

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Lakeview Middle School	District Name: Orange County Public School
Principal: Shirley Fox, Ph.D.	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins, Ed.D.
SAC Chair: Mary Ballerino	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)			
					AREA	2010	2011	2012
Principal	Shirley Fox, Ph.D.	BS Early Childhood; MEd Emotionally Handicapped; MEd Learning Disabilities; PhD Education and Curriculum; School Principal and Administration	6.5	23	Reading 3+	75	78	66
					Learning Gains Reading	66	65	66

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

					Progress of Bottom 25% in Reading	67	69	59
					Math 3+	75	76	65
					Learning Gains Math	72	70	66
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Math	66	61	54
					Science 3+	48	50	52
					Writing	91	89	84
					School Grade	560 (A)	558 (A)	587 (A)
Assistant Principal	Nathaniel Stephens, Ed.D.	BS Physical Education; MS Management and Administration of Educational Programs; EdD Organizational Leadership; Physical Education (K-12); Educational Leadership (All Levels)	2	2	AREA	2010	2011	2012
					Reading 3+	75	78	66
					Learning Gains Reading	66	65	66
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Reading	67	69	59
					Math 3+	75	76	65

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

					Learning Gains Math	72	70	66
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Math	66	61	54
					Science 3+	48	50	52
					Writing	91	89	84
					School Grade	560 (A)	558 (A)	587 (A)

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)			
					AREA	2010	2011	2012
Math	Marta Anderson	BS Education, ESE K-12, Math 6-12, Middle Grades Integrated	6	0	AREA	2010	2011	2012
					Math 3+	75	76	65
					Learning Gains Math	72	70	66
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Math	66	61	54

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

					School Grade	560 (A)	558 (A)	587 (A)	
Reading	Sharon Sales	BS Telecommunication, MEd Counselor Education, Language Arts 6-12, Reading Endorsement, Middle Grades Endorsement	0	4	AREA	2010	2011	2012	
					Reading 3+	75	78	66	
					Learning Gains Reading	66	65	66	
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Reading	67	69	59	
					School Grade	560 (A)	558 (A)	587 (A)	
Instructional	Mary Ballerino	Educational Leadership, Mathematics 5-9, Elementary Education, ESOL Endorsement	7	2	AREA	2010	2011	2012	
					Reading 3+	75	78	66	
					Learning Gains Reading	66	65	66	
					Progress of Bottom 25% in Reading	67	69	59	
					Math 3+	75	76	65	
					Learning Gains Math	72	70	66	

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

					Progress of Bottom 25% in Math	66	61	54
					Science 3+	48	50	52
					Writing	91	89	84
					School Grade	560 (A)	558 (A)	587 (A)

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Professional Development geared towards teacher's needs.	Administration, Support Teachers, Teacher Leaders	5/31/2013
2. Common planning time by content area	Administration, Support Teachers, Teacher Leaders	
3.		
4.		

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
5% (3)	Ongoing progress monitoring and feedback will be provided to teachers in an effort to increase their level of effectiveness. Additionally, online classes designed by Dr. Marzano for teachers to systematically acquire and implement the progression of knowledge and skills to become highly effective classroom teachers as evidenced by gains in student achievement will be encouraged and expected to be utilized.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
63	14% (9)	24% (15)	37% (23)	25% (16)	33% (21)	95% (65)	14% (9)	2	35% (22)

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
Melissa Poillion-Workman	Justin Markey	Ms. Workman is certified in General Science grades 5-9. She has taught for 8 years and has chaired the Science	Mentors will meet with our LRS quarterly and with their Mentees weekly throughout the school-year.

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

		Department for four years. Ms. Workman has attended PLC Conferences to fine-tune collaborative processes and many Summer Institutes through the AVID program in which she refined the craft of Interactive Notebooks. She also learned research-based effective teaching strategies through the AVID program, and Write Track. Ms. Workman also participated in curriculum writing for the Science Department, which included developing the CIA-Blueprints, Order of Instruction and Quarterly tests for science teachers district-wide.	
Kelly Hansen	Julianette Casanova Diaz	Ms. Hansen is Reading Endorsed, K-6 certified, ESOL, Language Arts, and Social Studies certified. She has taught for 8 years. Three of those years have been focusing on struggling readers. Mrs. Hansen has also worked with our after school reading program to promote literacy skills with our lowest performing students. Ms. Hansen has been paired with Ms. Casanova-Diaz to assist her with teaching our struggling readers.	Mentors will meet with our LRS quarterly and with their Mentees weekly throughout the school-year.
Sharon Carey	Joshua Loebenberg	Mrs. Carey has 19 years of experience teaching a variety of students. Her certifications include Special Education K-12, Reading Endorsement, Social Studies 5-9, Science 5-9, and Middle Grades Integrated 5-9. She holds a Masters degree in Special Education as well. Given her extensive background, she is a good match with Mr. Loebenberg. She will be able to assist him with differentiated instruction and working with special needs students.	Mentors will meet with our LRS quarterly and with their Mentees weekly throughout the school-year

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Administration and support staff will provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and will ensure that the school based team is implementing MTSS/RtI properly. Guidance Counselors are grade-level MTSS/RtI coaches for their respective grade levels. They will assist in providing information regarding core instruction, participate in student data collection, and provide information to the team regarding Tier 1, 2 & 3 interventions and materials as well as assist in the development of behavior support systems. The Staffing Specialist will participate in student data collection and will oversee instructional activities, materials and interventions used in Tier 3 instruction. A qualified general education teacher will provide core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention and collaborate with other support and instructional staff to implement Tier 2 interventions. The Literacy Coach and Reading teachers will provide guidance on the K-12 reading plan, facilitate and support data collection both formative and summative, assist in data analysis, and provide professional development to teachers through a variety of structures. The Math Coach will provide guidance the district's math curriculum and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for math. She will also act as a resource for instructional materials as well as facilitating and supporting data collection methods both formative and summative with the math PLCs, assist in data analysis and support teachers in the use of this data to drive instruction. Additionally, the Math Coach will co-teach weekly with all sixth grade and Intensive math teachers in order to model and provide feedback on research-based differentiated instructional best practices.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>The MTSS/RtI Leadership team will meet weekly on Tuesdays in order to also include our school psychologist and social worker. The team will participate in the following activities: review universal screening data and link research-based instructional decisions, review progress monitoring formative and summative data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as identify those students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will collaborate weekly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, and make decisions regarding appropriate interventions.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>As many members as possible of the MTSS/RtI leadership team will also be a part of the School Advisory Council to help develop and implement the School Improvement Plan. The team will provide summative data regarding Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets, as well as specific academic and social/emotional areas that need to be supported.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)/Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), 2012 Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT), District Benchmark Assessments (1) SRI (September), quarterly writing prompt (1st quarter), Common Pre-test teacher assessments, district mini-assessments. Behavior: Previous BIPs, Behavior observations, Accountability Sheets, Behavior checklists.</p> <p>Progress monitoring: PMRN, District Benchmark Assessments, SRI (Quarterly for Reading blocks, January all others) and Common Formative and Summative Teacher Assessments, District mini-assessments. Behavior: updated BIPs, Behavior observations, Point Sheets. Accountability Sheets, Behavior checklists.</p> <p>Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), District Benchmark Assessment II, SRI and Common Formative and Summative Teacher Assessments. District</p>

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

mini-assessments. Behavior: updated BIPs, Behavior observations, Point Sheets, Accountability Sheets, Behavior checklists.

End of year: FAIR, FCAT, SRI (May), Common Formative and Summative Teacher Assessments. Behavior: updated BIPs, Behavior observations, Point Sheets, Accountability Sheets, Behavior checklists.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' PLC's, departments and whole staff trainings throughout the year. The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional professional development needs during the weekly MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meetings. Classroom visitations and IPDPs will also be analyzed to determine professional development needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Shirley Fox, Principal

Dr. Nate Stephens, Assistant Principal

Ms. Mary Ballerino, Learning Resource Specialist/AVID Coordinator

Ms. Sharon Sales, Literacy Coach

Ms. Gina McNeil, Curriculum Leader for Reading

Ms. Marta Anderson, Math Coach/Curriculum Leader for Math

Ms. Carissa Vunk, Co-Curriculum Leader for Language Arts

Ms. Jennifer Garabedian, Co-Curriculum Leader for Language Arts

Ms. Melissa Poillion-Workman, Curriculum Leader for Science

Ms. Margo Hoffman, Curriculum Leader for Social Studies

Ms. Megan Szkarlat, Curriculum Leader for Performing Arts

Ms. Wilma Wright, Curriculum Leader for Physical Education

Ms. Suzanna Jordan, Curriculum Leader for General Electives

Ms. Loranette Ramos Robles, Curriculum Leader for Foreign Language/Dual Language

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

The School-Based Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly led by our reading curriculum leader and Literacy Coach for reading and our administration. Based on data of our students' mastery of the Reading Benchmarks from both formative and summative assessments, we will review current literacy practices and make instructional changes in an effort to increase literacy efficacy using the implementation of research-based instructional practices provided at the appropriate times in order to assist students' literacy achievement.

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

To ensure that research-based reading strategies are integrated into all core and elective content areas.

To ensure that every Level 1 and Level 2 reader is supported in all core-content areas.

To ensure that professional development incorporates a literacy component that supports the initiatives of the school improvement plan which is driven by all available data.

To increase the reading requirements for all students with a focus on both quantity and rigor.

To have teachers incorporate the Lexile data into their instructional planning and practices.

October 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

To continue expanding non-fiction, print rich materials in core classes.
To ensure that all teachers internalize the notion that every teacher is a literacy leader at Lakeview Middle School.

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.

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

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

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

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

It is an expectation that all teachers embed literacy strategies into each of their lessons. To assist in the process, the Literacy Coach will provide and recommend professional development opportunities to our staff on the use of effective, research-based reading strategies as they pertain to the critical components of reading. We will also continue to promote the use of AVID strategies, Thinking Maps, graphic organizers, and other tools as a means to develop organization, comprehension, and higher order thinking skills. In order to further meet the needs of our students, we are encouraging all teachers to become certified in Content Area Reading – Professional Development (CAR-PD) and enlighten themselves on the use of AVID and other research based instructional strategies.

**High Schools Only*

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

October 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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Teachers new to Lakeview have limited or no training on current school-wide practices being employed.	1A.1. Provide ongoing professional development that is differentiated in content and frequency based on need areas.	1A.1. Administration, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders, Literacy Council	1A.1. Formative and Summative Reading Data	1A.1. Benchmark assessments, FAIR assessments, SRI, FCAT 2.0, Formative and Summative tests, Staff Reflections, Peer observation.
Reading Goal #1A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 3 in reading by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% (388)	35% (318)					
	1A.2. All teachers are not implementing effective, causal instructional strategies with fidelity.						
	1A.3. Teachers having difficulty implementing research based reading strategies throughout all of the content areas.						
1A.4. Limited number of teachers participating in Lesson Study cycles							
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in					

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

	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for our higher performing students	2A.1. Increase enrichment resources (increase Lesson Study participation, materials and human resources)	2A.1 All Literacy Leaders	2A.1. Analysis of formative and summative data	2A.1. Benchmark assessments, SRI Lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0, Staff Reflection, Peer observation
Reading Goal #2A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at or above level 4 in reading by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36% (246)	38% (345)					
			2A.2. Continued implementation of Expert 21 into the daily classroom instruction with fidelity.	2A.2. Professional development for teachers to extend classroom Reading instruction to get students to apply their learning.	2A.2. All Literacy Leaders	2A.2. Analysis of formative and summative data,	2A.2. Benchmark assessments, SRI Lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0,
			2A.3. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for our higher performing students	2A.3. Utilize the district's assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	2A.3. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	2A.3. Data analysis of the iObservation tools	2A.3. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	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>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Limited time and resources available to implement Reading Plus with fidelity.	3A.1. Provide training for all Social Studies teachers on Reading Plus and monitor student progress weekly.	3A.1. All Social Studies teachers, Social Studies PLCs, Reading Coach, LRS and administrators	3A.1. Analysis of Reading Plus data and PLCs	3A.1. Benchmark assessments, FAIR assessments, SRI lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0, formative and summative assessments.
Reading Goal #3A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students making learning gains in reading by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66% (884)	69% (627)					
			3A.2 Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for our higher performing students	3A.2 Implement the district's assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	3A.2 Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	3A.2 Data analysis of the Observation tools	3A.2 Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, Observation data.
			3A.3 Teachers' ability to analyze, disaggregate, and utilize data to drive instruction.	3A.3 Continue modeling and discussing strategies to analyze student achievement data in an effort to identify instructional strategies that improve areas of deficiencies.	3A.3 Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	3A.3 Analysis of Reading Plus data and PLCs	3A.3 Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p><u>Reading Goal #4A:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% in reading by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.</p>			4A.1. Teachers have limited leveled non-fiction print rich materials available in the classroom.	4A.1. Continue to obtain non-fiction print rich materials to enhance instruction for core area classroom.	4A.1 Administrators, Literacy Coach, Reading teachers	4A.1. Analysis of data <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 62% (208)	4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 65% (148)		
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			62% (208)	65% (148)					
			4A.2. Students coming to school with a lack of resources (motivation, language, parental involvement, ability).			4A.2. Increase implementation of Ruby Payne strategies and training in order to provide needed resources.	4A.2. All Literacy Leaders, Administration, LRS	4A.2. Analysis of data	4A.2. Reading program assessments, Benchmark assessments, FAIR assessments, SRI lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0
			4A.3. Continued implementation of the Systems44 reading program for students with decoding and fluency deficiencies.			4A.3. Train Reading teachers on System 44 implementation and integration into classroom routines.	4A.3. Reading coach	4A.3. Analysis of System 44 data,	4A.3. FAIR Assessments, SRI lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0 data.
4A.4. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for our lower performing students			4A.4. Utilizing the LEXIA program in place of Reading Plus for low level reader and Systems 44 to assist in differentiating for lower performing students.	4A.4. Reading Coach, Social Studies Teachers, Administrative Team	4A.4. Analysis of Lexia Program Data and Reading Plus Data	4A.4. Reading Plus Data, SRI lexiles, FCAT 2.0 Data			

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%. <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By June of 2017, Lakeview Middle School will reduce the achievement gap in each subgroup by 50% or more as evidenced on the FCAT 2.0.	Baseline data 2010-2011	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 73% Asian: 78% Black/African American: 57% Hispanic: 59% White: 78% English language learners: 43% Students with disabilities: 35% Economically disadvantaged: 56%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 75% Asian: 80% Black/African American: 61% Hispanic: 63% White: 80% English language learners: 48% Students with disabilities: 41% Economically disadvantaged: 60%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 78% Asian: 82% Black/African American: 65% Hispanic: 66% White: 82% English language learners: 54% Students with disabilities: 47% Economically disadvantaged: 64%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 80% Asian: 84% Black/African American: 69% Hispanic: 70% White: 84% English language learners: 59% Students with disabilities: 53% Economically disadvantaged: 68%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 83% Asian: 86% Black/African American: 73% Hispanic: 74% White: 86% English language learners: 64% Students with disabilities: 59% Economically disadvantaged: 72%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 85% Asian: 88% Black/African American: 77% Hispanic: 78% White: 88% English language learners: 69% Students with disabilities: 65% Economically disadvantaged: 76%							
	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. <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading in each ethnic subgroup by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>White: 24%</td> <td>White: 21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 50%</td> <td>Black: 45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 54%</td> <td>Hispanic: 48%</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	White: 24%	White: 21%	Black: 50%	Black: 45%	Hispanic: 54%	Hispanic: 48%	5B.1. Limited access to on-line reading resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line resources.	5B.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings.	5B.1. All Literacy Leaders	5B.1. Analysis of formative and summative data <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading in each ethnic subgroup by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	5B.1. Benchmark Assessments, FAIR assessments, Reading Plus, SRI lexiles, FCAT 2.0 <u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>												
	White: 24%	White: 21%												
Black: 50%	Black: 45%													
Hispanic: 54%	Hispanic: 48%													
	5B.2. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for all students	5B.2. Implement the district's newly adopted assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	5B.2. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	5B.2. Data analysis of the iObservation tools	5B.2. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data.									
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction for ELL students	5C.1. Provide staff development that models differentiated instructional practices for ELL students.	5C.1. Administrators, LRS,	5C.1. PLC documentation of strategies used in the classroom.	5C.1. Benchmark assessments, FAIR assessments, SRI lexiles, Reading Plus, FCAT 2.0
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0. <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 88% (69)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 74% (81)					
			5C.2. Teachers implementing effective, causal instructional strategies with fidelity.	5C.2. Implement the district's newly adopted assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	5C.2. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	5C.2. Data analysis of the iObservation tools	5C.2. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Lack of time management of differentiating materials to incorporate content rich non-fiction supplemental texts into daily instructional practices.	5D.1. Provide professional development to teachers on incorporating centers that include non-fictional texts into their daily instructional practices. Pursue funding to obtain non-fiction print rich materials for core area classroom.	5D.1. Curriculum Leaders, Administrators, LRS	5D.1. Data analysis, PLC documentation of strategies used.	5D.1. Formative and summative tests; FACT
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0. <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 38% (111)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 34% (43)					
			5D.2. Teachers implementing effective, causal instructional strategies with fidelity.	5D.2. Implement the district's newly adopted assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	5D.2. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	5D.2. Data analysis of the iObservation tools	5D.2. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

<i>goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Limited access to grade level appropriate reading materials outside of the school day	5E.1. Provide after school reading program to re-enforce strategies in Reading Application and Informational Texts.	5E.1. Reading Coach,	5E.1. Data analysis, attendance records,	5E.1. Reading Benchmark data, SRI Lexiles, FCAT 2.0, formative and summative assessments.
Reading Goal #5E: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	40% (265)	36% (213)					
			5E.2. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for our students with limited resources	5E.2. Implement the district's newly adopted assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	5E.2. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	5E.2. Data analysis of the iObservation tools	5E.2. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Plus	All	Fox, Stephens, Ballerino	School Wide	Monthly Professional Development	Assessment of reading strategies through Monthly Professional Development	LRS
CAR-PD	Core Content Teachers	Sales, McNeil, District	Core Content Teachers	Ongoing throughout the year.	Certification of Completing CAR-PD,	LRS, Administration
Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching	All	Curr. Leaders and Admin.	School Wide	Ongoing throughout the year	iObservation reports	Administration
Read 180/System 44	ALL	Curriculum, PLC Leaders	School wide	One full day session to train in the use of the program	Common Assessments, Grading Practices, Homework	Administration, Reading Coach

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
Reading Plus	Web-based reading practice	School Budget	22,250.00
Lexia	Web-based reading practice	SAI	8,937.00
Read 180	Computers, workbooks, novels, direct instruction	SAI	17,976.90
Expert 21	Computers, books, projects	School Budget	15,663.00
			Subtotal: 64,826.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Dimension U	Computer based program to assist with increasing students Reading scores		
ePAT	Online practice test for 6 th Grade FCAT Reading	State provided	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Marzano's Art & Science of Teaching	Books, Training DVDs, Substitute Teachers	School Budget, Title II	1,600.00
Professional Learning Communities at Work	Books, PLC Conference and materials	Title II, PTSO	3,500
			Subtotal: 5,100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 69,926.00

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students proficient in Listening/Speaking by at least 10% to 77% as evidenced on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 70% (77)	1.1. Teachers lack of access to CELLA data.	1.1. Provide professional development on disaggregating student data to assist on identifying the target group.	1.1. Administration, teachers, CCT	1.1. Teachers designed tests, benchmark tests.	1.1. CELLA, Classroom Assessments
		1.2. Having students respond positively to motivation and engagement strategies.	1.2. Brag bucks, PLC recognition, positive referrals, the Hangout.	1.2. Teachers, CCT, Administration,	1.2. Formative assessments, benchmark tests	1.2. CELLA, Classroom Assessments
		1.3. Lack of strategies to differentiate instruction in the classrooms.	1.3. Professional development on how to effectively implement differentiated practices.	1.3. Teachers, CCT, Administration	1.3. Formative assessments, benchmark tests	1.3. CELLA, Classroom Assessments
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students proficient in Reading by at least 20% to 41% as evidenced on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 33% (36)	2.1. Student lack of opportunity to practice reading and writing strategies.	2.1. Provide strategies for teachers to incorporate Reading and writing skills strategies for ELL students.	2.1. Teachers, CCT	2.1. Formative assessments, benchmark tests	2.1. FCAT 2.0, CELLA
		2.2. Students not taking advantage of support offered before and after school.	2.2. Continue to brainstorm ideas to find a better solution to the after school reading classes.	2.2. Administration, teachers.	2.2. Formative assessments, benchmark tests	2.2. FCAT 2.0, CELLA

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

		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.						
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Students lack adequate practice of writing strategies due to limited English skills.	2.1. Develop classroom activities that focus on higher level writing strategies required by FCAT 2.0.	2.1. LA teachers, CCT	2.1. Quarterly Writing prompts.	2.1. CELLA, quarterly Writing data, FCAT 2.0 Writes (8 th Grade)
CELLA Goal #3: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students proficient in Writing by at least 20% to 38% as evidenced on the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	31% (34)					
		2.2. Students have difficulty activating prior knowledge	2.2. Provide professional development on strategies that will help activate student background knowledge and assist students in learning to write.	2.2. Language Arts Teachers, CCT, Administrative Team	2.2. Language Arts Teachers, CCT, Administrative Team	2.2. CELLA, quarterly Writing data, FCAT 2.0 Writes (8 th Grade)
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	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>						
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: <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>	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					

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

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

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

			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
Mathematics Goal #5E: <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>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. Limited access to on-line math resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line resources.	1A.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings. Teachers integrating technology and reviewing available online resources into their daily instruction. Research mathematics program that tracks student progress.	1A.1. Administrators, Technology Coordinator, Math Coach, Math Teachers,	1A.1. Analysis of testing data, analysis of lesson plans, computer lab usage.	1A.1. PLC Meetings, Lesson Plans, Computer Lab Usage, Projects,
Mathematics Goal #1A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 3 in math by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 29% (259)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 35% (318)	1A.2. Students fail to demonstrate an understanding of basic math skills and vocabulary.	1A.2. Assess proficiency with school based assessments. Differentiate instruction with on-line and other math resources. Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies into their practices via ongoing progress monitoring and providing timely, meaningful feedback.	1A.2. Math Teachers, Math Coach, Administrators	1A.2 Classroom Observations, progress monitoring of basic skills, and analysis of data	1A.2. Big 20s, Big 25s, mini-assessments, Benchmark Tests
			1A.3. Inability of students to make “real world” connections with math concepts.	1A.3. Incorporate STEM lessons into curriculum; increase the use of manipulative in lessons, and use graphic organizers to solve word problems. Creating lessons and problem based projects that tie to STEM for teachers on a quarterly basis. Align STEM projects with the Science Curriculum as best as possible. Incorporating the mechanics and conventions of writing into the STEM projects.	1A.3. Math Teachers, Math Coach, Administrators, Science Department Chair, PLC’s.	1A.3. Review of teachers’ lesson plans Classroom Observations	1A.3 PLC Meetings, Lesson Plans, Computer Lab Usage, Projects,

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: N/A	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>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Limited certification of sixth grade Math teachers. ¼ of our sixth grade math teachers are certified in Mathematics.	2A.1. Offer to reimburse teachers for the certification exam. Offer assistance in studying for the certification exam for Mathematics 5-9 or 6-12.	2A.1. Administrators, PTSO, Math Teachers,	2A.1. Analysis of data, Certification reports	2A.1. Certification reports,
Mathematics Goal #2A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at or above level 4 in reading by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 23% (210)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 29%(263)					
			2A.2 Providing rigorous curriculum for all students	2A.2 Continual review of student performance in anticipation of moving into advanced/honors mathematics. Continue to provide Algebra and Geometry classes to students who meet district criteria.	2A.2 Math Coach, Math Teachers, Guidance	2A.2 Classroom Walk-through Observations, analysis of data	2A.2. FCAT 2.0 data, Benchmark Test data, Entry Level Assessment data
			2A.3 Students attempting high school level classes in middle school have gaps in their knowledge due to NGSSS.	2A.3 Increasing the amount of students enrolled in the accelerated 6 th grade math class for students who are preparing to participate in high school level classes in middle school. Articulate with feeder pattern schools the criteria for the course. Have feeder schools	2A.3 Administration, Guidance , Math Coach	2A.3 Analysis of data	2A.3 FCAT 2.0 Data, EOC Exam, Course Pre-Test, Benchmark test data

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

			give the exam to get the data prior to the end of the year.			
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Lack of time to fill in mathematical gaps in learning and teach grade level curriculum.	3A.1. Create Intensive Math classes for 8 th Grade all level 1 and level 2 students. Provide intensive classes for 6 th and 7 th grade if resources allow.	3A.1. Administration, Guidance, Math Coach	3A.1. Analysis of data
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students making learning gains in math by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	67% (898)	70% (636)				
			3A.2. Students fail to demonstrate an understanding of basic math skills and vocabulary.	3A.2. Assess proficiency with school based assessments. Differentiate instruction with on-line and other math resources.	3A.2. Math Teachers, Math Coach, Administrators	3A.2. Marzano iObservations, progress monitoring of basic skills, and analysis of data
			3A.3. Inability to make "real world" connections with math concepts.	3A.3. Incorporate STEM lessons into curriculum; increase the use of manipulative in lessons, and use graphic organizers to solve word problems. Creating lessons and problem based projects that tie to STEM for teachers on a quarterly basis. Align STEM projects with the	3A.3. Math Teachers, Math Coach, Administrators	3A.3. Review of teachers' lesson plans Classroom Walk-through Observations

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

				mechanics and conventions of writing into the STEM projects.			
		4A.3 Lack of time to fill in mathematical gaps in learning and teach grade level curriculum.	4A.3 Create Intensive Math classes for 8 th Grade all level 1 and level 2 students. Provide intensive classes for 6 th and 7 th grade if resources allow.	4A.3 Administration, Guidance, Math Coach	4A.3 Analysis of data	4A.3 Progress of students will be monitored on mini-assessments, benchmark tests, and FCAT 2.0 data.	
		4A.4	4A.4	4A.4	4A.4	4A.4	
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 73% Asian: 82% Black/African American:55% Hispanic: 58% White: 77%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 75% Asian: 83% Black/African American:59% Hispanic: 62% White: 79%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 78% Asian: 85% Black/African American:63% Hispanic: 66% White: 81%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 80% Asian: 87% Black/African American:67% Hispanic: 69% White: 83%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 83% Asian: 88% Black/African American:71% Hispanic: 73% White: 85%	<u>Percent Proficiency</u> American Indian: 85% Asian: 90% Black/African American:76% Hispanic: 77% White: 88%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By June of 2017, Lakeview Middle School will reduce the achievement gap in each subgroup by 50% or more as evidenced on the FCAT 2.0.		English language learners: 42% Students with disabilities: 33% Economically disadvantaged: 55%	English language learners: 48% Students with disabilities: 39% Economically disadvantaged: 59%	English language learners: 53% Students with disabilities: 45% Economically disadvantaged: 63%	English language learners: 58% Students with disabilities: 51% Economically disadvantaged: 67%	English language learners: 63% Students with disabilities: 57% Economically disadvantaged: 71%	English language learners: 69% Students with disabilities: 64% Economically disadvantaged: 76%
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5B.1. Limited access to on-line math resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line resources.	5B.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings.	5B.1. Administrators, Technology Coordinator	5B.1. Analysis of data	5B.1. Software usage statistics	
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White: 28% Black: 49% Hispanic: 46%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White: 25% Black: 44% Hispanic: 41%					

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

the number of students not making satisfactory progress in math in each ethnic subgroup by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.							
			5B.2. Teachers are not adequately differentiating instruction for all students.	5B.2. Provide staff development for Differentiated Instruction and Thinking Maps	5B.2. Math Coach, Administrators	5B.2. Informal observations will be regularly conducted to ensure e that differentiated instructional strategies are being implemented in a highly engaging learning environment	5B.2. CWTs, analysis of Benchmark Test data
			5B.3	5B.3	5B.3	5B.3	5B.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Limited access to on-line math resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line resources.	5C.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings.	5C.1. Administrators, Technology Coordinator	5C.1. Analysis of data	5C.1. Software usage statistics
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in math by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	75% (54)	67% (46)					
			5C.2. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction for ELL students	5C.2. Provide staff development for Differentiated Instruction and Thinking Maps	5C.2. Math Coach, Administrators	5C.2. Informal observations will be regularly conducted to ensure e that differentiated instructional strategies are being implemented in a highly engaging learning environment	5C.2. iObservation Data, FCAT 2.0, analysis of Benchmark Test data
			5C.3	5C.3	5C.3	5C.3	5C.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Limited access to on-line math resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line	5D.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings.	5D.1. Administrators, Technology Coordinator	5D.1. Analysis of data	5D.1. Software usage statistics
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	53% (112)	47% (60)	resources.				
			5D.2. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction for SWD students	5D.2. Provide staff development for Differentiated Instruction and Thinking Maps	5D.2. Math Coach, Administrators	5D.2. Informal observations will be regularly conducted to ensure e that differentiated instructional strategies are being implemented in a highly engaging learning environment	5D.2. iObservation Data, FCAT 2.0, analysis of Benchmark Test data
			5D.3 Teachers not utilizing the FCIM process to support students with disabilities.	5D.3 Provide staff development on data collection to support FCIM processes. Implement support facilitation to assist students being served in the mainstream.	5D.3 Administrators, LRS, Teachers	5D.3	5D.3 iObservation Data, FCAT 2.0, analysis of Benchmark Test data
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. Limited access to on-line math resources to engage students. At peak usage only 25% of our students have access to on-line resources.	5E.1. Pursue funding and support from the district and other funding sources to enhance our technology offerings.	5E.1. Administrators, Technology Coordinator	5E.1. Analysis of data	5E.1. Software usage statistics
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math by at least 10% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	47% (294)	42% (248)					
			5E.2. Teachers are not adequately differentiating instruction for all students.	5E.2. Provide staff development for Differentiated Instruction and Thinking Maps	5E.2. Math Coach, Administrators	5E.2. Informal observations will be regularly conducted to ensure e that differentiated instructional strategies are being implemented in a highly engaging learning environment	5E.2. CWTs, analysis of Benchmark Test data
			5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

High 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	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>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Teachers having difficulty implementing the curriculum with fidelity.	1.1. Ongoing professional development focused on increasing rigor and relevance.	1.1. Math Coach/ Math Department	1.1. District Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, classroom assessment	1.1. EOC, Benchmark Assessment, classroom tests, iObservation
Algebra 1 Goal #1: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 3 on the EOC by at least 10%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (64)	42%(69)					
			1.2. Teachers lack supporting curriculum to meet the needs of students with limited math abilities as a result of state mandates.	1.2. Offer an Algebra 1 intervention class for students that are unsuccessful in the Algebra 1 classroom.	1.2. Math Coach, Algebra 1 teachers, and Intervention teacher.	1.2. Data from pre-tests, Chapter tests, and teacher observations.	1.2. Algebra 1 Benchmark Exams, EOC.
			1.3. Students lack academic vocabulary.	1.3. Ongoing Professional Development to assist with building vocabulary and differentiating instruction.	1.3. Faculty, Math Coach	1.3. Formative assessments, summative classroom assessments, iObservation data.	1.3. Algebra 1 Benchmark Exams, 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. Teachers have limited time for enrichment.	2.1. Teachers will be provided enrichment activities for high level students in the algebra classes.	2.1. Algebra teachers, Math Coach	2.1. Analysis of data, lesson plans, formative assessments.	2.1. District Benchmark Assessments, EOC,
Algebra Goal #2: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 4 and 5 on the EOC by at least 6%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54% (85)	58%(93)					
			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

		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017												
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years																			
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	96%	97%	98%	99%	100%	100%												
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> By June 2013, Lakeview Middle School will reduce the achievement gap by 50% or more as evidenced on the end of course exam.																			
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. Identifying candidates for Algebra 1.	3B.1. Refining the process for identifying students that are capable of success in the Algebra 1 classroom.	3B.1. Math Coach, Administration	3B.1. Observation data, informal observation data, formative assessments,	3B.1. Benchmark Data, EOC													
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White: 2% [3]</td> <td>White: 1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 2% [3]</td> <td>Black: 1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 0%</td> <td>Hispanic: 0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian: >1% [1]</td> <td>Asian: >1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian: >1% [1]</td> <td>American Indian: >1%</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 2% [3]	White: 1%	Black: 2% [3]	Black: 1%	Hispanic: 0%	Hispanic: 0%	Asian: >1% [1]	Asian: >1%	American Indian: >1% [1]	American Indian: >1%						
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																		
White: 2% [3]	White: 1%																		
Black: 2% [3]	Black: 1%																		
Hispanic: 0%	Hispanic: 0%																		
Asian: >1% [1]	Asian: >1%																		
American Indian: >1% [1]	American Indian: >1%																		
By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students participating in Algebra 1.		3B.2. Students lack prerequisite Algebra skills.	3B.2. Algebra Prep Camp to provide support for students entering into Algebra for the 2013-2014 school year.	3B.2. Math Coach, Administration	3B.2. Formative assessments, Observation data, tutoring data.	3B.2. Enrollment data, summer camp data,													
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.													

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.							
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students participating in Algebra 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0	0					
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.							
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students participating in Algebra 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0	0					
			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 Algebra 1.			3E.1. Students are not taking advantage of support offered before and/or after school.	3E.1 Encourage participation utilizing incentive plans. Offering the Algebra 1 support class within the school day.	3E.1. Math Coach, Algebra 1 teachers	3E.1. Formative assessments, Observation data, tutoring data.	3E.1. EOC exam
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at proficiency on the EOC by at least 20%	11% (6)	20% (10)					
			3E.2. Students lack of prerequisite Algebra skills.	3E.2. Algebra Prep Camp to provide support for students entering into Algebra for the 20`3-2014 school year.	3E.2. Math Coach, Administration	3E.2. Formative assessments, iObservation data, tutoring data.	3E.2. Enrollment data, summer camp data,
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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. Critical thinking skills to assist students in scoring above proficiency.	1.1. Provide students the opportunity to extend their learning beyond the classroom with STEM incorporated projects.	1.1. Geometry teacher, Math Coach, Administrators	1.1. Analysis of benchmark data, formative assessments, project data	1.1. Benchmark data and EOC.
Geometry Goal #1: Lakeview scored 100% at level 3	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
			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 Geometry.			2.1. Maintaining students at 100%.	2.1. Continue to provide enrichment support to maintain 100%.	2.1. Geometry teacher, Math Coach, Administrators	2.1. Analysis of benchmark data, formative assessments, project	2.1. Benchmark data and EOC.

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

Geometry Goal #2: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will maintain the number of students scoring in the top 1/3 at 100%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 100%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100%				data	
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
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		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Geometry Goal #3A: By June 2013, Lakeview Middle School will reduce the achievement gap by 50% or more as evidenced on the end of course exam.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian:					

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) 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
Manipulatives/Active Learning Strategies	All		Math Teachers	Monthly Department Meetings	In-service points and Classroom Walkthrough Observations	Math Coach, Administration
Thinking Maps / Thinking Like a Mathematician	All		Math Teachers	1 st Semester	Monitoring of lesson plans to ensure that thinking maps / graphic organizers are implemented regularly in the classroom	Math Coach, Administration
Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching	All	Curr. Leaders and Admin.	School Wide	Year-round	In-service Points and Classroom Walkthrough Observations	Math Coach, Administration
Intensive Math Training	Intensive Math	District Curriculum Leaders, Math Coach	Intensive Math Teachers	1 st 9-Week	Inservice Points and Classroom Walkthrough Observations	Math Coach, Administration

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

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Dimension U	Computer based program to assist with increasing students Math scores		
Subtotal: 4,687.50			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Summer Mathematics Camp to provide additional support for students struggling in Mathematics			
Algebra Prep Camp to provide support for students entering into Algebra for the 2012-2013 school year.			
Subtotal:			
Total: 4,687.50			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Limited engaging opportunities to practice what has been learned.	1A.1. FCAT SCaT implemented at all three grade levels throughout the school year. Utilizing inquiry based lessons on a	1A.1. Grade Level PLC's Department Chair	1A.1. Quarterly Pre and Post Tests given at each Grade Level, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	1A.1. 8 th Grade FCAT 2.0 Science Scores, 6 th & 7 th Grade pre/post test data, inquiry based lesson feedback,
Science Goal #1A: By June of 2013,	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 3 in science by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	34% (151)	37% (31)		weekly basis.			lesson plans, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
			1A.2. Students' lack of prior knowledge of science principles and concepts.	1A.2. Formative assessments used to elicit student prior knowledge and to provide feedback that drives instruction.	1A.2. Grade Level PLC's, Department Chair, Administration	1A.2. Quarterly Pre and Post Tests given at each Grade Level, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	1A.2. 8 th Grade FCAT 2.0 Science Scores, 6 th and 7 th Grade pre/post test data, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
			1A.3. Teachers' lack of understanding of how to develop and lead inquiry based lessons	1A.3. Provide teachers with professional development that addresses inquiry based lessons.	1A.3. Grade Level PLC's, Department Chair, Administration	1A.3. Quarterly Pre and Post Tests given at each Grade Level, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	1A.3. 8 th Grade FCAT 2.0 Science Scores, 6 th and 7 th Grade pre/post test data, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Lack of transportation for before and after school activities.	2A.1. Enrichment clubs provided for students (Alchemists Club, Rocket Club, Engineering Club)	2A.1. Grade Level PLC's, Department Chair	2A.1. Quarterly Pre and Post Tests given at each Grade Level, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	2A.1. 8 th Grade FCAT 2.0 Science Scores, 6 th and 7 th Grade pre/post test data, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
Science Goal #2A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at or above level 4 in science by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 17% (75)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 22% (15)	2A.2. Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating for all students	2A.2. Implement the district's assessment tool based on Marzano's strategies.	2A.2. Administrators, LRS, Literacy Coach, Reading Curriculum Leaders	2A.2. Data analysis of the iObservation tools, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	2A.2. Benchmark Data, FCAT 2.0, iObservation data, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
			2A.3 Limited opportunities to embed rigor in Science classrooms.	2A.3 Incorporate STEM lessons into curriculum and use graphic organizers to solve word problems. Creating lessons and problem based projects that tie to STEM for teachers on a quarterly basis. Align STEM projects with the Math Curriculum as best as possible. Incorporating a quarterly project that is planned by the Mathematics and Science Teachers collaboratively. Incorporating the mechanics and conventions of writing into the STEM projects.	2A.3 Science Department, Math Department,	2A.3 Quarterly Pre and Post Tests given at each Grade Level, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.	2A.3 8 th Grade FCAT 2.0 Science Scores, 6 th and 7 th Grade pre/post test data, Science Benchmark Assessment for 8 th Grade.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science 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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science 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>					

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: <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 Biology 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 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>					

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology I EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry Based Instruction	All	Department Chair	Grade level Science PLCs	Monthly Department Meetings	PLC reflections, notes, best practices sharing	Department Chair and Administration
Science Lesson Study		Department Chair or PLC		Three times annually		

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
Inquiry Based Instruction	PLC time	none	
Research the purchase of leveled non-fiction readers to help support the science curriculum.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Utilizing computer simulations.	Providing 3-5 computers per science classroom to integrate simulations and videos.		
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Inquiry Based Instruction	Experts on Campus - Utilizing teachers with expertise in the Inquiry methods for staff development	none	

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

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Quarterly Science Nights	Science Department	None	
Science Fair Night, 12/7/11	Science Department	None	
Various Clubs that support STEM	Science Department	None	
Science Summer STEM Camp	Science Department	None	
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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. Limited access to on-line writing resources and new staff who are not trained in varied writing strategies.	1A.1. Differentiate professional development to train staff in various writing strategies and purposes.	1A.1 Literacy Leaders, Curriculum Leaders, LRS, Principal, Assistant Principals	1A.1 Lesson Plans, Writing projects, Classroom visitations, PLCs, Professional Development plan.	1A.1. Student Writing Samples
Writing Goal #1A: By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the number of students scoring at level 3.0 in writing by at least 20% as evidenced on the 2013 FCAT Writes.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 83% (369)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 90% (246)	1A.2. Students lack organization skills	1A.2. As teams, we will implement creative and individualistic writing across the genres to break the cycle across the content areas. AVID strategies will be infused into all aspects of writing.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Resource Specialist, Language Arts Department Chair	1A.2. Ongoing progress monitoring and analyzing of student writing data.	1A.2. Common Unit Assessments, Writing prompts
			1A.3. Lack of resources and training for all staff across the different curriculums.	1A.3. Utilize "experts" within the school to teach staff about writing strategies and format.	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Resource Specialist,	1A.3. Professional Development tailored to specific school and teacher needs	1A.3. Professional development surveys to determine staff needs and effectiveness of

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

			Offer various trainings, which provide staff with effective strategies for writing and FCAT 2.0 based format.	Language Arts Department Chair		professional development offerings
		1A.4 Lack of mechanics and conventions that students are equipped with.	1A.4 Increase the usage of mechanics and conventions in writing across the curriculum with supplemental materials.	1A.4 Language Arts Department, PLC, Administration, LRS,	1A.4 Ongoing progress monitoring and analyzing of student writing data.	1A.4 Student Writing Samples, Common Unit Assessments, Writing prompts
		1A.5 Lack of increasing vocabulary.	1A.5 Increased usage of vocabulary strategies across the curriculum. (i.e. Word Walls, vocabulary frames.)	1A.5 Language Arts Department, PLC, Administration, LRS,	1A.5 Ongoing progress monitoring and analyzing of student writing data.	1A.5 Student Writing Samples, Common Unit Assessments, Writing prompts
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write Track Training	All	District/ FDLRS	School-wide	TBD	Classroom Visitations	Administrations, curriculum leaders, and support staff
Write Traits	All	District	School-wide	TBD	Classroom Visitations	Administrations, curriculum leaders, and support staff
Write for the Future	All	District	School-wide	TBD	Classroom Visitations	Administrations, curriculum leaders, and support staff

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
SpringBoard	College Board: SpringBoard Books	School Budget	1,804.28
			Subtotal: \$1,804.28
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write for the Future	Writing support for all curriculum areas		
Thinking Maps	Training from experts on campus in Thinking maps.		
			Subtotal:
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$1804.28			

End of Writing Goals

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>					

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional 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:

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

ATTENDANCE GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Students missing school and not being in class to receive instruction.	1.1. Implement our attendance procedures with fidelity for attendance monitoring and communication with parents and teachers. Attendance will be monitored through the grade level offices to increase communication and implement interventions with fidelity.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Teachers, Grade Level Clerk, Social Worker,	1.1. Attendance will be monitored and reported by teachers and the registrar on a daily basis in an effort to intervene on attendance issues before they become a problem. Special attention will be paid to students who are regularly arriving late and/or missing classes or school.	1.1. Attendance Reports, ProgressBook Reports,
Attendance Goal #1:							
By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase the attendance rate by at least 2%, reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 75%, and decrease the number of students with excessive tardies by 50%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	95% (869)	97% (888)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	410	110					
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)						
30	15						
			1.2. Students have limited passing time between classes.	1.2. Auditory cue to signal to students that they have 1 minute to get to their class.	1.2. Administrators, Grade Level Clerks	1.2. Master Schedule	1.2. Attendance data
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Suspension		1.1. Lack of consistency in the implementation of the school-wide behavior system	1.1. Positive Behavior Support system following the STOIC model.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade Level Administrators, Teachers, Guidance Counselors	1.1. Students that are having behavior issues will be discussed weekly in Professional Learning Communities and amongst team members as needed. The data from said meetings, to include current plans and interventions used, will be shared with grade level administrators and counselors to ensure that every effort is being made to help students meet success with regard to their behavior.	1.1. Data collected from ISS and the Education Data Warehouse (EDW)	
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions						2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
By June of 2013, Lakeview Middle School will decrease the total number of students receiving in-school suspension by 25% and out-of-school suspension by 25%.	337						200
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School						2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
	218						160
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions						2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
	220	165					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	137	100					
		1.2. Limited school level follow-up on suspended students.	1.2. Enact methods that allow students to reflect on why they were suspended and ways to replace negative behaviors.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade Level Administrators, Teachers, Guidance Counselors	1.2. ISS Program Specialist will provide students with reflection sheets while in ISS and those responsible for monitoring will analyze the response data in an effort to find effective methods to reduce recidivism.	1.2. Data collected from ISS and the Education Data Warehouse (EDW)	
		1.3. Lack of resources of guidance lessons for suspended students (In School Suspension)	1.3. Guidance counselors and support staff provide an affective lesson weekly in the In-School Suspension Room.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade Level Administrators, Teachers, Guidance Counselors	1.3. Those responsible for monitoring will analyze the student response data and data from EDW to determine the effectiveness of all programs	1.3. Student reflection sheets, data collected from the Education Data Warehouse	

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

					and efforts used to reduce recidivism.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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:

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Building time into the school day to allow students to make up assignments.	1.1. Lunchroom Learning Opportunity, if funding allows	1.1. Administration, Ms. Hitchcock	1.1. Data analysis	1.1. Benchmark assessments, classroom grades, formative and summative assessments, teacher feedback.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
			1.2. Providing academic support to students within the school day.	1.2. Study Skills Seminar – students are assigned to a course to assist with their organization and study skills. If funding allows	1.2. Administration, Guidance,	1.2. Data analysis	1.2. Benchmark assessments, classroom grades, formative and summative assessments, teacher feedback.
			1.3. Providing emotional and academic support within the school day.	1.3. Going the Extra Mile Mentoring Program. Matching up a student with a mentor that provides support to students within the school day.	1.3. Administration,	1.3. Data analysis	1.3. Benchmark assessments, classroom grades, formative and summative assessments, teacher feedback.
			1.4. Response to Intervention.	1.4. Utilizing the RtI problem solving process.	1.4. RtI committee, Administration, Department chairs, teachers.	1.4. Data Analysis	1.4. Benchmark assessments, classroom grades, formative and summative assessments, teacher feedback. Retention data,

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

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

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

		PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		

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
Mentor Program	Staff and Community members	Principal's Discretionary Fund	100.00
Study Skills Seminar	Habits of Highly Effective Teens / Study Skills / Novels	Instructional Materials	500.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase wireless hardware	Netbook Carts / Laptop Computers	Technology Fund / Fund of Foundation	20,000.00
Increase Interactive materials	SmartBoards / Document Cameras	Technology Fund / Fund of Foundation	20,000.00
			Subtotal:40,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$40,600.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: The 2012-2013 school will be a baseline year to collect and analyze parent involvement data in a meaningful way. Our goal will be to have at least 50% participation from the parents of all students involved in each activity by the end of the 2012-2013 school year.	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*	Limited opportunities for scheduling events that lend to parents wanting to come and learn about their child's education.	Holding a Curriculum Fair on a quarterly basis. Set the dates in advance and give them an incentive for attendance.	Administration, leadership council,	Sign in sheets for parent events.	Parent Effectiveness Survey (May 2012)
	10-15%	25-50%					
			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
Projects that will draw parents into the school.	ALL	PLC Leaders LRS	School-wide	Weekly PLC meetings, monthly PD sessions	Parent Effectiveness Survey (May 2012)	PLC leaders, LRS, Administration

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
Dual Language Parent Leadership Meetings	Dual Language Team Teachers	None	

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

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

Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Science Parent Night,	Algebra, Geometry, and Honors Earth Space Science Teachers	None	
Drama Parent Meetings	Drama Department head	None	
Quarterly AVID Parent Nights	AVID Site Team, held in October, January, March and May	None	
ESOL Parent Leadership Council	CCT,	None	
Curriculum Nights that incorporate all content areas	Leadership Council will head up these nights.		
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Goal #1: By June, 2013, students will have completed four STEM projects.	1.1. Lack of funds to implement school-wide program.	1.1. Pursue funding opportunities for STEM projects.	1.1. Math Coach, Science Department chair, administrators	1.1. Analysis of data	1.1. FCAT science data, Math Benchmarks, mini assessments, and chapter tests.
	1.2 Limited common planning to develop projects.	1.2. Provide common planning time for Math and Science Teachers to plan STEM projects.	1.2. Math Coach, Science Department chair, administrators	1.2. Analysis of data	1.2. FCAT science data, Math Benchmarks, mini assessments, and chapter tests.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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 <u>Additional Goal #1:</u>			1.1.					1.1. Enrollment Reports/Performance Data (i.e., EOC data)
By June 2014, Lakeview Middle School will increase enrollment and performance of students in high school courses by 3-5%.	2012 Current Level :*	2012 Expected Level :*	The problem-solving process for this goal is addressed in the appropriate sections above. Refer to math goal 2A.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
2. Additional Goal <u>Additional Goal #2:</u>			2.1					2.1. Enrollment Reports/Performance Data
By June 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase enrollment and performance of students in advanced programs (i.e., Honors, AVID) by 3-5%.	2012 Current Level :*	2012 Expected Level :*	The problem-solving process for this goal is addressed in the appropriate sections above. Refer to Writing Goal 1A, Math Goal 1A, and Reading Goal 1A.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
3. Additional Goal <u>Additional Goal #2:</u>			2.1					2.1. Enrollment Reports/Performance Data
By June 2013, Lakeview Middle School will increase enrollment in courses that improve college and career readiness.	2012 Current Level :*	2012 Expected Level :*	The problem-solving process for this goal is addressed in the appropriate sections above. Refer to Writing Goal 1A, Math Goal 1A, and Reading Goal 1A.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Cornell Note-taking, Quickwrite strategies	ALL	PLC/PD	School-wide	Monthly PD session	Debrief at PD session or in PLC meeting	AVID Coordinator/LRS

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
Quarterly AVID Parent Nights	AVID Site Team		

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

Subtotal:
Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.

Reading Budget	Total: 70,926.00
CELLA Budget	Total: 0.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: 4,688.00
Science Budget	Total: 0.00
Writing Budget	Total: 1,805.00
Civics Budget	Total: 0.00
U.S. History Budget	Total: 0.00
Attendance Budget	Total: 0.00
Suspension Budget	Total: 0.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: 40,600.00
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: 0.00
STEM Budget	Total: 0.00
CTE Budget	Total: 0.00
Additional Goals	

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

	Total: 0.00
	Grand Total: 118,019.00
	Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount