

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School – University of Florida Lab School

School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School – UF Lab School	District Name: P. K. Yonge
Principal: Dr. Cathy Atria	Superintendent: Dr. Lynda Hayes
SAC Chair: Kathy Olmos	Date of School Board Approval: 10/16/2012

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Catherin Atria	BS, University of Florida; MEd, Educational Leadership, UF; PhD, Educational Administration and Policy, UF Principal Certification, all levels; Biology 6-12; Social Science 5-9; Educational Leadership, all levels; Gifted Endorsement – FL	First year 2012-2013	7 years	N/A
Assistant Principal	Dr. Russ Froman	EdD in Higher Education Administration, UF; Masters in Ed Psychology, FSU; Bachelors in P.E., Auburn; Certified in School Counseling,	7	11	A for 12 years AYP goals met consistently in all reporting groups until 2008-2009; Total school achievement in reading and math consistently exceed state performance.

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

		Physical Education, School Leadership and School			
--	--	--	--	--	--

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)
Reading	Christy Garison-Gabbard	B.A. Elementary Education; Reading K-12 certification; K-6 Certification:5-9 English;6-12 Social Studies	6	4	PKY (A; No AYP)
Reading	Ashley Pennypacker-Hill	B.A. Elementary Education M.S. Special Education Certification; K-12 ESE; Elementary Ed. K-6; ESOL	8	3	PKY (A: no AYP)
Reading	Marisa R. Stukey	Ph.D- curriculum and instruction M.Ed- Reading B.A- Elementary education	8	5	PKY (A: 2007-2008 and 2008-2009)
Differentiated Instruction	Dr. Tanya Kort	Ph.D., MA. School Psy. (UF);B.A. English; B.S. Biology; School Psy.; NASP Certified	5	4	PKY (A; no AYP)

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. New to PKY teachers are assigned a Professional Learning Partner	Christy Garrison-Gabbard	August 2012
2. Induction meeting for newly hired PKY teachers	Christy Garrison-Gabbard	August 2012
3. Ongoing professional development and support for newly hired PKY teachers	Christy Garrison-Gabbard	June 2012
4. Immersion in PKY PLC's	Teacher Leaders	June 2012

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All instructional staff and paraprofessionals are highly qualified.	

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

Staff Demographics

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
67	4.5% (3)	22.5% (15)	46.3% (31)	26.9% (18)	71.6% (48)	100%	17.9% (12)	7.5%(5)	37.3% (25)

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
Pringle, Rose	Briel, Brenda	Beginning Teacher	Weekly meetings with mentor teacher; monthly meetings to work on Professional Learning which would include exposure to current learning regarding our Marzano framework, differential instruction, classroom management, Collins Writing, Kagan Structures and parent involvement strategies; Monthly check in with induction coordinator; Bi-weekly mentor observation first quarter with gradual release over the year.
Geiger, Macy	Clements, Tara	Beginning Teacher	
Cunningham, Greg	Combs, David	Beginning Teacher	
Zeller, Ashlea	Dunn, Tiffany	New to School	
Pavli, Lindsey	Ebert, Chelsea	Beginning Teacher	
Bourne, John	Hayes, Tim	Beginning Teacher	
Dixon, Kathy	May, Carrie	Beginning Teacher	
Barrett, Kelly	Meyers, Jeff	Beginning Teacher	
Krank, Michelle	Peraza, Anna	Beginning Teacher	

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

Kirby, Cary	Poole, Michael	Beginning Teacher	
Santiago, Griselle	Rodriguez, Lizzie	Beginning Teacher	
Gabbard, Christy	Thomas, Micaela	Beginning Teacher	
VanBoven, Ross	Wall, Holly	Beginning Teacher	
Chevallier, Jennifer	Yurko, Katie	Beginning Teacher	

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 Instructional support targets prevention of academic difficulties by providing coordinated instruction through Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction for underachieving K-5 students in reading and math. Classroom-based differentiated instructional support for 3-5 th grade students in reading and mathematics is supported through the Title I (1003a) School Improvement Grant. Math Advance Program (MAP) for underachieving middle school math students. Professional development set aside supported teacher training in new edition of math curriculum and planning for differentiated instructional support and formative assessments in mathematics. We All Value Education (WAVE) to support high school credit recovery and development of critical reading skill as well as study strategies.
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Job-embedded coaching and “just in time” professional development is provided to support development of classroom-based differentiated instructional support for underachieving 6 th -10 th grade students.
Title III N/A
Title X- Homeless The PKY Homeless Policy, coordination by PKY’s Homeless Liaison, provides continuous educational support to eliminate barriers to a free and appropriate education for any student identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI supports extended academic programs targeting intensive skill development during the summer, as well as before/after school. Instructional aides are provided in Kindergarten and first grade to support differentiated instructional support for students
Violence Prevention Programs Second Step training and curriculum materials for school psychologist and school counselors are available. Elementary school teachers participate in ongoing training to implement a Responsive Classroom approach to building community and preventing bullying and violence. The secondary faculty is focused on bully prevention efforts.
Nutrition Programs N/A
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education PKY high school students interested in pursuing career/technical education programs are eligible for dual enrollment at Santa Fe College.
Job Training PKY high school juniors and seniors may register for an Executive Internship course which place students in interest-aligned, community based workplace experience.
Other N/A
<i>Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)</i> chool-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Dr. Russell Froman: Assistant Principal K-12 Director of Special Programs: Laura Schollmeyer-Schwartz Dean of Students: Willie Powers School Counselors: Ritzy Ettinger, Lisa Clemons, and Susan Ireland UF Professor in Residence, School Psychologist; Dr. Nancy Waldron and Dr. Diana Joyce K-3 Elementary Reading and Curriculum Coach: Marisa Ramirez-Stucky 4-5 Elementary Reading and Curriculum Coach: Ashley Pennypacker-Hill 6-12 Reading and Curriculum Coach: Christy Garrison-Gabbard Elementary Instructional Support: Angie Flavin, Jennifer Dunn, Elizabeth Jacoby, and Ashley Pennypacker Secondary Instructional Support: Carrie Litchfield and Dr. Tanya Kort
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The MTSS Leadership Team meets monthly to monitor and continue development of the PKY MTSS system. Together they analyze student progress monitoring data and monitoring the connections between tiers of instruction and social and emotional support. In addition, they review and analyze Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional logs to identify areas in need. The MTSS Leadership Team collaborates with the Student Success Team (includes all stakeholders) at each grade level to analyze student achievement data and make instructional decisions for students in need of additional instructional support. Additionally, the MTSS Leadership Team works in conjunction with the Literacy Lead Team in planning and supporting differentiated instruction.
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 MTSS Leadership Team is integral to the implementation of the school improvement plan. Together they lead and support instructional efforts to close existing achievement gaps by designing and providing tiers of instructional support for under achieving students.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. PKY teachers utilize a balanced assessment system which includes FCAT, EOC, PERT, Florida Assessment in Reading, Fox in Box, DIBELS, Gates-McGinitie, FCAT Test Maker, Thinkgate, and other curriculum based assessment. PKY teachers have immediate access to FCAT navigator Plus, Skyward, and the PMRN for accessing coming critical data points. In addition, PKY School Psychologist assist the Reading Coaches in collecting and organizing critical data points on Tier 2/3 students in one spread sheet for each integrated web-based system will be developed to streamline this process for PKY faculty. The School Psychologist and the School Counselors work together to document Tier 2/3

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

social and emotional interventions.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. PKY has been developing and implementing MTSS since the 2006-2007 school year. As the system has expanded and evolved to the K-12 grade levels. Faculty and training has been provided along the way. Training and support continues through quarterly, grade level Student Success Team meetings whereby the Assistant Principal, Reading/Curriculum Coach, Director of Special Programs, School Psychologist, School Counselor, Classroom teacher, and Instructional Support teacher work together to analyze progress monitoring data and adapt instruction to address students' academic/behavioral needs. Additional job-embedded, in-class coaching and support is provided to train teachers in appropriate, research-based, standard response Tier 2 Instructional/Behavioral protocols.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The School Principal meets with individuals on the MTSS Leadership Team to oversee the process and assist with the collaboration between team members.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The Literacy Leadership Team includes Elementary Reading Coach, Secondary Reading Coach, Supervisor of Instructional Practice, reading intervention teachers, and teacher/curricular leaders representing all core content areas including foreign language.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The literacy Leadership Team meets quarterly and directs implementation of the K-12 Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan. P.K. Yonge encourages and support teacher leadership. Curriculum leaders (and department chairs) are identified by faculty and administration to ensure classroom-based/student-focused action plans. The Literacy Leadership Team coordinates their efforts with P.K. Yonge's K-12 Leadership Team as well as the School Improvement and SAC's Action Plan.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The Literacy Leadership Team is currently collaborating and revising the following initiatives: (1) continued support for the Elementary Home Reading Program, (2) Middle Grades self-selected home reading program, including a grade level reading incentive program, (3) continue to lead Professional Learning Communities focused on the inclusion of common Essential Literacy Standard throughout content area units of study, and (4) implementation of supplemental nonfiction reading in all content area classrooms grade 6-12 accompanied by targeted use of 10% summaries (Collins Writing Program) that require students to synthesize their thinking about challenging informational text.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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

N/A

****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?

PK Yonge's 6th-12th grade faculty participate in ongoing professional learning designed to ensure best practice for content-area reading instruction are part of our core program. . The Florida Reading Initiative provided the foundation on which P.K. Yonge has continued to build strong literacy-based content instruction. The Essential Literacy Standards, derived from the Next Generation SSS to focus on appropriate, literacy-based, cognitively complex tasks associated with reading, writing, research, and public speaking, were designed and implemented at P.K. Yonge to serve as the pre-cursor to Common Core Standards. During professional learning opportunities conducted over the past three years teachers planned for how they would systematically and explicitly incorporate and assess the PKY Essential Literacy Standards. Twice monthly department-focused PLC meetings provided a structure to support teachers' continued work in developing instructional support and appropriate performance assessments to address the PKY Essential Literacy Standards. P.K. Yonge will implement Common Core Standards for Literacy across all ELA, Science, Social Studies, and Technical Subjects with a continued focus on the reading improvement of every student. In addition to our core curriculum, tiered support for reading is provided by all ELA and Social Science teachers to students needing supplemental reading intervention. Our professional learning model for the 2012-13 school year includes both online and F2F opportunities for faculty to deepen knowledge and refine practice related to implementation of Common Core Literacy Standards.

****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?

P.K. Yonge implements a curricular program including cross-curricular units of study, relevant project-based learning opportunities, course offerings that align learning goals across grade levels and subjects, as well as electives related to performing arts, visual arts, sports, and technology. Our students also benefit from course opportunities at Santa Fe College, University of Florida, and other partnering institutions.

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?

PKY school counselors and homeroom teachers work directly with individual students as they plan their academic and career goals, As much as possible, a students' course of study is designed to be personally meaningful and supportive of their future plans.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

Trends noted in the High School Feedback indicate that PKY secondary math and reading programs are preparing our students for post high school educational opportunities. 78% of our graduates are enrolled in state, community, or private colleges and universities. Greater than 86% of our students are successfully completing their college English courses in the first year; 68% are successfully completing their college math classes in their first year. Over all FCAT achievement data suggests that students are better prepared in math, 93.3% of our student score 3 or above and in reading with 71.9% scoring 3 or above. 55% of our students were eligible to receive a Bright Futures award. It is expected that our strategy to focus on strengthening student performance on PKY Essential Literacy and Math Skills targeting higher order reasoning and cognitive complexity will result in PKY students being better prepared to succeed in post high school educational opportunities.

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
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			IA.11.1. Dedicated time available for classroom teachers to collaborate and engage in professional learning and planning in order to develop well-constructed units that differentiate instruction to support comprehension development of fluent level 2 readers.	IA.1. I.1.K-12 unit plans in all content areas will systematically address the PKY Essential Literacy Standards	IA.1. Reading Coaches, Department Chairs Supervisor of Instructional Practices	IA.1. Monthly department PLC meetings will focus on Lesson Study and Unit Tuning	IA.1. PKY Essential Literacy Standards Performance Rubrics
Reading Goal #1A: Students Scoring at Achievement Level 3	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	28% (206)	33% (241)					
			IA.2. Actively engaging students in growing their own vocabulary	IA.2. Increase use of research-based strategies for systematically improving students' academic vocabulary; Transfer of vocabulary acquisition strategies into independent study habits of secondary students	IA.2. Reading Coaches/ Principal/ Supervisor of Instructional Practices walkthroughs will focus on vocabulary building instruction	IA.2. Quarterly Student Success Team Meetings to analyze progress monitoring data; Monthly WOW Dept. Meetings to analyze student work; Monthly Grade Level Team meetings to analyze student response to instructional strategy	IA.2. FAIR Assessments to monitor Student Progress
		IA.3. Time for teachers to actively engage in continued professional learning and adequate support for implementing new strategies.	IA.3. Appropriate and frequent use of formative assessment to guide instruction and engage learners in focused lessons designed with specific learning goals in mind; Monthly PLCs focused on the AFL-formative assessment frameworks conducted with all core academic departments	IA.3 Reading Coaches/ Principal/ Supervisor of Instructional Practices walkthroughs will focus on vocabulary building instruction	IA.3. Collection and monitoring of meeting logs from monthly PLC as well as applicable student work artifacts if available	IA.3. Monthly Meeting Logs from AFL PLC; meeting notes	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Time in the instructional block to provide opportunities for students to engage in self-selected study designed to build critical thinking and reading skills	2A.1. 2.1. Grade level teams collaborate to provide opportunities for students to engage in self-selected reading, problem solving, and critical thinking including but not limited to evaluating text and media. These opportunities are provided through PBL experiences and collaborative inquiry occurring in a specific content area.	2A.1. Reading Coaches, Supervisor of Instructional Practices Grade level team leaders	2A.1. Monthly grade level team meetings focused on SST check-in (student success team)	2A.1. Curriculum based measures Student reading logs
Reading Goal #2A: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	51% (381)	56% (416)					
			2A.2. Student engagement in self-selected independent reading	2A.2. Increase the amount of self-selected reading through homeroom reading competitions, weekly required reading logs, and grade level incentives	2A.2. Classroom teachers, HR teachers, middle grades LA teachers; Reading Coach	2A.2. Monthly student reading totals calculated by grade level	2A.2. Student reading logs
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks	3A.1. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks~ specific to non-fiction complex tasks with varied text structures	3A.1. Reading Coaches, Principal, Supervisor of Instructional Practices , Department Chairs	3A.1. Monthly department PLC meetings will focus on Lesson Study and Unit Tuning	3A.1. PKY Essential Literacy Standards Performance Rubrics
Reading Goal #3A: Percentage of students making learning gains grades 4-10 th .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	51% (327)	56% (359)					
			3A.2. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks~ specific to non-fiction complex tasks with varied text structures	3A.2. 6-10 instructional calendar systematically outlining the increase of non-fiction text and comprehension instruction in targeted content areas	3A.2. Reading Coaches, Principal, , Department Chairs Supervisor of Instructional Practices	3A.2. Quarterly analysis of implementation calendar and instructional materials during SST meetings	3A.2. FAIR Assessment
			3A.3. Appropriate and frequent use of formative assessment to guide instruction and engage learners in focused lessons designed with specific learning goals in mind	3A.3. Monthly PLCs focused on the AFL- formative assessment frameworks conducted with all core academic departments	3A.3 Department Chairs/Principal, Reading Coach Supervisor of Instructional Practices	3A.3. Collection and Monitoring of Meeting logs from monthly PLC as well as applicable student work artifacts if available	3A.3. Monthly Meeting Logs from AFL PLC; meeting notes

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. 4.1 Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks	4A.1. 6-12 unit plans in all content areas will systematically address the PKY Essential Literacy Standards	4A.1. 4.1. Reading Coaches, Principal, , Department Chairs, Supervisor of Instructional Practices	4A.1. Monthly department PLC meetings will focus on Lesson Study and Unit Tuning	4A.1. PKY Essential Literacy Standards Performance Rubrics
Reading Goal #4A: Percentage of students in lowest 25% in grade 4- 10 th making learning gains.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	63%	68%					
			4A.2. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks~ specific to non-fiction complex tasks with varied text structures	4A.2. 6-10 instructional calendar systematically outlining the increase of non-fiction text and comprehension instruction in targeted content areas	4A.2. Principal, Reading Coach Supervisor of Instructional Practices,	4A.2. Quarterly analysis of implementation calendar and instructional materials during SST meetings	4A.2. FAIR Assessment
		Student engagement in critical reading and comprehension tasks based on complex non-fiction texts	4A.3. Implement a research-based standard response for Tier 2 instructional support for under achieving students in 6th-10th grades	4A.3. Tanya Kort; Reading Coach; Principal, Supervisor of Instructional Practices	4A.3. Quarterly Student Success Team Meetings will include analysis of FAIR assessment results and Instructional Support Logs	4A.3. FAIR assessment; Instructional Support Log	

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		75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	87%
Reading Goal #5A: In six years P.K. Yonge will reduce the achievement gap by 50%								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks	5B.1. Unit plans in all content areas will systematically address the PKY Essential Literacy Standards	5B.1. Reading Coach Reading Teachers Department Chair Administrators	5B.1. Monthly department PLC meetings will focus on Lesson Study and Unit planning	5B.1. PKY Essential Literacy Standards Performance Rubrics	
Reading Goal #5B: Students in specific subgroups that met Target Reading			2012 Current Level of Performance: White: 81% Black: 51% Hispanic: 84% Asian: 96% American Indian: n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance: White: 86% Black: 56% Hispanic: 89% Asian: 100% American Indian: n/a				
			5B.2. Time engaged in guided and independent critical reading and comprehension tasks specific to non-fiction complex tasks with varied text structure	5B.2. Instructional calendar systematically outlining the increase of non-fiction text and comprehension instruction in targeted content area	5B.2. Reading Coach Reading Teacher Department Chair Administrators	5B.2. Quarterly analysis of implementation calendar and instructional materials during SST	5B.2. FAIR assessments	
			5B.3. Student engagement in critical reading and comprehension tasks based on complex non-fiction texts	5B.3. Implement a research based standard response for Tier 2 instructional support for underachieving students	5B.3. Reading Coach Reading Teacher Department Chair Administrators	5B.3. Quarterly Student Success Team Meetings will include analysis of FAIR assessment	5B.3. FAIR assessments; Instructional Support Log	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: Student will Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Background knowledge and academic vocabulary (tier 2 and tier 3)	5D.1. Increase use of research-based strategies for systematically improving students' academic vocabulary	5D.1. Reading Coach Reading Teacher Administrators	5D.1. 5A.1. Administrative walkthroughs will focus on vocabulary building instruction	5D.1. FAIR Assessment				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">43%</td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">48%</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	43%	48%				
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>							
43%	48%								
5D.2. Student self-efficacy related to academic tasks, academic behaviors, and availability of instructional time dedicated to supplemental instruction	5D.2. Implement a research-based standard response for Tier 2 instructional support for under achieving students in 6th-10th grades	5D.2. Reading Coach Reading Teacher Administrators	5D.2. Quarterly Student Success Team Meetings will include analysis of FAIR assessment results and Instructional Support Logs	5D.2. FAIR Assessment; Instructional support log					
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. Reading Goal #5E: Students who are economically disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. 5D.1. Engagement with academic text (fiction and non-fiction), literature, and young adult text at instructional and independent levels.	5E.1. Unit plans in all content areas will systematically address the PKY Essential Literacy Standards	5E.1. Administrators Reading Coaches/ Department Chairs	5E.1. Monthly department PLC meetings will focus on Lesson Study and Unit Tuning	5E.1. PKY Essential Literacy Standards Performance Rubrics				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">63%</td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">68%</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	63%	68%				
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>							
63%	68%								
5E.2. Background knowledge and academic vocabulary (tier 2 and tier 3)	5E.2. Increase use of research-based strategies for systematically improving students' academic vocabulary	5E.2. Administrators Reading Coaches/ Department Chairs	5E.2. Administrative walkthroughs will focus on vocabulary building instruction	5E.2. FAIR Assessments					
	5E.3. Self-efficacy related to academic tasks, academic behaviors, and availability of instructional time dedicated to supplemental instruction	5E.3. Implement a research-based standard response for Tier 2 instructional support for under achieving students	5E.3. Administrators Reading Coaches/ Department Chairs	5E.3. Quarterly Student Success Team Meetings will include analysis of FAIR assessment results and Instructional Support Logs	5E.3. FAIR assessments; Instructional Support Log				

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Competency 2 (Florida Reading Initiative E6)	K-12	C. Gabbard	New Hires	Monthly	Classroom Observations; Debriefing Discussions	C. Gabbard
Assessments for Learning And Marzano’s Art & Science of Teaching	K-12	C. Gabbard	K-12	Monthly PLC Meetings	Monthly PLC Meetings	PLC AFL Leaders Principal, Assistant Principal
Classroom-focused Instructional Coaching	K-12	C. Gabbard T.Kort	Teachers in need of “just in time” instructional/curricular coaching	Available as needed and/or on request	Coaching Logs	Administrators

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			IA.1. Teacher familiarity with new curriculum materials	IA.1. Implementation of math curriculum materials and supplemental materials	IA.1. Math Department Chair, Curriculum Coach, Supervisor of Instructional Practices , Principal,	IA.1. Classroom Walk Through Analysis of student progress on curriculum-based measures	IA.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT
Mathematics Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Students grades 4-8 scoring Level 3 in mathematics	41% (212)	46% (239)					
			IA.2. Teacher facility in integrating Kagan structures to facilitate academic learning	IA.2. Continue implementation of Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures to increase student engagement in learning mathematics.	IA.2. Math Department Chair, Curriculum Coach, Supervisor of Instructional Practices Principal,	IA.2. Classroom Walk Through Monthly math curriculum meetings	IA.2. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT
			IA.3. Teacher facility in integrating Collins Writing types to facilitate learning in mathematics	IA.3. Include Collins Writing types in grades 6-12 to assist students in applying and integrating their mathematical problem solving skills	IA.3. Math Department Chair, Curriculum Coach, Principal, Supervisor of Instructional Practices.	IA.3. Classroom Walk Through Twice monthly math department meetings	IA.3. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT
			IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	IB.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. Teacher identification of appropriate curriculum-based resources and strategies for providing differentiated instructional support and challenge to students.	2A.1. Incorporate curriculum curriculum-based challenging instructional materials for high achieving students	2A.1. Math Department Chair Curriculum Coordinator Principal	2A.1. Monthly math curriculum planning meetings	2A.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-based progress monitoring tools FCAT
Mathematics Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Students scoring at or above achievement level 4 and 5 in grades 4-8 th in mathematics will increase by 5%.	43% (223)	48% (248)					
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. Timelines of administration and analysis of assessment information to inform instructional planning	3A.1. 3.1. Continue use of benchmarks assessments and curriculum-based progress monitoring tools to inform instructional planning.	3A.1. Math Department Chair Curriculum Coordinator Principal	3A.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings	3A.1. 3.1. Data spreadsheets
Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase by 5%	75%	80%					
			3A.2. Teachers are engaged in new learning regarding the use of assessments to inform student learning	3A.2. Increase use of formative assessments to engage students in actively contributing to their own learning gains.	3A.2. Math Department Chair Curriculum Coordinator Principal	3A.2. Monthly Department Professional Learning Community meeting minutes	3A.2. Monthly Department Professional Learning Community meeting minutes

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Adequate time during the school day and active participation by students in after school help sessions.	4A.1. Incorporate small group targeted instruction (Tier 2 support) for students at risk for not meeting end-of-year learning targets.	4A.1. Math Dept. Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teachers Curriculum Coordinator	4A.1. 4.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	4A.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT	
Mathematics Goal #4A: Percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
	72%	77%						
			4A.2. Connectivity challenges; adequate availability of computers	4A.2. Integrate Carnegie Learning Bridge to Algebra & Algebra I Cognitive Tutoring programs to accelerate student learning of essential math skills.	4A.2. Math Dept. Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teachers Curriculum Coordinator	4A.2. Software program use and assessment logs	4A.2. Software-based assessment tools FCAT	
		4A.3. Funding; consistent student participation	4A.3. Continue summer math transition program (7th-to-8th grade) to support lowest 25%.	4A.3. Math Dept. Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teachers Curriculum Coordinator	4A.3. Pre/post program assessments. Student attendance & surveys	4A.3. Pre/post program assessments		
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		75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	86%

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> In six years P.K. Yonge will reduce the achievement gap by 50%</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						
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u></td> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student subgroups will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td> <td>White:82% Black:59% Hispanic:84% Asian:79% American Indian: n/a</td> <td>White:87% Black:64% Hispanic:89% Asian:84% American Indian: n/a</td> </tr> </table>			<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Student subgroups will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	White:82% Black:59% Hispanic:84% Asian:79% American Indian: n/a	White:87% Black:64% Hispanic:89% Asian:84% American Indian: n/a	5B.1. Academic Self-efficacy and entering skill deficits	5B.1. Incorporate small group targeted instruction (Tier 2 Support) for students at risk for not meeting end of year learning targets.	5B.1. Math Department Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	5B.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Meetings and monthly math department meetings.	5B.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-Based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT EOC
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>											
Student subgroups will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	White:82% Black:59% Hispanic:84% Asian:79% American Indian: n/a	White:87% Black:64% Hispanic:89% Asian:84% American Indian: n/a											
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool						
<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u></td> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in mathematics</td> <td>55%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> </table>			<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in mathematics	55%	60%	5D.1. Academic Self-efficacy and entering skill deficits	5D.1. Incorporate small group targeted instruction (Tier 2 Support) for students at risk for not meeting end of year learning targets.	5D.1. Math Department Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	5D.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Meetings and monthly math department meetings.	5D.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-Based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT EOC
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>											
Students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in mathematics	55%	60%											

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. Academic Self-efficacy and entering skill deficits	5E.1. Incorporate small group targeted instruction (Tier 2 Support) for students at risk for not meeting end of year learning targets.	5E.1. Math Department Chair Math Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	5E.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Meetings and monthly math department meetings.	5E.1. Benchmark Assessments Curriculum-Based Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT EOC
Mathematics Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Students who are economically disadvantaged making satisfactory progress in mathematics	62%	67%					

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. Lack of exposure to higher level thinking skills	1.1. Incorporate small group targeted instruction (Tier 2/3 support) for students at risk for not meeting end-of-year learning targets	1.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	1.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings	1.1. Benchmark Assessments EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1 will increase by 5%.	41%	46%					
			1.2. Automaticity of basic facts and skill deficits	1.2. Integrate Carnegie Learning	1.2. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	1.2. Software program use and assessment logs	1.2. Software-based assessment tools EOC
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. Lack of exposure to higher level math	2.1. Teacher will provide Tier 1 instruction as well as enrichment	2.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher	2.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level	2.1. Benchmark Assessments EOC

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

<p><u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra I will increase by 5%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 47%</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 52%</p>		<p>activities in order to secure skills taught as well as enhance instruction.</p>	<p>Instructional Support Teacher</p>	<p>Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings</p>	
---	---	--	--	--	--------------------------------------	---	--

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	88%	89%	90%	91%	92%	72%
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: In six years, PKY will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.						
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. Retention of higher level thinking skills is lower and gaps in math skills	3B.1. Students that are not mastering benchmarks will receive Tier 2/3 math instruction which would be 100 minutes of math instruction a day, Tier 3 services would be small group instruction in addition to the Tier 2 support	3B.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	3B.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings	3B.1. Benchmark Assessments EOC	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: Student subgroups by ethnicity will make satisfactory progress in Algebra 1	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	For all subgroups the anticipated barrier would apply.				
	11% did not make satisfactory in all subgroups data was not provided to break down.	6%					

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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. Retention of higher level thinking skills is lower and gaps in math skills	3D.1. Students that are not mastering benchmarks will receive Tier 2/3 math instruction which would be 100 minutes of math instruction a day, Tier 3 services would be small group instruction in addition to the Tier 2 support. Provide differential instruction and appropriate accommodations within the classroom and when taking exams.	3D.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher ESE/Instructional Support Teacher	3D.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings	3D.1. Benchmark Assessments EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: Students with Learning Disabilities will make satisfactory progress	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 63% passed	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 68%					
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. Retention of higher level thinking skills is lower and gaps in math skills	3E.1. Students that are not mastering benchmarks will receive Tier 2/3 math instruction which would be 100 minutes of math instruction a day, Tier 3 services would be small group instruction in addition to the Tier 2 support	3E.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher ESE/Instructional Support Teacher	3E.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings	3E.1. Benchmark Assessments EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Available	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Not Available					

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. Lack of exposure to math vocabulary, theorems and background knowledge.	1.1. Incorporate Tier 2/3 support for students at risk for not meeting end of year learning targets	1.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	1.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	1.1. Benchmark Assessment EOC
Geometry Goal #1: P.K. Yonge will have at least 50% of students scoring an achievement level of 3	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70%	75%					
	Scored in the top 1/3						
			1.2. Gaps in mathematic skills	1.2. Carnegie Learning	1.2. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	1.2. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	1.2. Benchmark Assessment EOC
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. Lack of exposure to high level math	2.1. Teacher will provide Tier 1 instruction as well as enrichment activities in order to secure skills taught as well as enhance instruction.	2.1. Math Department Chair Math Teacher Instructional Support Teacher	2.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	2.1. Benchmark Assessment EOC
Geometry Goal #2: P.K. Yonge will have at least 30% of students scoring level 4 and 5 in Geometry EOC.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

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		70% of our students scored in the top 1/3				
	Geometry Goal #3A:						
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.			BB.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	BB.1.	BB.1.	BB.1.	BB.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *	This data is not available				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			BB.2.	BB.2.	BB.2.	BB.2.	BB.2.
			BB.3.	BB.3.	BB.3.	BB.3.	BB.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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. Retention of higher level thinking skills is lower and gaps in math skills	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: Students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in Geometry	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not available	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. Retention of higher level thinking skills is lower and gaps in math skills	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: Students who are economically disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress in Geometry.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Not Available	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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

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

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Mathematics Goals

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

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. Teacher content knowledge and adequate time for planning a standards-aligned, learning goals driven, inquiry-based science unit	1A.1. Provide coaching and support for science teachers as they develop and/or revise their curriculum units	1A.1. Department Science Chair Science Teacher	1A.1. Unit review; classroom observations	1A.1. Pre/post unit assessments Grade Level Benchmark Assessments FCAT Science results
Science Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
PK Yonge will increase the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 in science.	44%	49%					
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. Adequate time and resources for challenging advanced science students	2A.1. Identify and implement strategies for differentiating instructional support and classroom activities for advanced science students	2A.1. Department Science Chair Science Teacher	2A.1. Analysis of student work samples; observations of student engagement in class activities	2A.1. Pre/post unit assessments Performance-based assessments Benchmark Assessments FCAT Science Results
Science Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
PK Yonge will increase the percentage of students scoring at a level 4 and 5 in science.	9%	14%					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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. Difficulty with high level reading and difficult vocabulary which impacts comprehension.	1.1. The Biology teacher will work to ensure that the science curriculum being taught is closely aligned to the State Standards for Biology	1.1. Science Department Chair Biology Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	1.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	1.1. Benchmark Assessment EOC
Biology 1 Goal #1: 40% of PK Yonge students will score at an achievement level 3.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54% of students scored in the top 1/3	40%					
			1.2. Student difficulty with technical biology concepts and terminology.	1.2. Use interactive technology to increase student engagement and performance in science classes	1.2. Science Department Chair Biology Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	1.2. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	1.2. Benchmark Assessment EOC
			1.3. Students may not be able to attend these sessions due to lack of transportation.	1.3. Help sessions after school with an Instructional support teacher available. Provide targeted Biology EOC prep for all students during the spring	1.3. Science Department Chair Biology Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	1.3. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	1.3. Benchmark Assessment EOC
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. Lack of exposure to advanced scientific materials.	2.1. Teacher will provide Tier 1 instruction as well as enrichment activities in order to secure skills taught and enhance instruction.	2.1. Science Department Chair Biology Teachers Instructional Support Teacher	2.1. Analysis of progress monitoring data during quarterly grade level Student Success Team meetings and monthly math department meetings.	2.1. Benchmark Assessment EOC
Biology 1 Goal #2: 20% of P.K. Yonge students will score at an achievement level 4 or 5.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	This information is not available	20%					
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Time constraints on teacher contract hours	1A.1. Student writing samples will be collected and analyzed monthly by all teachers	1A.1. Reading Coaches; English Teachers Grade Level Team Leaders	1A.1 Monthly grade level PLC meetings will focus on establishing common expectations through analysis and scoring of students' writing samples	1A.1. PKY Grade Level Rubric; Teacher Sample Writing Folder
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
PK Yonge will increase the number of students achieving a level 3.0 and higher in writing.	83%	88%					

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of Collins Writing Program	K-12	Department Chairs/Learning Community Leaders	Professional Learning Community Groups (departments; grade levels)	Monthly	Teacher Writing Sample Folder; PLC Participation Rosters	English Teachers Department Chair Reading Coach

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

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			I.1. Lack of motivation and engagement towards academic tasks leads to chronic absences.	I.1. Increased implementation of motivating and engaging instructional blocks and Kagan strategies.	I.1. Principal Assistant Principal Attendance Clerk	I.1. Decreased number of absences and tardies.	I.1. Daily attendance records.
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
PK Yonge's goal is to reduce the number of chronic attendance and tardy problems through a systematic implementation of strategies.	<i>Enter numerical data for current attendance rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected attendance rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of absences in this box</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.</i>					

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
Support and feedback through Divisional Meetings regarding consistently communicating rules and consequences for truancy	K-12	Team Leaders Administration	Schoolwide	Monthly	Weekly team meetings and quarterly SST meetings. Checking attendance on a monthly basis.	Administration

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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. Lack of consistent implementation of Tier 1 strategies/rules and consequences may be contributing to both in-School and out-of-school suspensions	1.1. Utilize grade level assemblies, morning meetings (Elem), Second Step program in elementary, Bullying program K-12, Grade level/Division meeting to collaborate and problem solve with grade level teams.	1.1. Administration Dean of Students Counselors	1.1. Regularly monitor the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as the total number of referrals given	1.1. Discipline record
Suspension Goal #1:	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
PK Yonge will reduce the total number of both in-school and out-of-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year.	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of in-school suspensions</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of in-school suspensions</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended in-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended in-school</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out-of-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out-of-school</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out-of-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out-of-school</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

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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
I. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</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						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.

Reading Budget	Total:
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Total:
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

--

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

--

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

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

--	--