a therapeutic day school environment.</p>

Staff Demographics

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
12	.08% [1]	.08% [1]	17% [2]	67% [8]	67% [8]	100% [12]	.08% [1]	0% [0]	17% [2]

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
-------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

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

<p>Mary Rhea</p>	<p>Brian Godfrey</p>	<p>Mrs. Rhea is a trained mentor with many years of experience. Additionally, their portables are beside each other which will allow easy meeting and activities.</p>	<p>Assistance through new teacher Portfolio activities, lesson planning, monthly conferencing, informal observations, etc.</p> <p>Attend the DIA (District Interim Assessment) TIFP planning sessions throughout the year. These workshops support teachers, giving them teaching strategies to enable them to teach to the district pacing guides and to prepare students for the district assessments.</p> <p>Attend the CPI (Crisis Prevention Intervention) training on Oct. 5. This training provides practices to support students with intensive behavioral and emotional needs.</p> <p>Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Piazza will monitor progress on the beginning teacher packet activities. We will also conduct data chats with Mr. Godfrey and will give lots of feedback based on walkthroughs and observations.</p>
------------------	----------------------	---	--

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 EHM is not a title 1 school.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training

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

Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. E.H. Miller’s RtI team meets each Thursday. The core team members are: Mary Piazza, Principal Audrey Lamoreaux, School Psychologist Carrie Lacayo, School Mental Health Therapist Yashika Benford, Behavior Specialist Judy Hendrickson, Vision Specialist (as needed) Rena Carney, Speech & Language Specialist Sarah Azula, Staffing Specialist Various Teachers as scheduled Appropriate OT/PT Therapists Outside Agency Representatives as needed</p>
<p>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? <i>E. H. Miller’s RtI process for our EBD population is led by Audrey Lamoreaux, our School Psychologist. The team meets each Thursday morning and as needed other days. Our RtI team reviews and evaluates data collected in order to identify problems, develop a hypothesis and create a plan to deliver strategies that will assist in student success. These strategies are then implemented and progress monitored and revisited at following RtI meetings. Assistance from outside agencies is often enlisted as we work together. Outside agencies are also enlisted for coaching and professional development needed to implement some strategies. We have RtI as well for our IND population, and those meetings are on Tuesdays and are led by Sarah Azula, staffing specialist. Tuesdays are also our IEP meeting days so we have the team on site to address any issues with our IND population that may need to be reflected in IEP or BIPs. The RtI team is the primary vehicle for student growth and all other solutions teams at the school meet at other times so as not to conflict.</i></p>
<p>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 function of the RtI team and process at E.H. Miller does support the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. The student problems our team addresses are critical barriers to meeting any of our SIP goals.</p>
MTSS Implementation

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

<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>For our IND and ASD population, we use standardized UNIQUE monthly pre and post test results, as well as Brigance and FAA to track success in areas of Reading, Math, & Science. Anecdotal notes and teacher created assessment is utilized along with placement testing to assist with writing and behavior progress monitoring. When needed, we institute a behavior tracking form and an ABC (antecedent, behavior, consequence) Form for recording observable behavior targeted for reduction.</p> <p>For our EBD population (as well as IND/EBD) we have a very structured process that includes data chats with the EBD teachers on a rotating schedule. Each Thursday afternoon on a rotating basis one of our 4 self-contained EBD teachers comes in for a data chat which provides the data for the following week's morning RtI meetings. During the EBD data chats, the following data is pulled and charted:</p> <p>Daily Behavior Points- pulled from Skyward Grading Program Referral Data Absence Data Grades Standardized Testing data: FAIR, SRI, FCAT, Florida Writes, FAA, Brigance Non-Standardized Testing Data: DIA Reading and Math, Putnam Writes, Monthly Unique Pre & Post tests Mental Health Testing and Evaluation Behavior tracking spreadsheets and ABC tracking for specific targeted behaviors Anecdotal notes from teachers</p> <p>Audrey Lamoreaux uses our district's official RtI forms to record and chart data. We also utilize customized forms for data tracking provided by behavior specialist Yashika Benford.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>During pre-planning each year the RtI process is explained and changes, meeting times, etc. conveyed. Throughout the year, we use the RtI meetings themselves to train staff through modeling.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>Principal will attend and monitor the RtI meetings and continue to rely on them to assist meeting the school goals.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</p> <p>The Literacy Team is comprised of our 4 EBD teachers: Lisa Godfrey, Mary Rhea, Brian Godfrey and William Stroman, as well as 3 IND teachers Linda Becker, Donna Moore, and Cathy Campbell.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).</p> <p>Since the curriculum and ability levels are so different between IND and EBD, the mixed team doesn't meet after the initial two weeks of school. Instead, a more practical meeting schedule allows for Mrs. Piazza, Principal & Mrs. Ford, TOSA, to meet with the IND Literacy team and the EBD Literacy Team separately on a bi-monthly basis so topics and coaching are more relevant.</p>

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

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

Due the severe cognitive & emotional/behavioral disabilities of our student population, we want to keep the school-wide literacy initiatives very focused:

1. Media Center moved to a more accessible location
2. Assistance from District on media center software to allow checking out of books.
3. Reading promoted in all classrooms and modeled by staff. Continued purchase of grade-appropriate textbooks for EBD population so that our students are learning from the same materials as their peers across the district.

Our main hurdle is our media center at present. Prior to the current principal's arrival, the school's allocations were cut, which resulted in the elimination of an instructional aide to run the media center. Over the course of the year following, the computer which housed all the book inventory and allowed checking out books via a scanner crashed. E.H. Miller does not have an on-site technology specialist, we are served once a week and the specialist has said that we will need a new computer and new software and she isn't sure she can retrieve the old inventory records. As you can see, getting the media center up and running will require district assistance and support. So this is my main initiative this year. To get our media center operational. I have already moved the books from an old portable on the far end of the campus to a brightly lit, centrally located room..

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.

Since E.H. Miller is not a title I school, our students are not eligible for SES services.

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.

E.H. Miller School is not a Title 1 School.

****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?

Our classrooms are all self-contained and teachers are responsible for their student's growth via standardized testing. The RtI process and the Literacy team meetings support the improvement in reading of our students. Additionally, new curriculum materials that match the district's regular school's materials are being ordered so more NGCAR-PD reading strategies can be implemented in all courses. Reading challenging text multiple times for multiple purposes will be possible with the new more rigorous materials. Additionally we provide a 90 minute reading block 2nd period for grades K-12.

****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?

Since our teachers deliver instruction in a self-contained setting, instruction naturally can be integrated across subjects. Additionally, our IND curriculum, UNIQUE is already designed to integrate Language Arts, Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Social Personal Skills.

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?

Due the severe cognitive & emotional/behavioral disabilities of our student population, and the fact that classes are very limited and self-contained, options in course of study are difficult. We do however offer various venues for self-expression and choice within the regular classes.

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](#).

Due the severe cognitive & emotional/behavioral disabilities of our student population, we focus our main efforts on life skills and vocational training. We have not issued

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

any standard high school diplomas in the past few years; however, by purchasing new standard curriculum materials this year, we hope to have the capacity to offer regular high school courses for a student needing our services but who is seeking a standard high school diploma. Our students at present are all on ESE Special Option Diploma tracks.

E. H. Miller School makes every attempt to prepare our students with significant cognitive disabilities and their families for life beyond high school utilizing the following 2 strategies:

1. Educate families and work with agencies so parents apply for med-waiver for their child and explore support service options for adults with disabilities.
2. Provide students with job exploration courses is to enable students with disabilities to acquire the career knowledge and skills necessary to identify career options, obtain community resources related to career decisions, and develop work-related behaviors. We utilize a series of Career Preparation courses that allow hands-on Comprehensive Work Development skills. High School IND students operate 2 periods of the day in a simulated work environment where students become employees and teachers become supervisors. Procedures are followed so students get the feel of real work, at the same time learn and explore new career vocational areas. Each area has a comprehensive array of tasks for the students to perform. The instructor monitors the tasks and provides feedback and assistance where needed. Students completing the high school Career Prep program have many job skills and have a better understanding of the real working world.

Our Career Preparation block 5th and 6th period provides the missing link between the world of education and the world of work. The simulated work environment, with the focus on independence and exploration of skills and interests is critical to helping teachers and students determine the next steps in their transition towards independence and potential competitive employment. The career block is included in IEPs and transition plans for our students. Our simulated work environments at present include: internships at Publix Grocery Store, Custodial work, running our school store The BeeMart, operating an enterprise system with a greenhouse and garden, animal care, and child day care.

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. We have a small number of FCAT assessed students. These students are diagnosed with severe emotional and/or behavioral disabilities. Their condition must be so severe that they are unable to function in a regular school setting...thus they are sent to E.H. Miller to provide a therapeutic day school environment. Due to the severe behavior issues of these students and/or their emotional instability, academic instruction is often interrupted with outbursts and the need for intervention. This slows down the learning process.</p>	<p>1A.1. To minimize halts in instruction, a clear menu of interventions was collaboratively established and implemented by the EBD team. The strategies consist of various in class interventions and the following "out of class" interventions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cool Down 2. Refocus 3. Seclusion 4. Time Out (consequence) 5. Animal Therapy Sessions (de-escalation) <p>To implement these interventions, each classroom needed a full</p>	<p>1A.1. Administration</p>	<p>1A.1. At our weekly EBD Team Support meetings we'll monitor the interventions and their success. Modifications and additional interventions will be added as needed.</p>	<p>1A.1. Success with the interventions will be evaluated via student point sheets and mainstream success. We will utilize self-reflection and teachers implementation of the interventions will be evaluated in the following 5 sections in Marzano's Domain 1: DQ 6 (4) Establishing Classroom Routines. DQ 7 (33) Wittiness DQ 7 (34) Applying Consequences for lack of Adherence to Rules & Procedures. DQ 8 (37) Using Verbal & Nonverbal Behaviors that indicate affection for students. DQ 8 (38) Displaying Objectivity and Control.</p>		
---	---	--	-----------------------------	---	---	--	--

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

		time aide free to remove the student and implement the strategies.					
<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012-13, E.H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 3+) on FCAT Reading by 5 percentage points.							
	<i>In 2011-12, 8% scored level 3 or higher (1 student out of the 12 assessed).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 13% of our assessed students will score level 3 or higher.</i>					
		1A.2. Currently, our FCAT assessed population does not have grade level materials aligned to either the NGSSS or Common Core.	1A.2. Order new materials from Pearson, Prentice Hall, and Glencoe which match the rest of the district. These new materials will enable delivery of instruction aligned to district pacing guides. Once instruction is following pacing guides, teachers can assess student progress by administering District Interim Assessments.	1A.2.Administration	1A.2. EBD student participation in District Interim Assessment will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.2. P.O.s will document success in ordering materials.	
		1A.3. Currently we lack sufficient progress monitoring data for reading.	1A.3.. This year we will participate in not only District Interim Assessments, but we will also administer FAIR and SRI.	1A.3.Administration	1A.3. EBD student participation in standardized progress monitoring will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.3. Self Reflection in teacher's Growth Plans as well as Marzano's DQ1 (2) Tracking student progress. Lesson Plans will be checked to reflect testing and use of results to modify instruction.	

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

<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>	<p>1B.1. Lack of research-based curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>1B.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with MeVille to WeVille, Edication City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>1B.1. Administration</p>	<p>1B.1. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA.</p>	<p>1B.1. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> In 2012-13, E.H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (levels 4+) on FAA by five percentage points</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 50% of our FAA assessed students scored proficient or above (20 students out of the 40 assessed).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 55% of the assessed students will score proficient.</i></p>					
	<p>1B.2. Lack of Access Point version of Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>1B.2. Utilize teacher-made supplemental materials designed to meet individual student needs. Create and implement scales for continuous summative assessments in classrooms</p>	<p>1B.2. Administration</p>	<p>1B.2. Walkthrough and observation data.</p>	<p>1B.2. Self Reflection, Marzano Teacher evaluation system. Lesson Plan checks.</p>		

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

		1B.3.Funding for Technology is very limited and high caseloads for therapists.	1B.3. Ensure that support services (Occupational therapy, Physical Therapy, Assistive Technology, Behavior, Speech/Language) strategies are implemented throughout daily instruction. Incorporate more technology to assist communication and participate in FAA technology pilot this year.	1B.3.Administration and Sarah Azula (Staffing Specialist who coordinates IEP reviews.	1B.3. Walkthrough and observation data.	1B.3. Self Reflection, IEPs, BIPs and RtI data. Lesson Plan checks.	
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--

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. We have a small number of FCAT assessed students. These students are diagnosed with severe emotional and/or behavioral disabilities. Their condition must be so severe that they are unable to function in a regular school setting...thus they are sent to E.H. Miller to provide a therapeutic day school environment. Due to the severe behavior issues of these students and/or their emotional instability, academic instruction is often interrupted with outbursts and the need for intervention. This slows down the learning process.</p>	<p>2A.1. 1A.1. To minimize halts in instruction, a clear menu of interventions was collaboratively established and implemented by the EBD team. The strategies consist of various in class interventions and the following "out of class" interventions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cool Down 2. Reflex 3. Seclusion 4. Time Out (consequence) 5. Animal Therapy Sessions (de-escalation) <p>To implement these interventions, each classroom needed a full time aide free</p>	<p>2A.1. Administration</p>	<p>2A.1. At our weekly EBD Team Support meetings we'll monitor the interventions and their success. Modifications and additional interventions will be added as needed.</p>	<p>2A.1. Success with the interventions will be evaluated via student point sheets and mainstream success. We will utilize self-reflection and teachers implementation of the interventions will be evaluated in the following 5 sections in Marzano's Domain 1: DQ 6 (4) Establishing Classroom Routines. DQ 7 (33) Wittiness DQ 7 (34) Applying Consequences for lack of Adherence to Rules & Procedures. DQ 8 (37) Using Verbal & Nonverbal Behaviors that indicate affection for students. DQ 8 (38) Displaying Objectivity and Control</p>		
---	---	--	-----------------------------	---	--	--	--

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

		to remove the student and implement the strategies.					
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 4 or above on FCAT Reading by 5 percentage points							
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 4 or higher (0 students out of the 12 assessed)</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our assessed students will score level 4 or higher.</i>					
		2A.2. Currently, our FCAT assessed population does not have grade level materials aligned to either the NGSSS or Common Core.	2A.2. Order new materials from Pearson, Prentice Hall, and Glencoe which match the rest of the district. These new materials will enable delivery of instruction aligned to district pacing guides. Once instruction is following pacing guides, teachers can assess student progress by administering District Interim Assessments. These new materials should facilitate increased rigor.	2A.2. Administration	2A.2. EBD student participation in District Interim Assessment will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	2A.2. P.O.s will document success in ordering materials.	
		2A.3. Currently we lack sufficient progress monitoring data for reading.	2A.3. This year we will participate in not only District Interim Assessments, but we will also administer FAIR and SRI.	2A.3. Administration	2A.3. EBD student participation in standardized progress monitoring will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	2A.3. Self Reflection in teacher's Growth Plans as well as Marzano's DQ1 (2) Tracking student progress. Lesson Plans will be checked to reflect testing and use of results to modify instruction.	

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

<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</p>	<p>2B.1. Lack of research-based curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>2B.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with MeVile to WeVile, Education City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>2B.1. Administration</p>	<p>2B.1. Collect data via Walkthroughs and observations. Continue collaborative discussions with faculty.</p>	<p>2B.1. Lesson Plan checks, iobserve Marzano teacher evaluation system.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> In 2012-13, E.H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 7 or above on FAA by five percentage points</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 31% scored level 7 or higher (12 of the 40 assessed students).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 36% of our assessed students will score level 7 or higher.</i></p>					
		<p>2B.2. Lack of Access Point version of Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>2B.2. Continue to utilize our UNIQUE curriculum which is aligned to regular Common core standards. Continue collaboration amongst teachers to improve lesson planning with UNIQUE via the new lesson plan template.</p>	<p>2B.2. Administration</p>	<p>2B.2. Collect data via Walkthroughs and observations. Continue collaborative discussions with faculty.</p>	<p>2B.2. Lesson Plan checks, iobserve Marzano teacher evaluation system.</p>	

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

		2B.3. Funding for Technology is very limited and high caseloads for therapists.	2B.3. Ensure that support services (Occupational therapy, Physical Therapy, Assistive Technology, Behavior, Speech/Language) strategies are implemented throughout daily instruction. Incorporate more technology to assist communication and participate in FAA technology pilot this year. Seek grant funding as needed.	2B.3.Administration	2B.3. Monitor for increase in technology and assistive device use to assist in student learning and communication. Monitor and participate in IEP and RtI meetings to ensure needed services are being delivered.	2B.3. IEPs RtI data.	
--	--	---	--	---------------------	---	----------------------	--

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 reading.	3A.1. Same as Reading 1A	3A.1. Same as Reading 1A	3A.1. Same as Reading 1A	3A.1. Same as Reading 1A	3A.1. Same as Reading 1A		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of making learning gains on FCAT Reading by 5 percentage points	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% made academic gains in reading (0 students out of the 12 assessed).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our assessed students will show learning gains in reading.</i>					
		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 reading.</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as Reading 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as Reading 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as Reading 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as Reading 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as Reading 1B</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> In 2012-13, E.H. Miller will increase the number of students making learning gains on FAA by five percentage points</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 7% made gains in reading (2 students out of the 28 where comparison data was available).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 12% of our assessed students will show learning gains in reading.</i></p>					

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

		3B.2. Data is not reliable. Huge subjectivity during administration of the FAA has led to erratic data over the past few years. Due to some students responses being through selection and eye gaze many teachers administering the testing in the past, tended to unintentionally inflate scores.	3B.2.Intensive training and PD has been delivered over the past year to ensure more consistency and uniform testing interpretation with the FAA.	3B.2. District ESE Department, E.H. Miller Administration.	3B.2.Monitor for a leveling out of scores so actual growth can be assessed.	3B.2. FAA results for 2012-13 school year.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		

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>					
<i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students, 25% of 12 is not a statistically relevant group. In our case we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the bottom 25% at their home schools.</i>							
	NA	NA					
		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

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						
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> <p><i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students on FCAT, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</i></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 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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #5B: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students, 25% of 12 is not a statistically relevant group. In our case we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the bottom 25% at their home schools.</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> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	

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.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<p>Reading Goal #5C: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</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>					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	

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

		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Reading Goal #5D: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</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>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	

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

		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.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 12 students via FCAT and 40 via AA, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</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>					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	

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

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.							
	PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	IEP Writing	All Grade Levels	FDLRS	All teachers, mandatory	Preplanning	IEP reviews and spot checks by District Staff and Crystal Oglesbee	Mary Piazza, Jane Ford, Sarah Azula, Crystal Oglesbee
	PLC – Growth Plan and self-assessment	All Grade Levels	Cathy Campbell & Linda Becker	All teachers	Oct. 5, 2012 & ongoing through Oct. 26, 2012	Growth Plan approval in iobserve system	Mary Piazza
PLC – Reading Strategies & SFA Reading Edge	All Grade Levels	Mary Piazza, Jane Ford	Becker, Moore, Campbell, L. Godfrey, Rhea, B. Godfrey, William Stroman	Monthly	Lesson Plan checks and Walkthrough data	Mary Piazza, Jane Ford	

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

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

UNIQUE Pre-K Curriculum	Purchasing this curriculum will provide a great resource for our Pre-K classroom and allow consistency across the IND population.	Private Speech/Language Grant	1,500.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
ipads, Touch Chat software	For our non-verbal students, this software will enable students more communication.	Private Speech/Language Grant	2,000
2 new computers for Assistive Technology Pilot and two voice output devices.	These new computers will allow more students to access reading and FAA via technology. This will enable us to have students practice using the technology prior to the FAA Pilot's first assessment round.	Private Speech/Language Grant	2,000
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Communication Boards in all classrooms	The wall hanging carpet and Velcro attachments will enhance reading and communication in all classrooms	Private Speech/Language Grant	800.00
Subtotal:6300.00			
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: <i>E.H. Miller does not administer CELLA. We have 3 ESOL students but they have severe cognitive disabilities making the CELLA inappropriate.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	<i>na</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #2: <i>E.H. Miller does not administer CELLA. We have 3 ESOL students but they have severe cognitive disabilities making the CELLA inappropriate.</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	<i>na.</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

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.	
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> <i>E.H. Miller does not administer CELLA. We have 3 ESOL students but they have severe cognitive disabilities making the CELLA inappropriate.</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	<i>na</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

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:0			
Total:0			

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		

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. Behavior. We have a small number of FCAT assessed students. These students are diagnosed with severe emotional and/or behavioral disabilities. Their condition must be so severe that they are unable to function in a regular school setting... thus they are sent to E.H. Miller to provide a therapeutic day school environment. Due to the severe behavior issues of these students and/or their emotional instability, academic instruction is often interrupted with outbursts and the need for intervention. This slows down the learning process.</p>	<p>1A.1. Interventions. To minimize halts in instruction, a clear menu of interventions was collaboratively established and implemented by the EBD team. The strategies consist of various in class interventions and the following "out of class" interventions: 1. Cool Down 2. Refocus 3. Seclusion 4. Time Out (consequence) 5. Animal Therapy Sessions (de-escalation) To implement these interventions, each classroom needed a full time aide free</p>	<p>1A.1. Administration.</p>	<p>1A.1. At our weekly EBD Team Support meetings we'll monitor the interventions and their success. Modifications and additional interventions will be added as needed.</p>	<p>1A.1. Success with the interventions will be evaluated via student point sheets and mainstream success. We will utilize self-reflection and teachers implementation of the interventions will be evaluated in the following 5 sections in Marzano's Domain 1: DQ 6 (4) Establishing Classroom Routines. DQ 7 (33) Wittiness DQ 7 (34) Applying Consequences for lack of Adherence to Rules & Procedures. DQ 8 (37) Using Verbal & Nonverbal Behaviors that indicate affection for students. DQ 8 (38) Displaying Objectivity and Control</p>		
---	---	--	------------------------------	---	--	--	--

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

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

		to remove the student and implement the strategies.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 3+) on FCAT Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 3 or higher (0 students out of the 3 assessed)</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Math assessed elementary students will score level 3 or higher.</i>					
		1A.2. Currently, our FCAT assessed EBE Elementary classroom does have access to Envision Math online; however, we feel the EBD population would benefit from the addition of hard copies of level textbooks and workbooks.	1A.2. Order a class set of textbooks to supplement Envisions online Math curriculum. These new materials will enable delivery of instruction aligned to district pacing guides. Once instruction is following pacing guides, teachers can assess student progress by administering District Interim Assessments.	1A.2. Administration	1A.2. EBD student participation in District Interim Assessment will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.2. P.O.s will document success in ordering materials.	

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

		1A.3. Currently we lack sufficient progress monitoring data for math.	1A.3. This year we will participate in not only District Interim Math Assessments, but we will also administer a pre & posttest via MobyMath online.	1A.3. Administration	1A.3. EBD student participation in math progress monitoring will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.3. Self Reflection in teacher's Growth Plans as well as Marzano's DQ1 (2) Tracking student progress. Lesson Plans will be checked to reflect testing and use of results to modify instruction.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1. Same as 1B	1B.1. Same as 1B	1B.1. Same as 1B	1B.1 Same as 1B	1B.1. Same as 1B		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 4,5,6) on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 55% scored level 4 or higher (6 of the 11 assessed at the elementary level).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 60% of our FAA assessed students will score level 4 or higher in Math.</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. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 4 or higher on FCAT Math (0 students out of the 3 elementary students who took FCAT Math.</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Math assessed elementary students will score level 4 or higher.</i>					
		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 mathematics.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as 1B</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 7 or higher on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 27% scored level 7 or higher (3 of the 11 assessed at the elementary level).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 32% of our FAA Math assessed elementary students will score level 7 or higher.</i></p>					
		<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	
		<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	

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. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1		
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>This element is not applicable for E.H. Miller. Of the 3 elementary students assessed with FCAT last year, none had prior year's data for growth calculations. This is partially due to the high mobility rate of our student population.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					
		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>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>E.H. Miller will increase the percentage of elementary students making learning gains on the FAA Math by five percentage points.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 17% made learning gains on FAA math (1 of the 6 assessed with prior year scores for comparison).</i></p>	<p><i>In 2012-13, 22% of our FAA assessed elementary students will make learning gains in math.</i></p>					
		<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	
		<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	

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>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 3-5 elementary students, 25% of this small total is not a statistically relevant group. In our case we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the bottom 25% at their home schools.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		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						
<p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5A: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 3-5 students on elementary FCAT, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students.</i></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 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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 3-5 students on elementary FCAT, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students.</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> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	<p>5B.2.</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	

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>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. We have only 3 ELL students and they have severe cognitive disabilities.</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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 3-5 elementary students, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</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>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 3-5 elementary students, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the lowest performing students if they were at their home schools.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		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	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. Behavior. We have a small number of FCAT assessed students. These students are diagnosed with severe emotional and/or behavioral disabilities. Their condition must be so severe that they are unable to function in a regular school setting... thus they are sent to E.H. Miller to provide a therapeutic day school environment. Due to the severe behavior issues of these students and/or their emotional instability, academic instruction is often interrupted with outbursts and the need for intervention. This slows down the learning process.</p>	<p>1A.1. Interventions. To minimize halts in instruction, a clear menu of interventions was collaboratively established and implemented by the EBD team. The strategies consist of various in class interventions and the following "out of class" interventions: 6. Cool Down 7. Refocus 8. Seclusion 9. Time Out (consequence) 10. Animal Therapy Sessions (de-escalation) To implement these interventions, each classroom needed a full time aide free</p>	<p>1A.1. Administration.</p>	<p>1A.1. At our weekly EBD Team Support meetings we'll monitor the interventions and their success. Modifications and additional interventions will be added as needed.</p>	<p>1A.1. Success with the interventions will be evaluated via student point sheets and mainstream success. We will utilize self-reflection and teachers implementation of the interventions will be evaluated in the following 5 sections in Marzano's Domain 1: DQ 6 (4) Establishing Classroom Routines. DQ 7 (33) Wittiness DQ 7 (34) Applying Consequences for lack of Adherence to Rules & Procedures. DQ 8 (37) Using Verbal & Nonverbal Behaviors that indicate affection for students. DQ 8 (38) Displaying Objectivity and Control</p>		
---	--	--	------------------------------	---	--	--	--

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

		to remove the student and implement the strategies.					
Mathematics Goal #1A: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 3+) on FCAT Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 3 or higher (0 students out of the 7 assessed)</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Math assessed middle school students will score level 3 or higher.</i>					
		1A.2. Currently, our FCAT assessed EBD Middle school students do not yet have access to grade level curriculum materials to assist instruction and preparation.	1A.2. Order a class set of Glencoe Math textbooks and teacher support materials.. These new materials will enable delivery of instruction aligned to district pacing guides. Once instruction is following pacing guides, teachers can assess student progress by administering District Interim Assessments.	1A.2. Administration	1A.2. EBD student participation in District Interim Assessment will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.2. P.O.s will document success in ordering materials.	
		1A.3. Currently we lack sufficient progress monitoring data for math.	1A.3. This year we will participate in not only District Interim Math Assessments, but we will also administer a pre & posttest via MobyMath online.	1A.3. Administration	1A.3. EBD student participation in math progress monitoring will increase. Mrs. Piazza will monitor and ensure testing is presented in a positive manner to students.	1A.3. Self Reflection in teacher's Growth Plans as well as Marzano's DQ1 (2) Tracking student progress. Lesson Plans will be checked to reflect testing and use of results to modify instruction.	

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

<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1B.1. Lack of research-based math curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>1B.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with Education City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>1B.1. Administration.</p>	<p>1B.1. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA.</p>	<p>1B.1. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 4,5,6) on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 50% scored level 4 or higher (8 of the 16 assessed at the middle school level).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 55% of our FAA assessed students will score level 4 or higher in Math.</i></p>					
		<p>1B.2. Lack of quality lesson planning</p>	<p>1B.2. Implement teacher lesson planning with new lesson plan template and review schedule.</p>	<p>1B.2. Administration</p>	<p>1B.2. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA Math.</p>	<p>1B.2. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>	
		<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	

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. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1	2A.1. Same as 1A.1		
Mathematics Goal #2A: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 4 or higher on FCAT Math (0 students out of the 7 middle school students who took FCAT Math.</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Math assessed middle school students will score level 4 or higher.</i>					
		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 mathematics.</p>	<p>2B.1. Lack of research-based math curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>2B.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with Education City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>2B.1. Administration.</p>	<p>2B.1. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA.</p>	<p>2B.1. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 7 or higher on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 19% scored level 7 or higher on FAA Math (3 students out of the 16 middle school students who took FAA Math.</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 24% of our FAA Math assessed middle school students will score level 7 or higher.</i></p>					
		<p>2B.2. Lack of quality lesson planning.</p>	<p>2B.2. Implement teacher lesson planning with new lesson plan template and review schedule.</p>	<p>2B.2. Administration</p>	<p>2B.2. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA Math.</p>	<p>2B.2. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>	
		<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	

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. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1	3A.1. Same as 1A.1		
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>E.H. Miller will increase the percentage of middle school students making learning gains on the FCAT Math by five percentage points.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% made learning gains on FCAT Math (0 of the 5 assessed with prior year scores for comparison).</i>	<i>In 2012-13, 5% of students will prior year scores for comparison will make learning gains on FCAT Math.</i>					
		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>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B.1 & 2B.1</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B.1 & 2B.1</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B.1 & 2B.1</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B.1 & 2B.1</p>	<p>3B.1. Same as 1B.1 & 2B.1</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>E.H. Miller will increase the percentage of middle school students making learning gains on the FAA Math by five percentage points.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 0% made learning gains on FAA math (0 of the 8 assessed with prior year scores for comparison).</i></p>	<p><i>In 2012-13, 5% of our FAA assessed middle school students with prior year scores for comparison will make learning gains in math.</i></p>					
		<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	
		<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	

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>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 5-10 middle school students, 25% of this small total is not a statistically relevant group. In our case we focus on all our students since they all would be considered in the bottom 25% at their home schools.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		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						
<p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5A:</u> <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 5-10 students on middle school FCAT Math, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students.</i></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 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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 5-10 students on middle grades FCAT Math, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	na 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.	

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

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

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

in need of improvement for the following subgroup:							
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>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of 3 ELL students, all of whom have severe cognitive disabilities.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. 100% of our students are SWD.</i>							
	na	na					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>This element is not applicable to E.H. Miller. Since we only test a total of around 5-10 students on middle school FCAT Math, any subgroup data or achievement gap data, is not applicable. We test such a small number of students, that we are able to view each student individually, as any breakdown would be statistically irrelevant. In our case, we focus on all our students since we have so few.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School	Mathemat	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			
<p>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1.1. Lack of research-based math curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>1.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with Education City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>1.1. Administration</p>	<p>1.1. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA.</p>	<p>1.1. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>			

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

<p>Mathematics Goal #1: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 4,5,6) on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 31% scored level 4 or higher (4 of the 13 assessed at the high school level).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 36% of our FAA assessed students will score level 4 or higher in FAA Math.</i></p>					
		<p>1.2. Lack of Access Point version of Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>1.2. Utilize teacher-made supplemental materials designed to meet individual student needs. Create and implement scales for continuous summative assessments in classrooms</p>	<p>1.2. Administration</p>	<p>1.2. Walkthrough and observation data.</p>	<p>1.2. Self Reflection, Marzano Teacher evaluation system. Lesson Plan checks.</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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2.1. Lack of research-based math curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities</p>	<p>2.1. Continue UNIQUE ESE curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Continue to supplement with Education City and Starfall. Continue small group learning centers.</p>	<p>2.1. Administration</p>	<p>2.1. Monthly Pre and Posttests from UNIQUE. Growth on Brigance administered at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year. Year to year growth on FAA.</p>	<p>2.1. Self Reflection via teacher Growth Plans in iobserve. Teacher evaluation results and walkthroughs. Lesson Plan checks.</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #2: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 7 or higher on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 15% scored level 7 or higher (2 of the 13 assessed at the high school level).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 20% of our FAA assessed students will score level 7 or higher on FAA. Math.</i></p>					
		<p>2.2. Lack of Access Point version of Common Core Standards</p>	<p>2.2. Utilize teacher-made supplemental materials designed to meet individual student needs. Create and implement scales for continuous summative assessments in classrooms</p>	<p>2.2. Administration</p>	<p>2.2. Walkthrough and observation data.</p>	<p>2.2. Self Reflection, Marzano Teacher evaluation system. Lesson Plan checks.</p>	
		<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	

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. Same as for 1 & 2.	3.1. Same as for 1 & 2.	3.1. Same as for 1 & 2.	3.1. Same as for 1 & 2.	3.1. Same as for 1 & 2.		
Mathematics Goal #3: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students making learning gains on FAA Math by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 15% scored made learning gains (2 of the 13 assessed at the high school level).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 20% of our FAA assessed students will make learning gains on FAA math.</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

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>We have no students enrolled in algebra.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> <i>na</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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 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						
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> E.H. Miller has not yet offered Algebra 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		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: E.H. Miller has not yet offered Algebra I.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>na</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>na</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3C:</u> E.H. Miller has not yet offered Algebra I.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: E.H. Miller has not yet offered Algebra I.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	na	na					
		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.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</u> E.H. Miller has not yet offered Algebra I.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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 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						
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Geometry Goal #3B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	na White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

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

Geometry Goal #3D: E. H Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		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 Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Geometry.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

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

or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math PLC	All grade levels	Administration	All Teachers	As possible during monthly meetings.	Lesson Plan Checks and Progress monitoring data.	Mary Piazza

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
Moby Math Online Math Program	Moby Math is appropriate for progress monitoring and individualized targeted tutoring for ESE students.	District	Approximately 500.00
Subtotal:500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:500.00			
Total:500.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Lack of high interest, hands on Science curriculum and materials. Although we can access Discovery Science content online, we have no hands on materials.	1A.1. Implement teacher-created hands on science labs to supplement and elicit interest in science content.	1A.1. Mary Piazza, Jane Ford	1A.1. Lesson Plan checks, walkthroughs, and observations.	1A.1. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 1: DQ 1 (1): Providing clear learning goals and scales. DQ 1 (2): Tracking Student progress. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 2: 3: Attention to established content standards.		
<u>Science Goal #1A:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 3+) on FCAT Science by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 3 or higher (0 students out of the 2 assessed)</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Science assessed students will score level 3 or higher</i>					
		1A.2. Lack of knowledge of standards and best practices for teaching science.	1A.2. Implement teacher-created scales specific to science standards for student progress monitoring.	1A.2. Mary Piazza, Jane Ford	1A.2. Lesson Plan checks, walkthroughs, and observations	1A.2. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 1: DQ 1 (1): Providing clear learning goals and scales. DQ 1 (2): Tracking Student progress. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 2: 3: Attention to established content standards.	

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

	<p>1A.3. Behavior. We have a small number of FCAT assessed students. These students are diagnosed with severe emotional and/or behavioral disabilities. Their condition must be so severe that they are unable to function in a regular school setting... thus they are sent to E.H. Miller to provide a therapeutic day school environment. Due to the severe behavior issues of these students and/or their emotional instability, academic instruction is often interrupted with outbursts and the need for intervention. This slows down the learning process</p>	<p>1A.3. To minimize halts in instruction, a clear menu of interventions was collaboratively established and implemented by the EBD team. The strategies consist of various in class interventions and the following "out of class" interventions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cool Down 2. Refocus 3. Seclusion 4. Time Out (consequence) 5. Animal Therapy Sessions (de-escalation) <p>To implement these interventions, each classroom needed a full time aide free to remove the student and implement the strategies.</p>	<p>1A.3. Mary Piazza, Jane Ford</p>	<p>1A.3. At our weekly EBD Team Support meetings we'll monitor the interventions and their success. Modifications and additional interventions will be added as needed.</p>	<p>1A.3. Success with the interventions will be evaluated via student point sheets and mainstream success. We will utilize self-reflection and teachers implementation of the interventions will be evaluated in the following 5 sections in Marzano's Domain 1: DQ 6 (4) Establishing Classroom Routines. DQ 7 (33) Wittiness DQ 7 (34) Applying Consequences for lack of Adherence to Rules & Procedures. DQ 8 (37) Using Verbal & Nonverbal Behaviors that indicate affection for students. DQ 8 (38) Displaying Objectivity and Control.</p>	
--	---	---	-------------------------------------	---	---	--

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

<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p>	<p>1B.1. Lack of research-based curricula aligned with the Access Points specifically designed for student with significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>1B.1. Continue using UNIQUE integrated curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities, but supplement with hands on teacher-made supplemental science activities and materials designed to meet individual student needs.</p>	<p>1B.1. Mary Piazza</p>	<p>1B.1. Lesson Plan checks, walkthroughs, and observations.</p>	<p>1B.1. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 1: DQ 1 (1): Providing clear learning goals and scales. DQ 1 (2): Tracking Student progress. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 2: 3: Attention to established content standards.</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #1B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Levels 4,5,6) on FAA Science by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 33% scored level 3 or higher (3 students out of the 9 assessed)</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 38% of our FCAT Science assessed students will score level 3 or higher</i></p>					
		<p>1B.2. Teacher discomfort with scale creation and continuous progress monitoring.</p>	<p>1B.2. Have teachers create and implement scales for continuous summative assessment in classrooms.</p>	<p>1B.2. Mary Piazza</p>	<p>1B.2. Lesson Plan checks, walkthroughs and observations.</p>	<p>1B.2. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 1: DQ 1 (1): Providing clear learning goals and scales. DQ 1 (2): Tracking Student progress. Marzano Teacher Evaluation Instrument areas of Domain 2: 3: Attention to established content standards.</p>	

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

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Same as for 1A.	2A.1. Same as for 1A.	2A.1. Same as for 1A.	2A.1. Same as for 1A.	2A.1. Same as for 1A.		
Science Goal #2A: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Levels 4 or 5 on FCAT Science by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 4 or 5 (0 students out of the 2 assessed)</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FCAT Science assessed students will score level 4 or 5.</i>					
		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 science.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as for 1B.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as for 1B.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as for 1B.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as for 1B.</p>	<p>2B.1. Same as for 1B.</p>		
<p>Science Goal #2B: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Levels 7,8,9 on FAA Science by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 0% scored level 7 or higher on FAA Science (0 students out of the 9 assessed)</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 5% of our FAA Science assessed students will score level 7 or higher.</i></p>					
		<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	<p>2B.2.</p>	
		<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	<p>2B.3.</p>	

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]).

<p>High School Science Goals</p>	<p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	ent						
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. Same as for 1B above.	1.1. Same as for 1B above.	1.1. Same as for 1B above.	1.1. Same as for 1B above.	1.1. Same as for 1B above.		
Science Goal #1: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 4, 5, or 6 on FAA Science by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 64% scored level 4,5,6 or higher (7 students out of the 11 assessed).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 69% of our FAA Science assessed high school students will score level 4,5 or 6.</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

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. Same as for 1B above.	2.1. Same as for 1B above.	2.1. Same as for 1B above.	2.1. Same as for 1B above.	2.1. Same as for 1B above.		
Science Goal #2: In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring Level 7 or higher on FAA Science by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 36% scored level 4,5,6 or higher (4 students out of the 11 assessed).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 41% of our FAA Science assessed high school students will score level 7 or higher.</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						

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

	Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Biology.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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

<u>Biology 1 Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Biology.							
	na	na					
		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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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:0			
Total:0			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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

1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring proficient (Level 3+) on FCAT Writing by 5 percentage points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>In 2011-12, 33% of our FCAT Writing assessed students scored level 3 or higher (2 students out of the 6 assessed).</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 38% of our FCAT Writes assessed students will score level 3 or higher.</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 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

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

<p><u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> In 2012-13, E. H. Miller will increase the number of students scoring level 4,5 or 6 on FAA Writing by 5 percentage points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>In 2011-12, 32% scored level 4,5 or 6 (6 students out of the 19 assessed)</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, at least 37% of our FAA assessed high school students will score level 7 or higher.</i></p>					
		<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	<p>1B.2.</p>	
		<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	<p>1B.3.</p>	

Writing Professional Development

<p>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.</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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
none						

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:0			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

* 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> E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Civics this year.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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

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> E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in Civics this year.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:0			

End of Civics Goals

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
U.S. History Goal #1: E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in U. S. History.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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 U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>U.S. History Goal #2:</u> E. H. Miller has no students enrolled in U. S. History.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	na	na					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:0			
Total:			

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Attendance Goal #1: <i>Due to the nature of our students, many of whom are medically fragile, attendance is not an applicable goal for E. H. Miller.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					

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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</i>					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>					
	<i>na</i>	<i>na</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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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:0			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p>Suspension Goal #1: <i>E. H. Miller is a restrictive environment with self-contained classrooms. We have specially trained teachers and support staff who are able to provide intensive behavior interventions in lieu of suspension in most cases. Suspensions are only utilized in our EBD population when warranted by extremely violent behavior. We will maintain or reduce our suspension rate for the 2012-13 school year.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<p><i>For the 2011-12 school year, E. H. Miller had a 0% in school suspension rate (0 suspensions)</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, E.H. Miller expects to maintain its 0% in school suspension rate.</i></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u></p>					
	<p><i>For the 2011-12 school year, E. H. Miller had a 0% in school suspension rate (0 students).</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, E.H. Miller expects to maintain its 0% in school suspension rate.</i></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u></p>					
	<p><i>For the 2011-12 school year, E. H. Miller had a 15% suspension rate.</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, E.H. Miller expects to maintain its 0% in school suspension rate.</i></p>					

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

	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>For the 2011-12 school year, E. H. Miller suspended 15 students for at least 1 day.</i>	<i>For the 2012-13 school year, E.H. Miller expects to maintain its 0% in school suspension rate.</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

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
CPI training	All EBD teachers	Carl Coalson	All EBD teachers K-12	October 5, 2012	Walk through and observation data	Mary Piazza and Jane Ford

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Installation of Padding for walls and floor in seclusion room	For safety purposes we will be installing padding in an emotionally neutral color for our seclusion room.	District ESE Department and Maintenance Department	2000.00
Subtotal:			
Total:2000.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

<p><u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u></p> <p><i>E. H. Miller School will maintain a 2% or lower dropout rate for the 2012-13 school year.</i></p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>For the 2011-12 School year, E. H. Miller had a 1% dropout rate. One student dropped out due to a pregnancy and birth of a child.</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, we will maintain a 2% or lower dropout rate.</i></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i></p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:0			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Communication	1.1. Daily Communication sheets and folders, monthly BUZZ newsletters, personal invitations to programs and to participate in SAC meetings.	1.1. Teachers & Administration.	1.1.A parent survey will be administered to measure parent’s perception of effective communication.	1.1. Agendas, parent sign ins, survey data.		

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

<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
<p><i>E. H. Miller will increase the parent involvement in SAC by 5 percentage points.</i></p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>							
	<p><i>For the 2011-12 school year, we only had a 3% involvement rate for our SAC meetings</i></p>	<p><i>For the 2012-13 school year, parental involvement in SAC will increase to 8% on average.</i></p>					
		<p>1.2.Perceived relevance of Parent involvement</p>	<p>1.2.Offer a variety of information on topics parents are interested in such as MED waiver, dealing ASD, what local agencies offer assistance, respite care opportunities, etc.</p>	<p>1.2 School staff and district staff.</p>	<p>1.2.A parent survey will be administered to measure the perception of relevance and importance.</p>	<p>1..2 Newsletter Articles, Flyers, Sign ins and survey data.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide refreshments for SAC meetings to enhance their participation	Refreshments for parents	Internal Account such as Vending Machine revenue	50.00
Subtotal:			
Total:50.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: <i>This element is not appropriate for our students with either severe cognitive or emotional/behavioral disabilities.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a</small>						

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

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:0			

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: <i>E. H. Miller will increase the number of CTE courses by 5% for the 2012-13 school year.</i>	1. Funding for materials for CTE courses.	1.1. Utilize grant funding and enlist SAC assistance.	1.1. Mary Piazza	1.1. Master schedule showing CTE courses.	1.1. Student enrollment in CTE courses.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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	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
As part of the IND Career Block, we need to fund the Garden.	Fertilizer, seeds, plants, gardening pots, etc.	Private Grant through WalMart	1500.00
As part of the IND Career Block, we need to purchase inventory items to stock our school store: The Bee Mart	Various	SAC funds, possibly Vending Machine Fund.	200.00
Subtotal:1700.00			
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. Time and acquisition of certified trainer.	1.1. Deliver CPI training on In-service day Oct. 5 from 8-4 p.m. Provide breakfast and lunch to allow the full 8 hours for certification. Additionally give 2 hours comp. time to participants for the extra time they worked that day.	1.1. Mary Piazza, organizer. Carl Coalson, of SEDNET, trainer.	1.1. S All CPI participants are administered a comprehensive written test at the end of training and must pass with 80% or higher. Administration will monitor the correct use of procedures throughout the year. 18 staff members were certified. 11 of whom are EBD team members. So at present we have 92% (11 of our 12) EBD team members certified in CPI.	1.1. Number of certifications in CPI.		
<p><u>Additional Goal #1:</u> <i>We will increase our percentage rate for certification in a crisis prevention program for our EBD staff by 50 percentage points.</i></p> <p><i>Note: The majority of our IND teachers work with students with severe cognitive and physical disabilities. These staff members do not require CPI training.</i></p>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					

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

	During the 2011-12 school year, we utilized PCM as our crisis program. 25% (2 of 8) EBD staff members were officially certified in PCM.	75% of our EBD staff will be certified in a crisis prevention program. This year we will use CPI (Crisis Prevention Intervention). We will have met our goal if 6 of our 8 EBD staff members receive certification in CPI.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Breakfast and Lunch for participants	We need to get the full 8 hours of training in on the in-service day, so by providing lunch and breakfast we can work right through training.	Internal Vending Machine Funds or other fund source as discovered.	50.00
Subtotal:50.00			
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:6300.00
CELLA Budget	Total:0
Mathematics Budget	Total:500.00
Science Budget	Total:0
Writing Budget	Total:0
Civics Budget	Total:0
U.S. History Budget	Total:0
Attendance Budget	Total:0
Suspension Budget	Total:0
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:50.00
STEM Budget	Total:0
CTE Budget	Total:1700.00
Additional Goals	Total:50.00
	Grand Total:8600.00

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

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

**As an ESE K-12 Center School, E.H. Miller has not heretofore received a school grade.

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.
The E. H. Miller SAC will meet periodically for the following purposes: 1. To enlist parental ideas and wishes for their children; 2. To make decisions collaboratively on how to spend the remaining SAC funds; 3. To deliver and share information to parents about important topics of interest such as: MED Waiver process, outside agency resources, respite care opportunities, school events, etc.

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Funding School Store: Bee Mart	200.00