FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Arbor Ridge School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Paige Tracy	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Larry Baird	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.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Paige Tracy	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education; Master's degree in Elementary Education; Master's degree in Educational Leadership/ Certifications held: Elementary Education, Educational Leadership	15	15	2011-2012 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade-715 (adjusted) points; 88% meeting high standards in Reading, 86% in Math, 94% meeting high standards in Writing, 72% meeting high standards in Science; 80% of students making learning gains in Reading and 76% in Math; 64% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, 35 Middle School Acceleration Points, 50 Middle School Performance Points. 2010-2011 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP standards met; 94% meeting high standards in Reading, 93% in Math, 84% meeting high standards in Writing, 77% meeting high standards in Science; 72% of students making learning gains in Reading and 74% in Math; 81% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 86% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
Assistant Principal	Christine Jakubcin	Bachelor of Arts in Education; Masters of Education in Educational Leadership; Certified in Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, Elementary Education, and Educational Leadership	1	2.5	2011-2012 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade-715 (adjusted) points; 88% meeting high standards in Reading, 86% in Math, 94% meeting high standards in Writing, 72% meeting high standards in Science; 80% of students making learning gains in Reading and 76% in Math; 64% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, 35 Middle School Acceleration Points, 50 Middle School Performance Points. 2010-2011 Engelwood Elementary School-earned "C" grade; 79% of AYP standards met; 54% meeting high standards in Reading, 53% in Math, 72% meeting high standards in Writing, 28% meeting high standards in Science; 56% of students making learning gains in Reading and 62% in Math; 61% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 83% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Jennifer George	Bachelors of Science in Early Childhood, Bachelors of Arts in Liberal Studies Certifications held: Early Childhood Education Pk-3, Elementary Education K-6; Reading Endorsement	11	4.5	2011-2012 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade-715 (adjusted) points; 88% meeting high standards in Reading, 86% in Math, 94% meeting high standards in Writing, 72% meeting high standards in Science; 80% of students making learning gains in Reading and 76% in Math; 64% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, 35 Middle School Acceleration Points, 50 Middle School Performance Points. 2010-2011 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP standards met; 94% meeting high standards in Reading, 93% in Math, 84% meeting high standards in Writing, 77% meeting high standards in Science; 72% of students making learning gains in Reading and 74% in Math; 81% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 86% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
Curriculum Resource Teacher	Tammy Carver	Bachelors of Science in Elementary Education, Masters in Educational Leadership Certifications held: Elementary Education 1-6, Educational Leadership	10	17	2011-2012 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade-715 (adjusted) points; 88% meeting high standards in Reading, 86% in Math, 94% meeting high standards in Writing, 72% meeting high standards in Science; 80% of students making learning gains in Reading and 76% in Math; 64% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math, 35 Middle School Acceleration Points, 50 Middle School Performance Points. 2010-2011 Arbor Ridge School-earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP standards met; 94% meeting high standards in Reading, 93% in Math, 84% meeting high standards in Writing, 77% meeting high standards in Science; 72% of students making learning gains in Reading and 74% in Math; 81% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 86% of

					students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Administrative and coaching support.	Paige Tracy (Principal), Christine Jakubcin (A.P.), Tammy Carver (CRT), Jennifer George (Reading Coach)	June, 2013
2. Mentoring program for new teachers to Arbor Ridge.	Tammy Carver (CRT)	June, 2013
3. Interview and hire only highly qualified teachers.	Paige Tracy (Principal), Christine Jakubcin (A.P.)	June, 2013
4. Opening our campus to college interns and volunteers is one way we can promote our campus environment and let pre-service teachers know what our school can offer them as teachers.	Paige Tracy (Principal)	June, 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
7% (5)	• Administrative and coaching support. • Mentoring program for new teachers to Arbor Ridge.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
67	1 (-1%)	14(21%)	20(30%)	32(48%)	15 (22%)	67(100%)	89(12%)	6(9%)	33(49%)

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
Karla Vinson	Yanique Vaughn	Karla has been a teacher for 24 years. She has spent 7 of those 24 years teaching third grade. Karla is a recognized teacher leader in our school. She has been team leader 5 times throughout her career. She has supervised 6 senior interns and 4 junior interns from the University of Central	The mentor will: communicate daily with the mentee, plan lessons with them weekly, update them on school specific happenings, serve as a model classroom for the mentee to observe, pair up for professional development, serve as the mentee's instructional coach especially

		Florida. She has extensive knowledge of the OCPS curriculum, working as a collaborative team and developing Common Assessments.	concerning the new teacher evaluation tool, make themselves available to answer questions or address concerns.
Debra Bayley	Lorrie Mann	Deb has been a teacher for 24 years and spent 8 of those years teaching 6th grade World History. Deb is a recognized teacher leader in our school. She has been team leader 5 times throughout her career and was recognized as Arbor Ridge Teacher of the Year. She has supervised 4 senior interns and 3 junior interns from the University of Central Florida. She has previously served as a mentor teacher.	The mentor will: communicate daily with the mentee, plan lessons with them weekly, update them on school specific happenings, serve as a model classroom for the mentee to observe, pair up for professional development, serve as the mentee's instructional coach especially concerning the new teacher evaluation tool, make themselves available to answer questions or address concerns.

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 N/A-we are not a Title I school.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Paige Tracy, Principal Christine Jakubcin, Assistant Principal Pat Weber, RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist Jennifer George, Reading Coach Tammy Carver, Curriculum Resource Teacher Marcia Rabin, Behavior Specialist Alina Davis, Curriculum Compliance Teacher (Language Learner Support) Kirsten Roche, School Psychologist Jennifer Stever-D'Andrea, Dean Teena Turner, Social Worker Mary Cole, SAFE Coordinator
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? Our MTSS leadership team meets as a group monthly (more if necessary) to discuss students' academic progress and data, as well as staff training and support. MTSS Leadership Team members also meets with grade level teachers twice a month to review universal screening data and link instructional decisions, review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting and/or exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk, or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks, and develop intervention, enrichment, and problem solving plans for students. The team collaborates regularly to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The MTSS Leadership Team also works with staff to facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS Leadership Team assists in gathering and analyzing data. Following the RtI problem solving process of interview and observation, the team works with teachers and parents to attain a better understanding of why a problem may be occurring. After analyzing school, class, group and/or individual student data, and parent input, instructional and/or behavioral needs are identified. Structures are examined to determine which research-based interventions may be implemented to address the identified needs. Infrastructures and interventions are developed and shared with SAC and included in the School Improvement Plan.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Arbor Ridge uses a variety of data to evaluate students and make intervention decisions. All data is entered onto our Data Matrix and maintained in each PLC's group notebook. Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN/FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), CELLA, Envision pre-tests, Imagine It! Oral reading fluencies and benchmark assessment, STAR assessments, Edusoft Benchmark Assessment, Compass Learning, and Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). Progress Monitoring: PMRN/FAIR, iStation, CBM, classroom assessments, Edusoft Benchmark assessments, writing assessments, Great Leaps oral reading fluencies, DIBELS, PMAPP End of Year: PMRN/FAIR, FCAT, FAA, CELLA Behavior: teachers have classroom management systems that all students are expected to follow. When classroom behavior expectations are not being met the teacher will meet

with the RtI Leadership Team to develop a plan of action and start collecting data. If the action plan is not successful, a Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) will be administered. Upon completion of the FBA, the RtI Leadership Team will meet with the teacher and parent to review the data and FBA results to develop a more detailed plan. If needed the RtI Leadership Team will enlist assistance from the district behavior coach and an Educational Planning Team (EPT) will be scheduled. All behavior data will be collected and maintained by our behavior specialist.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The MTSS Leadership Team has attended the district MTSS Implementation training. The staff has received small group MTSS overview training provided by our district MTSS support person. Continuing MTSS professional development will be provided during teacher's common planning time in small sessions throughout the year. In addition, PLCs will work on MTSS professional development during monthly meetings. The MTSS Leadership Team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during their monthly meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The MTSS Leadership Team will work to support teachers by identifying, promoting, and training teachers about evidence-based instructional practices for Tiers 1, 2, and 3. Effective leadership and professional development to align and integrate initiatives, and streamline procedures associated with supporting the use of data-based problem-solving process will also be provided. MTSS implementation data at each level will be used to identify gaps in infrastructure or supports needed to sustain efficient and effective use of evidence-based practices at the school and classroom level. The MTSS leadership team will be available to teachers and parents as needed to support the problem-solving process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal, Paige Tracy; Assistant Principal, Christine Jakubcin; Reading Coach, Jennifer George; CRT, Tammy Carver; Dean, Jennifer Stever D'Andrea; Staffing Specialist, Pat Weber; SAFE Coordinator, Mary Cole; CCT, Alina Davis; 1st, Sarah Hall; 3rd, Kim McCabe; 7th, Shannon Bowlin
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT is a collaborative team that will meet monthly (or more often as needed), to ensure that all teachers are involved in developing student's proficiency of literacy skills. The LLT will be responsible for reviewing data to determine whether school reading goals are being met, and to help support the reading related goals and objectives stated in this School Improvement Plan, the school professional development plan (including Professional Learning Communities), and reading initiatives, including implementing the Common Core State Standards, throughout the school with the goal to increase student achievement in reading.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Working collaboratively through group Collaborative Learning Teams, the LLT will work with teachers to help answer the essential question they are focusing on by analyzing student data, both state and school assessments as well as formative and common assessments, and to help address reading benchmarks in all content areas, K-8. The LLT will help enhance the implementation of the Common Core State Standards through inservices, work sessions with PLC's, and providing resources to both teachers and parents. The LLT will help enhance best practices by providing literacy learning opportunities throughout the year.

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.

N/A-not a Title I school.

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

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

Seven of our eighteen middle school teachers have or our currently working on their reading endorsement. Each grade level has a common planning period which they use to collaborate and plan so that reading strategies are taught in every classroom. The teachers focus on using best practices for integrating literacy across the content areas, focusing on bellwork, using a common language and increasing the use of higher order thinking questions. In addition, the teachers meet with the leadership collaborative team to discuss data and to develop plans using strategies and tools to meet the needs of all students and increase student performance.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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.

N/A

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. Teaching the new reading benchmarks (NGSSS) at a high complexity level while using materials that are not based on the NGSSS (Imagine It! 2008) or CCSS Teachers confidence level in teaching new standards at high complexity levels commiserate with FCAT 2.0 Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction Increasing number of students who are on Free and Reduced Lunch Students start school well below grade level 1.	1A.1. Establish both formative and common assessments and conduct data meetings twice a month along with grade level PLC's to monitor student progress.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches, Leadership team, classroom teachers	1A.1. Require Collaborative Learning Team Notebooks to log formative and common assessment data as well as Interventions. Teachers will input their data on the Data Matrix (server based) and the data wall where information is kept on all of the AYP sub-groups to help monitor the achievement gaps.	1A.1. Reports from FAIR, iStation, OCPS Benchmark tests, Compass Learning, other monitoring assessments
Reading Goal #1A: We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classes. We will address the reading deficiencies of our students in the following ways: implementing the RtI process and monitoring data on our lowest readers; intervention reading blocks will be scheduled at each grade level K-5; Reading Academy will be scheduled for our 6-8th graders; teachers will receive training in reading comprehension strategies, data analysis, vocabulary skills, brain-based learning; differentiated instruction; and implementing the NGSSS as well as CCSS. Needs assessment data indicate a need for targeted reading interventions and an	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *28% (134)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31% (154)*					
			1A.2.	1A.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD on the standards to be taught and assessed using the NGSSS and CCSS for their grade level.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coach	1A.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	1A.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
			1A.3.	1A.3. Require measurable, student friendly daily objectives and essential questions to be posted in the classroom K-8; these are aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.	1A.3. Principal, Instructional Coaches, grade level team leaders	1A.3. Classroom visits, weekly objectives/questions are written into each lesson plan	1A.3. Copies of the weekly objectives/questions, classroom walkthrough documents

emphasis on the FCAT reading Reporting Categories for grades 3-5 in Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction and Reading Application. Needs assessment data indicate a need for targeted reading interventions and an emphasis on the FCAT reading Reporting Categories for grades 6-8 in Reading Application and Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction.						
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.		1B.1. Teachers new to NGSSS Access Points. Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction	1B.1. Provide all ESE staff with PD on the access points to be taught and assessed using the NGSSS access points for their grade level.	1B.1. District support staff, staffing specialist, experienced teachers, principal, and assistant principal.	1B.1. Classroom visits, assessment results, require data collection, collaboration with colleagues.	1B.1. Observation checklists, lesson plans, classroom walk through, PD sign in sheets, PD agenda.
Reading Goal #1B: ***We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all Exceptional Student Education classes. We will address the reading deficiencies of our ESE students in the following ways: teachers will receive training in reading comprehension strategies, data analysis, vocabulary skills, differentiated instruction; and implementing the NGSSS Access Points.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *15% (2)* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *23% (3)*					
		1B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability.	1B.2. Implement measurable IEP goals and objectives that are aligned to the NGSSS access points. Use academic, and behavior data to analyze student needs and conduct data meetings weekly to monitor student progress and make instructional adjustments as needed.	1B.2. Staffing and behavior specialists	1B.2. IEP reviews, data analysis	1B.2. Data sheets, IEP, Florida Alternate Assessment, classroom observations
		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 in reading. Reading Goal #2A: *We will continue to monitor students who are on the "bubble" from moving up to an FCAT achievement level 4 or 5 through increasing rigor and complexity in teaching practices. We will also identify the top performing 20% of incoming 3rd graders to target with increased cognitively complex teaching strategies.* *Teachers are enriching and challenging these students with technology, self-study programs, novel study groups, special projects, and advanced coursework in middle school.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *57% (266)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60% (296)*	2A.1. Teaching the new reading benchmarks (NGSSS) at a high complexity level while using materials that are not based on the NGSSS (Imagine It! 2008) or CCSS Teachers confidence level in teaching new standards at high complexity levels commiserate with FCAT 2.0 Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction Increasing number of students who are on Free and Reduced Lunch Students start school well below grade level 1.	2A.1. Implement a daily enrichment block (runs concurrently with intervention block) with the establishment of Novel study groups for the Level 4 and 5 students in 4th -5th grades as well as identified students in 3rd using FAIR data. Students will also work on inquiry skills using a technology-based research tool (e-Inquiry through SRA) that uses content-area reading to complete a research-based project through a unit of study. Establish Novel Study groups for the Level 4 and 5 students in 6th-8th grade as well as advanced coursework.	2A.1. Media Specialist, Reading Coach	2A.1. Lesson plans for the group meetings, schedule for group meetings, monitor OCPS benchmark reading scores, completed project reviews from eInquiry	2A.1. OCPS Benchmark reading scores, Accelerated Reader reports, scores for eInquiry projects based on a rubric
			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 reading. Reading Goal #2B: *On data from the 2011 Florida Alternate Assessment we have 1 student who topped out at a level 9, 4 students who move up a level, and 3 students who moved up 2 or more levels.* *Teachers are providing*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62% (8).*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *69% (9)*	2B.1. Teachers new to NGSSS access points. Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction	2B.1. Provide all ESE staff with PD on the access points to be taught and assessed using the NGSSS access points for their grade level.	2B.1. District support staff, staffing specialist, experienced teachers, principal, and assistant principal.	2B.1. Classroom visits, assessment results, require data collection, collaboration with colleagues.	2B.1. Observation checklist, lesson plans, classroom walk through, PD sign-in sheets, PD agenda.
			2B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability.	2B.2. Provide structure and routine. Practice implementing skills learned. Analyze data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	2B.2. Classroom teachers	2B.2. Classroom walk through, observation of individual students, informal assessment	2B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment, IEPs, Data Sheets, classroom observations

direct instruction implementing programs aligned with the NGSSS Access Points to enhance student learning.		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. Teaching the new reading benchmarks (NGSSS) at a high complexity level while using materials that are not based on the NGSSS (Imagine It! 2008) or CCSS Teachers confidence level in teaching new standards at high complexity levels commiserate with FCAT 2.0 Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction Increasing number of students who are on Free and Reduced Lunch Students start school well below grade level 1.	3A.1. Continue use of the computer assisted instructional reading program of iStation for grades K-5. Students will use the program at least three times a week, along with monthly progress monitoring of all students K-5. Students will also be placed into skills groups that are teacher-directed based on the data from iStation reports.	3A.1. Classroom teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, Staffing Specialist	3A.1. Review daily/weekly/monthly data from iStation reports at data meetings to track the growth of students	3A.1. iStation's ISIP (iStations Indicators of Progress) Reports, Class Summary reports, Progress By Skill report, and Priority Reports (alerts teachers of students needing additional support with targeted lessons)
Reading Goal #3A: *We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classes, including, but not limited to, increased rigor, relevance, and complexity. We will address the reading deficiencies of our students in the following ways: implementing the RtI process and monitoring data on our lowest readers; intervention reading blocks will be scheduled for grades K-5; Reading Academy will be scheduled for our 6th-8th grade students; teachers will receive training in reading comprehension strategies, Depth of Knowledge application, data analysis, vocabulary skills, brain-based learning; differentiated instruction; and implementing the NGSSS and CCSS; middle school will promote literacy across the content areas.* *Needs assessment data indicate a need for targeted reading interventions and an emphasis on the FCAT reading reporting categories of Reading Application and Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *80% (373)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *83% (410)*	3A.2.	3A.2. Continue use of the computer assisted instructional reading program Compass Learning for grades 4-8. Students will use the program at least three times a week, along with monthly assessments based on the NGSSS.	3A.2. Classroom teachers, Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, Technology Specialist	3A.2. Review the reports generated from Compass Learning at data meetings to track the growth of students	3A.2. Compass Learning Student Portfolio and Progress Reports
			3A.3.	3A.3. Analyze FCAT Reading scores to determine the percent of students making learning gains and compare that data to 2011-2012.	3A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Leadership team, Instructional Coaches	3A.3. Meet with the leadership team to examine the data reports from the FCAT	3A.3. 2012 FCAT reports and AMO targets

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.		3B.1. Teachers new to NGSSS access points. Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction	3B.1. Provide all ESE staff with PD on the access points to be taught and assessed using the NGSSS access points for their grade level.	3B.1. District support staff, staffing specialist, experienced teachers, principal, and assistant principal.	3B.1. Classroom visits, assessment results, require data collection, collaboration with colleagues.	3B.1. Observation checklist, lesson plans, classroom walk through, PD sign-in sheets, PD agenda.
Reading Goal #3B: We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all ESE classes. We will address the reading deficiencies of our students by providing professional development for teachers.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *62% (8)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *69% (9)*				
		3B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability	3B.2. Provide structure and routine. Practice implementing skills learned. Analyze data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	3B.2. Classroom teachers	3B.2. Classroom walk through, observation of individual students, informal assessment	3B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment, IEPs, Data Sheets, classroom observations
		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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4A: 2012 Current Level of Performance:* 64% (76) 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 67% (82) *We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classes. We will address the reading deficiencies of our students in the following ways: implementing the RtI process and monitoring data on our lowest readers; intervention reading blocks will be scheduled at each grade level; teachers will receive training in reading comprehension strategies, Depth of Knowledge, data analysis, vocabulary skills, brain-based learning; differentiated instruction; and implementing the NGSSS and CCSS. Needs assessment data indicate a need for targeted reading interventions and an emphasis on the FCAT reading reporting categories of Reading Application and Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction.* *RtI data will be collected every week to monitor academic growth.*	4A.1. See barriers listed in 1A.1 above	4A.1. Utilize the monthly researched validated computerized benchmark screenings and continuous progress monitoring tools for students in iStation (K-5). Have students work on the program at least 3 times a week, along with documenting the progress from small group teacher-led instruction that is delivered through iStation. *Supports the RtI process	4A.1. Classroom teachers, Staffing specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Reading Coach	4A.1. Review the daily/weekly/monthly data from iStation reports at data meetings or RtI meetings, as well as through Collaborative Team Meetings to adjust instruction based on needs.	4A.1. iStation's ISIP (iStations Indicators of Progress) Reports, Class Summary reports, Progress By Skill report, and Priority Reports (alerts teachers of students needing additional support with targeted lessons lesson plans from small group instruction
	4A.2.	4A.2. Continue to implement a daily reading intervention block for all grades K-5 in addition to the 90 minute reading block for targeted students.	4A.2. Principal, Reading Coach, CRT, Reading teachers, ESE resource teachers, classroom teachers	4A.2. Intervention group schedules, data monitoring logs, classroom visits	4A.2. Copies of schedules and monitoring logs, classroom walkthrough documentation
	4A.3.	4A.3. Continue to implement the Reading Academy for 6-8th grade students who scored a level 1 or 2 on FCAT 2011. Students will receive instruction from a reading endorsed teacher using Jamestown Reading Navigator (JRN) as their Comprehensive Intervention Reading Program. JRN combines both an online computer adaptive and assisted instructional component as well as teacher-led small group instruction based on the areas of intervention needed from working online in JRN.	4A.3. Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, Principal	4A.3. Reports from JRN that include Class and Student Scores Reports, Class Summary, Intervention reports, NWEA Benchmark Test Results reports, Reading Skill Overview, and Time Summary. Data will also be analyzed from teacher-led groups.	4A.3. Various reports from JRN, OCPS Benchmark reports
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.1. Teachers new to NGSSS access points.	4B.1. Provide all ESE staff with PD on the access points to be	4B.1. District support staff, staffing specialist, experienced teachers,	4B.1. Classroom visits, assessment results, require data collection,	4B.1. Observation checklists, lesson plans, classroom walk through,

Reading Goal #4B: *We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all ESE classes. We will address the reading deficiencies of our students by providing professional development for teachers. Academic/goal progress data will be collected weekly to monitor reading growth.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *0% (3) Of the 3 students in our lowest 25% none made learning gains.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *1% (1)*	Minimal or old technology at the school, lack of upgraded tools to support instruction	taught and assessed using the NGSSS access points for their grade level.	principal, and assistant principal.	collaboration with colleagues.	PD sign-in sheets, PD agenda.
			4B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability.	4B.2. Provide structure and routine. Practice implementing skills learned. Analyze data and make adjustments to instruction as needed.	4B.2. Classroom teachers	4B.2. Classroom walk through, observation of individual students, informal assessment	4B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment, IEPs, Data Sheets, classroom observations
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 83%	**84%**	**86%**	**87%**	**89%**	**90%**	**92%**
Reading Goal #5A: ***Our score for the 2011-2012 school year was 88% which exceeded our target percent of 84%.***							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5B.1. No print rich environment at home or anyone to read to them or with them	5B.1. Establish the use of the Imagine It, photo library in classrooms to build vocabulary and back ground knowledge.	5B.1. Reading Coach, CRT, classroom teacher	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs looking for the use of the photo cards, lesson plans will include them as a material being used Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	5B.1. OCPS Benchmark Tests, Mini-Assessments, Lesson Assessments from core program	
Reading Goal #5B: In 2010-2011, we had 76% of our Black students scoring satisfactorily in Reading. This percentage stayed the same in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 78%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 80% of our black students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* ***Black: 22%***	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* ***Black: 20%***					
		5B.2. Students start school well below grade level	5B.2. Implementation of interactive word walls in all classrooms	5B.2. Reading Coach, CRT, classroom teacher	5B.2. Classroom walkthroughs looking for the use of the word wall, lesson plans will include them as a material being used Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	5B.2. OCPS Benchmark Tests, Mini-Assessments, Lesson Assessments from core program	

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 are unaware or forgetting that LF students are still considered ELLs and many need some additional support. Therefore teachers are not implementing strategies needed to continue to improve the students' level of English language proficiency.	5C.1. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for ELLs who have exited the program but still need support	5C.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.1. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.1. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
Reading Goal #5C: In 2010-2011, we had 63% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily in Reading. This percentage increased to only 65% in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 66%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 69% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *35%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31%*					
			5C.2. Teachers are not implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing reading skills for ELLs.	5C.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
			5C.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	5C.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	5C.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	5C.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and FCAT
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.							
Reading Goal #5D: In 2010-2011, we had 51% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily in Reading. This percentage increased to 60% in 2011-2012; therefore we surpassed our 2012 AMO target of 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NA-we will continue to monitor the progress of our ESE students.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.							
Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In 2010-2011, we had 74% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily in Reading. This percentage increased to 82% in 2011-2012; therefore we surpassed our 2012 AMO target of 76%.	NA-we will continue to monitor the progress of our ED students.	*NA*					

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
Common Core State Standards Implementation trainings	K-2 3-8	Reading Coach and CRT for grades K-5, Assistant Principal and Dean for 6-8	K-8 Teachers	Intense Training K-2 2012-13 Introduction Training 3-8 2012-2013	Documentation of CCSS in lesson plans, PLC notebook documentation of building CCSS lesson plans and exemplar lessons	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CRT, Dean
High Probability Strategies: Identifying Similarities and Differences	K-8	PDS Online	All instructional personnel	On-going self-paced	Completion through PDS online	PDS online facilitator as well as CRT for collection points

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
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CCSS Blackbelt Training	Training for ELA Grades 3-5 & Middle School	Title II	$2,800
			Subtotal:$2,800
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$2,800

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. 58 % (35) of the 60 students tested have been in the ESOL program for less than three years and have not had extensive exposure to ESOL strategies and support.	1.1. Provide additional intervention, small group, and individual instruction focusing on language acquisition.	1.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, reading coach, CRT, classroom teachers and ESOL paraprofessional	1.1. Review daily/weekly/monthly data at data meetings to track the growth of students. Intervention group schedules, classroom visits	1.1. Copies of schedules and monitoring logs, classroom walkthrough documentation. Reports, lesson plans from small group instruction
CELLA Goal #1: ***Our data from the 2012 CELLA indicate that We will raise expectations of instructional practices incorporating appropriate ESOL support strategies and in all classes with ELLS to improve listening and speaking skills. We will address these deficiencies of our students in the following ways: provide bilingual support for non English speakers where feasible, implement small group and individual instruction to support language acquisition, implement the RtI process, and develop Academic Needs Identification Plans for students struggling with content.***	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *65% (39)*	1.2. Teachers continue to work on implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing listening and speaking for ELLs.	1.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	1.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	1.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	1.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
		1.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	1.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	1.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	1.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	1.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and CELLA
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. 58 % (35) of the 60 students tested have been in the ESOL program for less than three years and have not had extensive exposure to ESOL strategies and support.	2.1. Provide additional intervention, small group, and individual instruction focusing on language acquisition.	2.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, reading coach, CRT, classroom teachers and ESOL paraprofessional	2.1. Review daily/weekly/monthly data at data meetings to track the growth of students. Intervention group schedules, classroom visits	2.1. Copies of schedules and monitoring logs, classroom walkthrough documentation. Reports, lesson plans from small group instruction
CELLA Goal #2: ***Our data from the 2012 CELLA indicate that We will raise expectations of instructional practices incorporating appropriate ESOL support strategies and in all classes with ELLS to improve reading skills. We will address these deficiencies of our students in the following ways: provide bilingual support for non English speakers where feasible, implement small group and individual instruction to support language acquisition, implement the RtI process, and develop Academic Needs Identification Plans for students struggling with content.***	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *48% (29)*	2.2. Teachers continue to work on implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing reading for ELLs.	2.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	2.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	2.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	2.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
		2.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	2.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	2.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	2.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	2.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and CELLA

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		3.1. 58 % (35) of the 60 students tested have been in the ESOL program for less than three years and have not had extensive exposure to ESOL strategies and support.	3.1. Provide additional intervention, small group, and individual instruction focusing on language acquisition.	3.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, reading coach, CRT, classroom teachers and ESOL paraprofessional	3.1. Review daily/weekly/monthly data at data meetings to track the growth of students. Intervention group schedules, classroom visits	3.1. Copies of schedules and monitoring logs, classroom walkthrough documentation. Reports, lesson plans from small group instruction
CELLA Goal #3: *Our data from the 2012 CELLA indicate that We will raise expectations of instructional practices incorporating appropriate ESOL support strategies and in all classes with ELLS to improve writing skills. We will address these deficiencies of our students in the following ways: provide bilingual support for non English speakers where feasible, implement small group and individual instruction to support language acquisition, implement the RtI process, and develop Academic Needs Identification Plans for students struggling with content.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *38% (23)*					
		3.2. Teachers continue to work on implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing writing for ELLs.	3.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	3.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	3.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	3.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
		3.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	3.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	3.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	3.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	3.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and CELLA

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
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

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.							
Mathematics Goal #1A: *In 2012, 36% of students in grades 3-5 scored at Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 which is 7% increase from the previous year. (29% in 2011)* *Kindergarten and First Grade Teachers will receive training and support to make the transition from teaching NGSSS to the CCSS. Our Blackbelt CCSS Math Team comprised of teachers grades K -2 and the CRT will receive ongoing training to support the implementation Second grade teachers will receive training and support to begin the transition to CCSS. Teachers in grades 3 – 5 will continue to attend training on the NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *36% (75)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *39% (83)*	1A.1. Classroom implementation of the CCSS in grade K – 1using Envision Math as our primary resource. Providing support, other resources and monitoring the instruction which must embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices. Blended implementation of the NGSSS and CCSS in grade 2 using Envision Math as our primary resource. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Envision Math in grades 3 - 5 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0 while at the same time begin training on the CCSS and embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices.	1A.1. Utilize Envision (K – 5 and OCPS Pacing Guides and Task Analysis found on the IMS to implement grade level standards either CCSS or NGSSS. Continue to support the instructional staff to implement both the CCSS (K – 1) or NGSSS (2 – 5) and provide professional development as needed. Also continue to review the FCAT Item Specifications. Divide the instructional staff into Collaborative Learning Teams and provide training on establishing SMART GOALS and the connection between their IPDP and the SIP. These CLTs will meet the first Wed. of each month throughout the 2012 - 2013 school year. Provide training and support for CLTs on developing Common Assessments and Lesson Study. Analyze the FCAT 2013 Math results grades 3 – 5 to determine if we accomplished the goal.	1A.1 Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	1A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	1A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
			1A.2 Finding a dedicated block of time during the instructional day for iii math.	1A.2. Include opportunities for teaching math in all subject/content areas. Core RtI Team will meet bi-monthly with grade level teams to review classroom and district	E Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	1A.2. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework	1A.2. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments

2.0. We will formulate a "Blackbelt Team" to receive training on the CCSS. This team will lead the transition in grades 3 – 5. They will begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their instruction. Provide ongoing training and support for Envision math (K – 5). Teachers will disaggregate both school (Envision) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data in order guide instruction.			formative and summative assessment data. Disaggregate assessment data by AYP subgroups to monitor achievement gaps. Teachers will provide small group instruction during the math block. Provide ongoing consultation and support to include modeling lessons with both the core and intervention components of Envision for K – 5 Utilize iStation for grades 4 – 5 math.		Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	
		1A.3. The achievement gap between ESE students and General Education students continues to widen.	1A.3. Continue to support our ESE students in Envision Math. Provide scaffolding and intervention as needed. Research effective instructional practices Incorporate small group instruction with the designated math block to provide differentiation. Direct teachers to use IMS as a resource to support ESE students in the general education classroom.	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	1A.3. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	1A.3. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1B: *Teachers will attend NGSSS Math Access Points training to ensure they are teaching goal focused grade level math access points. Provide ongoing training*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *54% (7)* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *62% (8)*	1B.1. Teachers unfamiliar with NGSSS Access Points.	1B.1. Continue to support teachers in the implementation of NGSSS Access Points.	1B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, District ESE Personnel	1B.1. Examine/review IEPs	1B.1. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
		1B.2. More students with increasingly significant cognitive disabilities.	1B.2. Training on materials and strategies to promote effective instruction. Integrate math in activities throughout the day.	1B.2. Staffing Specialist, CRT, Math Specialist	1B.2. Monitor instruction	1B.2. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment

and support for writing measureable IEP goals that promote learning gains. Teachers will analyze data in order to guide instruction and the writing of IEP goals.		1B.3. Teachers not comfortable with data analysis and how it guides instruction and writing IEP goals.	1B.3. Collaborative Team Meetings to review and analyze data. Continue to review NGSSS Access Points Provide ongoing support, including modeling lessons with all math components.	1B.3. Staffing Specialist, Behavior Specialist, District ESE Personnel	1B.3. Closely examine student data and assessment results.	1B.3. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Due to complexity of FCAT Math 2.0 teachers need additional support and training to match their instruction to the assessment	2A.1. Provide professional development on "Rigor and Relevance' and "Webs DOK". Afford teachers the opportunity to observe in another classroom where the teacher facilitates student learning. Continue to support teachers in using the Gradual Release Model "I do, We do, You do. Implement a Math Counts club in Elementary School Provide training on the enrichment components of Envision. Train a "Blackbelt" team of teachers grades 3 – 5 on the CCSS. Begin the process of embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their teaching.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	2A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	2A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #2A: *In 2012, 39% of students in grades 3- 5 scored at Level 4 or 5 in FCAT 2.0 which is a 12% decrease from the previous year. (51% in 2011)* *We would like to increase the percent of students who score at FCAT Levels 4 or 5 on math. We also need to increase the percent of students scoring at these high achievement levels who make an annual learning gain. We will continue to provide training on "Rigor and Relevance, Webs DOK and 21st Century Learners. Teachers will continue to attend training on the NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT 2.0.* *We will formulate a "Blackbelt Team" to receive training on the CCSS. This team will lead the transition in grades 3 – 5. They will begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their instruction. Provide ongoing training*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *39% (83)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *42% (89)*					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

and support for Envision math (K – 5) *Teachers will disaggregate both school (Envision) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data in order guide instruction especially for students who need enrichment and acceleration.*						
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2B: *Teachers will attend NGSSS Math Access Points training to ensure they are teaching goal focused grade level math access points.* *Provide ongoing training and support for writing measureable IEP goals that promote learning gains.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *38% (5)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *46% (6)*	2B.1. Teachers unfamiliar with NGSSS Access Points.	2B.1. Continue to support teachers in the implementation of NGSSS Access Points.	2B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, District ESE Personnel	2B.1. Examine/review IEPs	2B.1. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			2B.2. More students with increasingly significant cognitive disabilities.	2B.2. Training on materials and strategies to promote effective instruction. Integrate math in activities throughout the day.	2B.2. Staffing Specialist, CRT, Math Specialist	2B.2. Monitor instruction	2B.2. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			2B.3. Teachers not comfortable with data analysis and how it guides instruction and writing IEP goals.	2B.3. Collaborative Team Meetings to review and analyze data. Continue to review NGSSS Access Points Provide ongoing support, including modeling lessons with all math components.	2B.3. Staffing Specialist, Behavior Specialist, District ESE Personnel	2B.3. Closely examine student data and assessment results.	2B.3. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment

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 Classroom implementation of the CCSS in grade K – 1using Envision Math as our primary resource. Providing support, other resources and monitoring the instruction which must embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices. Blended implementation of the NGSSS and CCSS in grade 2 using Envision Math as our primary resource. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Envision Math in grades 3 - 5 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0 while at the same time begin training on the CCSS and embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices.	3A.1. Meet with grade level teams to review OCPS Benchmark 1 and FCAT forecast data. Report student's initial FCAT forecast by marking it on their data sheet and placing them in the appropriate FCAT achievement level on the School Data Wall. Discuss with RTi core team students in need of math intervention. Implement istation grades 4 – 5 Implement Compass Learning grades 4 – 5. CLTs will monitor assessment data to ensure AYP subgroup performs at a proficient level which is equal to or within 10% of all other AYP subgroups. Begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into instruction grades K – 5.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	3A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	3A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #3A: *In 2012, 76% of students taking FCAT Math 2.0 made an annual learning gain which is a 2% increase from the previous year.* *We need to increase the percent of students in grades 4 – 5 who make an annual learning gain in math. Since the percent of students who scored at Level 3 or above is 88%, our goal is for our learning gains to be equal to or above that percent. We especially need to increase the percent of students who score at FCAT Level 4 or 5 who make an annual learning gain. Based on data from FCAT 2012 67% of students in grade 4 made a learning gain which was up 10% from the previous year and 62% in fifth grade which was no change from the previous year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *76% (355)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *79% (370)*					
			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. Teachers unfamiliar with NGSSS Access Points.	3B.1. Meet with Collaborative Team to analyze student data.	3B.1. Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, math specialist,	3B.1. Examine/review IEPs	3B.1. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal

Mathematics Goal #3B: ***Increase the percent of students who make an annual learning gain in math. Increase the percentage of students scoring level 7 and above. Continue training of programs aligned with NGSSS Math Access Points and their implementation. Provide ongoing support for a modified curriculum.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *69% (9)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 77% (10)			principal, assistant principal, and district support personnel.		assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			3B.2. More students with increasingly significant cognitive disabilities.	3B.2. Implement programs that align with NGSSS Math Access Points.	2B.2. Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, district support personnel, principal, assistant principal.	3B.2. Monitor instruction.	3B.2. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			3B.3. Teachers not comfortable with data analysis and how it guides instruction and writing IEP goals.	3B.3. Monitor assessment data to ensure this group continues to perform at the Commended level.	2B.3. Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, district support personnel, principal, assistant principal.	3B.3. Closely examine student data and assessment results	3B.3. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Students in grades 3 – 5 are not fluent in their basic math facts.	4A.1. Utilize Compass Learning grades 4 -5. Utilize iStation in grades 4 – 5 Provide opportunities through Precision Teaching for students to increase math fluency of basic facts in addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. Provide follow-up training on the intervention pieces of Envision K – 5.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	4A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	4A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #4A: *In 2012, 65% of the students in the lowest 25% in math made an annual learning gain which is a 21% decrease from the previous year.* *We will provide follow-up training on the intervention pieces of Envision Math K – 5. Also, we will administer the OCPS Mini Benchmark Assessments after we remediate. RtI team will monitor the assessment data of Lowest 25% in math and meet with grade level discuss interventions.* *Teachers will continue to attend training on the CCSS and NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT 2.0.* *Provide ongoing training and support for Envision math (K – 5). Teachers will disaggregate both school (Envision) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *65% (76)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *68% (80)*					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data in order guide their instruction and provide interventions. *Based on data from FCAT 2012 48% of students in the lowest 25% in grade 4 made a learning gain which is a 14% drop from the previous year. 44% of students in the lowest 25% in fifth grade made a learning gain which is a 31% drop from the previous year.*						
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4B: *Provide follow up training in programs aligned with NGSSS Math Access Points Teachers continue to attend training in NGSSS Math Access Points. Teachers will closely examine their formative data in order to guide their instruction and provide remediation.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *67% (2)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100% (3)	4B.1. Teachers unfamiliar with NGSSS Access Points.	4B.1. Meet with Collaborative Team to analyze student data.	4B.1 Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, math specialist, principal, assistant principal, and district support personnel.	4B.1. Examine/review IEPs	4B.1. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			4B.2. More students with increasingly significant cognitive disabilities.	4B.2. Implement programs that align with NGSSS Math Access Points.	4B.2.Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, math specialist, principal, assistant principal, and district support personnel.	4B.2. Monitor instruction.	4B.2. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment
			4B.3. Teachers not comfortable with data analysis and how it guides instruction and writing IEP goals.	4B.3. Monitor assessment data to ensure this group performs at an achieved level.	4B.3. Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers, math specialist, principal, assistant principal, and district support personnel.	4B.3. Closely examine student data and assessment results	4B.3. Data sheets, IEPs, classroom observations, informal assessment, Florida Alternate Assessment

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 84%	**85%**	**87%**	**88%**	**89%**	**91%**	**92%**
Mathematics Goal #5A: ***Our score for the 2011-2012 school year was 86% which exceeded our AMO target percent of 85%.***							

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. Lack of teacher training on how to access subgroup data on IMS and then to utilize the data to provide interventions, differentiate the curriculum and inform instruction.	5B.1. Teachers will continue to rewrite their core instruction assessments and develop common assessments using information learned at the Webb's DOK training to better align their instruction with both their summative and formative assessments. As the instructional staff is trained on the new elements of the Marzano Framework, the CRT and Reading Coach will place greater emphasis on how making the changes to classroom practices will impact student achievement especially that of our subgroups. Meet bi-monthly to take an in-depth look at student progression data from the OCPS Benchmark Exams, Common Assessments and Envision. We will use this analysis to make instructional decisions concerning how to intervene and how to scaffold the curriculum effectively. We will utilize our Blackbelt Team	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	5B.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	5B.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #5B: In 2010-2011, we had 79% of our Black students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage decreased to 76% in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 81%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 83% of our black students scoring satisfactorily. In 2010-2011, we had 81% of our Hispanic students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage stayed the same in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 83%. Our Target for the 2012-	2012 Current Level of Performance:* ***Black: 24%*** ***Hispanic: 19%***	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* ***Black: 17%*** ***Hispanic: 16%***					

2013 school year is to have 84% of our Hispanic students scoring satisfactorily.				to assist in the implementation of CCSS in grades K – 1. Monitor the instructional pieces to ensure teachers are going deeper with the curriculum so students can transfer the knowledge at the appropriate level. Continue to explore the possibility of a iii block for math. School champions will train the teachers on the Insight component of IMS>			
			5B.2. Lack of teacher training on instructional practices and accommodations geared specifically for targeted subgroups	5B.2. Teachers will continue to rewrite their core instruction assessments and develop common assesments using information learned at the Webb's DOK training to better align their instruction with both their summative and formative assessments. As the instructional staff is trained on the new elements of the Marzano Framework, the CRT and Reading Coach will place greater emphasis on how making the changes to classroom practices will impact student achievement especially that of our subgroups. Meet bi-monthly to take an in-depth look at student progression data from the OCPS Benchmark Exams, Common Assessments and Envision. We will use this analysis to make instructional decisions concerning how to intervene and how to scaffold the curriculum effectively. We will utilize our Blackbelt Team to assist in the implementation of CCSS in grades K – 1. Monitor the instructional pieces to ensure teachers are going deeper with the curriculum so students can transfer the knowledge at the	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	5B.2. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	5B.2. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments

			appropriate level. Continue to explore the possibility of a iii block for math.			
		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 mathematics.			5C.1. Teachers are unaware or forgetting that LF students are still considered ELLs and many need some additional support. Therefore teachers are not implementing strategies needed to continue to improve the students' level of English language proficiency in math.	5C.1. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for ELLs who have exited the program but still need support	5C.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.1. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.1. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
Mathematics Goal #5C: In 2010-2011, we had 71% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage decreased to 70% in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 73%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 76% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *30%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *24%*					
			5C.2. Teachers are not implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing math skills for ELLs	5C.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
			5C.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	5C.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	5C.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	5C.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and FCAT
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. Teachers not familiar with the new standards and how to use test item specifications.	5D.1. Lesson study will be implemented to build teacher capacity in deconstructing/unwrapping the standards.	5D.1. Principal, Math Specialist, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers.	5D.1. Review daily/weekly/monthly data at data and/or RtI meetings or through Collaborative Team Meetings to adjust instruction based on needs.	5D.1. Progress reports, in-program assessment, lesson plans from small group instruction, IEP, OCPS Benchmark
Mathematics Goal #5D: In 2010-2011, we had 58% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage increased to 61% in 2011-2012, however our AMO target was 62%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 65% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *39%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35%*					
			5D.2. Teacher's confidence levels in teaching standards at a high complexity level commiserate with FCAT.	5D.2. Implement a daily math intervention block for targeted students in grades 3-5 in addition to the 60 minutes math block.	5D.2. Principal, Math Specialist, Assistant Principal, CRT, Staffing Specialist, classroom teachers.	5D.2. Intervention group schedules, data monitoring logs/graphs, classroom visits	5D.2. Progress reports, in-program assessment, lesson plans from small group instruction, IEP, OCPS Benchmark

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Lack of teacher training on how to access subgroup data on IMS and then to utilize the data to provide interventions, differentiate the curriculum and inform instruction Lack of teacher training on instructional practices and accommodations geared specifically for targeted subgroups	5E.1. Place more emphasis on "students who lack support for school" during our bi-monthly student progression/data meetings. Assist teachers on how to identify these students using IMS.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist IMS Champions	5E.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	5E.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #5E: In 2010-2011, we had 74% of our ED students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage increased to 75% in 2011-2012, however our AMO target was 76%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 78% of our ED students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *25%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *22%*					
			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

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. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Holt-McDougal in grades 6 - 8 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0.	1A.1. Utilize Holt-McDougal and OCPS Pacing Guides and Task Analysis found on the IMS to implement grade level standards. Continue to support the MS Math instructional staff to implement NGSSS (6 -8) and provide professional development as needed. Also continue to review the FCAT Item Specifications. Divide the instructional staff into Collaborative Learning Teams and provide training on establishing SMART GOALS and the connection between their IPDP and the SIP. These CLTs will meet the first Wed. of each month throughout the 2012 - 2013 school year. Provide training and support for CLTs on developing Common Assessments and Lesson Study. Analyze the FCAT 2013 Math results grades 6 - 8 to determine if we accomplished the goal.	1A.1 Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	1A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	1A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #1A: *In 2012, 28% of students in grades 6-8 scored a Level 3 on FCAT Math which is a 4% drop from the previous year.* *We will formulate a Blackbelt CCSS Math Team comprised of teachers in grades 6 - 8 and the Administrative Dean. This team will receive training to support the implementation of CCSS in two years. This team will lead the transition in grades 6 – 8. Mathematics teachers in grades 6 - 8 will continue to attend training on the NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT 2.0.* *Mathematics teachers in grades 6 – 8 will begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their instruction.* *Provide ongoing training*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *28% (72)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *31% (80)*					
			1A.2. The only students taking FCAT Math in grade 8 are those who are taking Pre-Algebra in conjunction with Intensive Math because of low FCAT performance in Gr. 7 and will therefore impact our scores.	1A.2. Closely monitor their OCPS Benchmark Forecast Provide remediation as needed	1A.2. Gr. 8 Pre-Algebra Teacher CRT	1A.2. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and	1A.2. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">on Holt-McDougal. Teachers will disaggregate both school (Holt-McDougal) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data in order guide instruction.</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>scales

Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #1B:

N/A-None of our middle school students take FAA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Due to complexity of FCAT Math 2.0 teachers need additional support and training to match their instruction to the assessment	2A.1. Provide professional development on "Rigor and Relevance' and "Webs DOK". Afford teachers the opportunity to observe in another classroom where the teacher facilitates student learning. Continue to support teachers in using the Gradual Release Model "I do, We do, You do. Continue to offer Math Counts club in Middle School Provide training on the acceleration components of Holt-McDougal Train a "Blackbelt" team of teachers grades 6-8 on the CCSS. Begin the process of embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their teaching.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	2A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	2A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #2A: *In 2012, 68% of students in grades 6 – 8 scored a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math which is a 4% increase from the previous year.* ***We would like to increase the percent of students who score at FCAT Levels 4 or 5 on math. We also need to increase the percent of students scoring at these high achievement levels who make an annual learning gain. We will continue to provide training on "Rigor and Relevance, Webs DOK and 21st Century Learners. Teachers will continue to attend training on the NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT 2.0. We will formulate a "Blackbelt Team" to receive training on the CCSS. This team will lead the transition in grades 6 - 8. They will begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into their instruction.***	2012 Current Level of Performance:* ***68% (174)***	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* ***71% (183)***					
			2A.2. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Holt-McDougal in grades 6 - 8 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0. The only students taking FCAT Math in grade 8 are those who are taking Pre-Algebra in conjunction with Intensive Math because of low FCAT performance in Gr. 7 and will therefore impact our scores.	2A.1. Utilize Holt-McDougal and OCPS Pacing Guides and Task Analysis found on the IMS to implement grade level standards. Continue to support the MS Math instructional staff to implement NGSSS (6 -8) and provide professional development as needed. Also continue to review the FCAT Item Specifications. Divide the instructional staff into Collaborative Learning Teams and provide training on establishing SMART GOALS and the connection between their IPDP and the SIP. These CLTs will meet the first Wed. of each month	2A.1 Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist.	2A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	2A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Provide ongoing training and support for Holt-McDougal 6 – 8. Teachers will disaggregate both school (Holt-McDougal) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data in order guide instruction especially for students who need enrichment and acceleration.</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>throughout the 2012 - 2013 school year.

Provide training and support for CLTs on developing Common Assessments and Lesson Study.

Analyze the FCAT 2013 Math results grades 6 - 8 to determine if we accomplished the goal.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #2B:

N/A-None of our middle school students take FAA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td><td>2B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Holt-McDougal in grades 6 - 8 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0. The only students taking FCAT Math in grade 8 are those who are taking Pre-Algebra in conjunction with Intensive Math because of low FCAT performance in Gr. 7 and will therefore impact our scores. Due to complexity of FCAT Math 2.0 teachers need additional support and training to match their instruction to the assessment	3A.1. Meet with grade level teams to review OCPS Benchmark 1 and FCAT forecast data. Report student's initial FCAT forecast by marking it on their data sheet and placing them in the appropriate FCAT achievement level on the School Data Wall. Discuss with RTi core team students in need of math intervention. CLTs will monitor assessment data to ensure AYP subgroup performs at a proficient level which is equal to or within 10% of all other AYP subgroups. Begin to embed the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into instruction grades 6 – 8.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	3A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	3A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #3A: *In 2012, 76% of students made an annual learning gain on FCAT math which is a 2% increase from the previous year.* *We need to increase the percent of students in grades 4 – 5 who make an annual learning gain in math. Since the percent of students who scored at Level 3 or above is 86%, our goal is for our learning gains to be equal to or above that percent. We especially need to increase the percent of students who score at FCAT Level 4 or 5 who make an annual learning gain. Based on data from FCAT 2012, 60% of students in Gr. 6 made an annual learning which is a 11% drop from the previous year. In Gr. 7, 99% of students made a learning gain which was up 4% from the previous year. Lastly 67% of our eighth grade students made a learning gain which is a 20% drop from the previous year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *76% (195)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *79% (203)*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #3B:

N/A-None of our middle school students take FAA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Middle School math teachers providing small group instruction within the class time in order to provide intervention and remediation.	4A.1. Coordinate with MS math district contact to plan an offsite classroom observation of small group instruction done well. Research ways to get started with small group instruction in a middle school math class: How do I organize it? What does it look like? What are other students working on not in the small group? Etc.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	4A.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	4A.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #4A: *In 2012, 65% of students in the lowest 25% in math made an annual learning gain which is a 21% decreae from the previous year.* *We will administer the OCPS Mini Benchmark Assessments after we remediate. RtI team will monitor the assessment data of Lowest 25% in math and meet with grade level discuss interventions. Teachers will continue to attend training on the CCSS and NGSSS and the Item Specifications for FCAT 2.0 to ensure they are teaching the correct grade level benchmark and at an appropriate complexity level to ensure student's score at the proficient level on FCAT 2.0.* *Provide ongoing training and support for Holt-McDougal math (6 - 8). Teachers will disaggregate both school (Holt-McDougal) and district (OCPS Benchmark) assessment data to differentiate instruction and close the achievement gap between AYP subgroups. Teacher s will closely examine their formative assessment data*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *65%(42)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *68% (44)*	4A.2. Middle School math teachers differentiating the curriculum for students.	4A.2. Coordinate with MS math district contact to plan an offsite classroom observation of differentiated instruction done well. Research ways to get started with differentiated instruction in a middle school math class: How do I organize it? What does it look like? What are other students working on? How do I get through my curriculum?	4A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	4A.2. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	4A.2. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
			4A.3. Classroom implementation of the NGSSS using Holt-McDougal in grades 6 - 8 which includes benchmarks being taught at a complexity level commiserate with FCAT 2.0. The only students taking FCAT Math in grade 8 are those who are taking Pre-Algebra in conjunction with Intensive Math because of low FCAT performance in Gr. 7 and will therefore impact our scores.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

<table>
<tr><td>in order guide their instruction and provide interventions.
Based on data from FCAT 2012, 82% of our sixth grade students in the lowest 25% mathematically, made a learning gain which is a 1% increase from the previous year. In grade 7, 100% of students in the lowest 25% in math made a learning gain which is equal to the % of the previous year. In grade 8, 74% of students in the lowest 25% made an annual learning gain which is a 21% decrease from the previous year.</td><td colspan="2"></td><td>Due to complexity of FCAT Math 2.0 teachers need additional support and training to match their instruction to the assessment</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>4B.1.</td><td>4B.1.</td><td>4B.1.</td><td>4B.1.</td><td>4B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #4B:

N/A-None of our middle school students take FAA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>4B.2.</td><td>4B.2.</td><td>4B.2.</td><td>4B.2.</td><td>4B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>4B.3.</td><td>4B.3.</td><td>4B.3.</td><td>4B.3.</td><td>4B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 84%	**85%**	**87%**	**88%**	**89%**	**91%**	**92%**
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Our score for the 2011-2012 school year was 86% which exceeded our AMO target percent of 85%.*							

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. Lack of teacher training on how to access subgroup data on IMS and then to utilize the data to provide interventions, differentiate the curriculum and inform instruction.	5B.1. Teachers will continue to rewrite their core instruction assessments and develop common assessments using information learned at the Webb's DOK training to better align their instruction with both their summative and formative assessments. As the instructional staff is trained on the new elements of the Marzano Framework, the CRT and Reading Coach will place greater emphasis on how making the changes to classroom practices will impact student achievement especially that of our subgroups. Meet bi-monthly to take an in-depth look at student progression data from the OCPS Benchmark Exams, Common Assessments and Envision. We will use this analysis to make instructional decisions concerning how to intervene and how to scaffold the curriculum effectively. School champions will train the	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	5B.1. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	5B.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
Mathematics Goal #5B: In 2010-2011, we had 79% of our Black students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage decreased to 76% in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 81%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 83% of our black students scoring satisfactorily. In 2010-2011, we had 81% of our Hispanic students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage stayed the same in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 83%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 84% of our Hispanic students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * *Black: 24%* *Hispanic: 19%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Black: 17%* *Hispanic: 16%*					

				teachers on the Insight component of IMS>			
			5B.2. Lack of teacher training on instructional practices and accommodations geared specifically for targeted subgroups	5B.2. Teachers will continue to rewrite their core instruction assessments and develop common assesments using information learned at the Webb's DOK training to better align their instruction with both their summative and formative assessments. As the instructional staff is trained on the new elements of the Marzano Framework, the CRT and Reading Coach will place greater emphasis on how making the changes to classroom practices will impact student achievement especially that of our subgroups. Meet bi-monthly to take an in-depth look at student progression data from the OCPS Benchmark Exams, Common Assessments and Envision. We will use this analysis to make instructional decisions concerning how to intervene and how to scaffold the curriculum effectively. We will utilize our Blackbelt Team to assist in the transition to CCSS in 6-8. Monitor the instructional pieces to ensure teachers are going deeper with the curriculum so students can transfer the knowledge at the appropriate level.	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Math Specialist or Department Chair RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist	5B.2. Examine lesson plans Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup	5B.2. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
			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 mathematics.			5C.1. Teachers are unaware or forgetting that LF students are still considered ELLs and many need some additional support. Therefore teachers are not implementing strategies needed to continue to improve the students' level of English language proficiency in math.	5C.1. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for ELLs who have exited the program but still need support	5C.1. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.1. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.1. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
Mathematics Goal #5C: In 2010-2011, we had 71% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage decreased to 70% in 2011-2012, instead of increasing to 73%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 76% of our ELL students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *30%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *24%*	5C.2. Teachers are not implementing the most effective strategies at varying levels of English language proficiency for developing math skills for ELLs	5C.2. Provide all instructional staff with PD to review appropriate ESOL strategies for varying levels of proficiency.	5C.2. Principal, assistant principal, CCT	5C.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans	5C.2. Classroom walkthrough documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
			5C.3. ELLs need more time and practice developing skills to improve language proficiency.	5C.3. If available through Title III funds, tutoring will be offered to ESOL students grades 1-5.	5C.3. Principal, assistant principal, CCT, afterschool tutors	5C.3. Review data monthly to track growth of students. Meet with teachers to discuss student learning.	5C.3. Progress monitoring with tutoring curriculum unit assessments as well as classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmark, and FCAT
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. Teachers not familiar with the standards and how to use test item specifications.	5D.1. Lesson student will be implemented to build teacher capacity in deconstructing/unwrapping the standards.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, CRT, classroom teachers, ESE teachers.	5D.1. Review data in Collaborative Team Meetings to adjust instruction based on student needs.	5D.1. Benchmark, informal assessment, in-program assessment, IEP
Mathematics Goal #5D: In 2010-2011, we had 58% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily in Math. This percentage increased to 61% in 2011-2012, however our AMO target was 62%. Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 65% of our ESE students scoring satisfactorily.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *39%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *35%*	5D.2. Teachers not comfortable with data analysis and how it guides instruction.	5D.2. Coaching to support consistent implementation with fidelity.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, CRT, classroom teachers, ESE teachers.	5D.2. Classroom visits	5D.2. Benchmark, informal assessment, in-program assessment, IEP

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="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:</th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5E.1.
Lack of teacher training on how to access subgroup data on IMS and then to utilize the data to provide interventions, differentiate the curriculum and inform instruction

Lack of teacher training on instructional practices and accommodations geared specifically for targeted subgroups</td><td>5E.1.
Place more emphasis on “students who lack support for school” during our bi-monthly student progression/data meetings.

Assist teachers on how to identify these students using IMS.</td><td>5E.1.
Principal
Assistant Principal
CRT
Math Specialist or Department Chair
RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist
IMS Champions</td><td>5E.1.
Examine lesson plans

Monitor classroom walkthrough data collected using Marzano Framework

Monitor the design and utilization of learning goals and scales

Closely examine assessment data disaggregated by benchmark and monitor the percent of students on target especially by subgroup</td><td>5E.1.
Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations
Results of both school, district and state assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5E:

In 2010-2011, we had 74% of our ED students scoring satisfactorily in Math.

This percentage increased to 75% in 2011-2012, however our AMO target was 76%.

Our Target for the 2012-2013 school year is to have 78% of our ED students scoring satisfactorily.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td colspan="5" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>25%</td><td>22%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">High School Mathematics Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td><td>1.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #1:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #2:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

High School AMO Mathematics Goals

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

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
A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
HS Mathematics Goal A: *N/A 100% of Arbor Ridge students made satisfactory progress. There is no achievement gap.*							
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	
B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
HS Mathematics Goal B: *N/A 100% of Arbor Ridge students made satisfactory progress.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*						
		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 subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
HS Mathematics Goal C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A- Fewer than 10 students in this subgroup.	*NA*	*NA*					
			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
D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
HS Mathematics Goal D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A- Fewer than 10 students in this subgroup.	*NA*	*NA*					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">HS Mathematics Goal E:

N/A 100% of students made satisfactory progress.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of HS Mathematics AMO 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. Two additional sections of Algebra 1 (regular) have been added to the master schedule. Per the OCPS Math Progression, many students were placed in Algebra who do not have the pre-algebra foundations to be successful in Algebra.	1.1. Teachers will implement extra help sessions for students needing extra support.	1.1. Algebra 1 Math teachers, CRT, Dean, Principal, AP.	1.1. Benchmark data will be evaluated.	1.1.Algebra 1 EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *80out of 84 (96%) of the students taking Algebra 1 will achieve a level three or higher on the EOC*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50 out of 50 (100%) of the students who took the Algebra 1 EOC achieved a level three or higher.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *80 out of 84 (96%) of students taking the Algebra 1 EOC will successfully pass the EOC with a level three or higher.*					
			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 Algebra 1.			2.1. Two additional sections of Algebra 1 (regular) have been added to the master schedule. Per the OCPS Math Progression, many students were placed in Algebra who do not have the pre-algebra foundations to be successful in Algebra.	2.1. Teachers will implement extra help sessions for students needing extra support.	2.1. Algebra 1 Math teachers, CRT, Dean, Principal, AP.	2.1. Benchmark data will be evaluated.	2.1. Algebra 1 EOC
Algebra Goal #2: *77 out of 84 (92%) students will earn levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *46 out of 50 or 92% of students earned a level 4 or 5 on the Algebra 1 EOC*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *77 out of 84 or 92% of students taking the Algebra 1 EOC will earn a level 4 or 5.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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. NONE	1.1. Maintain current successful practices.	1.1. Algebra 1 Math teachers, CRT, Dean, Principal, AP.	1.1. Benchmark evaluation	1.1. EOC
Geometry Goal #1: *To maintain 100% of our students passing the Geometry EOC.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *18/18 (100%) of the students passed the Geometry EOC*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *16/16 (100%) of the students will achieve a level 3 or greater on the Geometry EOC.*					
			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. N/A	2.1.N/A	2.1.N/A	2.1.N/A	2.1.N/A
Geometry Goal #2: NA- The Geometry test is not currently evaluated using achievement levels.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
Meeting Math Foundations	6-8	Math Department Chairperson	Middle School Math Teachers	Quarterly	Monitor benchmark results	CRT, Dean, AP, Principal, Math teachers
Blackbelt Team CCSS	K – 2	CRT	Teacher Gr. K- Melissa Deal Teacher. Gr. 1- Linda Maloof Teacher Gr. 2- Kelly Peters	Ongoing	Blackbelt Team meets with grade level team members	Tammy Carver- CRT
Blackbelt Team CCSS	3-5	CRT	Teacher Gr. 3- Leslie Patrick Teacher. Gr. 4- Chrissy Morales Teacher Gr. 5- Zachary Anderson	Ongoing	Blackbelt Team meets with grade level team members	Tammy Carver- CRT
Blackbelt Team CCSS	6 – 8	Dean	Teacher Gr. 6- Toni Vincent Teacher Gr. 7- Michelle Faulkner Teacher Gr. 8- April Waye	Ongoing	Blackbelt Team meets with grade level team members	Jennifer Stever- D'Andrea
Collaborative Learning Teams NGSSS & FCAT Item Specifications	Instructional Staff K – 8 & ESE	CLT Leader	Members of Collaborative Team which is Grade Level and Support Team Members	First Wednesday of every month through June	Review of Collaborative Team Notebook including Meeting Documentation Forms	Tammy Carver, CRT Paige Tracy, Principal
Envision Math	K – 5	Kelly Peters	Members of Grade Levels K – 4; Fifth Gr. Math	Early Release Elective Time Special Area Time	Lesson Plans; Surveys; Benchmark Assessment Results	Tammy Carver, CRT Kelly Peters, Math Specialist
Math Fluency & Precision; Tips and Tricks	K – 5 & MS Math	Toni Vincent	Grade Levels; MS Math Content Teachers	Early Release Elective Time Special Area Time	Lesson Plans; Surveys; Benchmark Assessment Results	Tammy Carver, CRT Kelly Peters, Math Specialist

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CCSS Blackbelt Training	Training for Math Grades 3-5 and Middle School	Title II	$2,800
			Subtotal:$2,800
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$2,800

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. Teachers are not familiar with the NGSSS.	1A.1. Teachers will be trained to use the Curriculum View component of IMS in order to obtain the most up-to-date information on their grade level standards. They will also be trained to use the Insight component to look at ongoing assessment data. Fifth Grade teacher will use the P-Sell Program.	1A.1. IMS Champions CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	1A.1. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system.	1A.1. 2013 FCAT 2.0
Science Goal #1A: *In 2012, 49% of students in Gr. 5 scored a Level 3 on FCAT Science 2.0 which is a 20% gain over the previous year.* *In Gr. 8, 45% of students scored a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 which is a 17% drop from the previous year.* *In 2013, 51% of students in Gr. 5 and 48% of students in Gr. 8 will score a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Gr. 5- 49% (33/68)* *Gr. 8- 45% (35/77)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Gr. 5- 51%* *Gr. 8- 48%*	1A.2. The FCAT 2.0 is still new and the format and test item complexity are still relatively unfamiliar to teachers.	1A.2. Teachers will be trained to use the Curriculum View component of IMS where they can view grade level deconstructed standards and test item specifications.	1A.2. IMS Champions CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	1A.2. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system	1A.2. 2013 FCAT 2.0
			1A.3. Teachers are using new science curriculum and familiarizing themselves with the format and components.	1A.3. Continue to provide training and updates on the new Science Fusion Curriculum for both elementary and middle school.	1A.3. CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	1A.3. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system	1A.3. 2013 FCAT 2.0
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. Teachers are not familiar with NGSSS Science Access Points.	1B.1. Teachers will be provided with updated information about the NGSSS Science Assess Points and how best to implement them in the classroom.	1B.1. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel, Principal, Assistant Principal.	1B.1. Daily progress monitoring.	1B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #1B: *Last year 33% of Florida Alternate Assessment students scored a Level 4, 5, or 6 in science. This year at least 50% of our students will score a level 4, 5, or 6 in science.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *33% (2)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% (3)*	1B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability.	1B.2. Teachers will be provided with training on how to instruction using NGSSS Science Access Points.	1B.2. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel	1B.2. Daily progress monitoring.	1B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment

		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. Teachers are not familiar with the NGSSS.	2A.1. Teachers will be trained to use the Curriculum View component of IMS in order to obtain the most up-to-date information on their grade level standards. They will also be trained to use the Insight component to look at ongoing assessment data. Fifth Grade teacher will use the P-Sell Program.	2A.1. IMS Champions CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	2A.1. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system.	2A.1. 2013 FCAT 2.0
Science Goal #2A: *In 2012, 7% of students in Gr. 5 scored a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science 2.0 which is a 9% drop from the previous year.* *In Gr. 8, 37% of students scored a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 which is a 1% drop from the previous year.* *In 2013, 10% of students in Gr. 5 and 40% of students in Gr. 8 will score a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Gr. 5- 7% (5/68)* *Gr. 8- 37% (28/77)*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Gr. 5- 10%* *Gr. 8- 40%*	1A.2. The FCAT 2.0 is still new and the format and test item complexity are still relatively unfamiliar to teachers.	2A.2. Teachers will be trained to use the Curriculum View component of IMS where they can view grade level deconstructed standards and test item specifications.	2A.2. IMS Champions CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	2A.2. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system	2A.2. 2013 FCAT 2.0
			1A.3. ***Teachers are using new science curriculum and familiarizing themselves with the format and components.***	2A.3. Continue to provide training and updates on the new Science Fusion Curriculum for both elementary and middle school.	2A.3. CRT Science Lead Teacher Science Department Chair	2A.3. Progress monitor 4 x prior to FCAT using the OCPS Benchmark Science Exams. View and disaggregate the data using the Edusoft system	2A.3. 2013 FCAT 2.0
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. Teachers are not familiar with NGSSS Science Access Points.	2B.1. Teachers will be provided with updated information about the NGSSS Science Assess Points and how best to implement them in the classroom.	2B.1. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel, Principal, Assistant Principal.	2B.1. Daily progress monitoring.	2B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Science Goal #2B: *Science Goal #2B:* *Last year 50% of our Florida Alternate Assessment students scored a level 7 or above.* *This year at least 67% of our Florida Alternate Assessment students will score a level 7 or above.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50% (3)*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *67% (4)*	2B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability	2B.2. Teachers will be provided with training on how to instruction using NGSSS Science Access Points.	2B.2. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel	2B.2. Daily progress monitoring.	2B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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.
N/A	1B.2. Teachers will be provided with training on how to instruction using NGSSS Science Access Points.	1B.2. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel					
	N/A	*N/A*					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	*N/A*	*N/A*					
			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: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			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: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *N/A*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *N/A*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Fusion Textbook/Resource Training	K – 8	District Contact	Teachers K -4, Tara Pettengill, MS Science Teachers	Ongoing	OCPS Benchmark Exam	CRT
Collaborative Learning Teams NGSSS & FCAT Item Specifications	Instructional Staff K – 8 & ESE	CLT Leader	Members of Collaborative Team which is Grade Level and Support Team Members	First Wednesday of every month through June	Review of Collaborative Team Notebook including Meeting Documentation Forms	Tammy Carver, CRT Paige Tracy, Principal

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Teachers are not using the calibration papers to score students' essays.	1A.1. Meet with the fourth grade teaches and eighth grade Language Arts teacher to review ways to embed the use of the calibration papers (essay set) into their writing program.	1A.1. CRT Reading Coach	1A.1. Students will be able to determine the score for an essay by matching the writing to that of a scored calibration paper and defend their reasoning for choosing that score	1A.1. 2013 FCAT Writing
Writing Goal #1A: *In 2012, 88 % of students in Gr. 4 scored a 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writing which is a 10% drop from the previous year. In Gr. 8, 97% of students scored a 3.0 or higher which is a 3% drop from the previous year.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Gr. 4- 88% (60/68)* *Gr. 8- 97% (75/77)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Gr. 4- 91%* *Gr. 8- 100%*	1A.2. Teachers in primary grades are not incorporating "Writers Workshop" into their Language Arts block.	1A.2. Utilize the OCPS Curriculum Services Page to provide resources for teachers in grade K – 3 on best practices for teaching writing.	1A.2. CRT Reading Coach	1A.2. Classroom Observations using Marzano Framework Review of student writing samples	1A.2. 2013 FCAT Writing
			1A.3. Grade Levels are not responding to school-wide grade level writing prompts.	1A.3. Form a "Writing Team" to develop grade level prompts to which students will respond twice during the school year and will be scored by grade level above.	1A.3. CRT Reading Coach	1A.3. Scores on students' essays Teacher feedback on process	1A.3. 2013 FCAT Writing
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Teachers are not familiar with NGSSS Science Access Points.	1B.1. Teachers will be provided with updated information about the NGSSS Writing Assess Points and how best to implement them in the classroom.	1B.1. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel, Principal, Assistant Principal.	1B.1. Daily progress monitoring.	1B.1. Florida Alternate Assessment
Writing Goal #1B: *Increase the number of students performing at Level 7 and above.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *100% (6)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50% (3)*	1B.2. Increasing number of ESE students with substantial cognitive disability.	1B.2. Teachers will be provided with training on how to instruction using NGSSS Writing Access Points.	1B.2. Staffing Specialist, District Personnel	1B.2. Daily progress monitoring.	1B.2. Florida Alternate Assessment
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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
45 Day Plan for FCAT Writing	Gr. 4	District Contact	Fourth Grade Teachers	District Determines	Classroom observations Student Writing Samples	CRT
Scoring Essays Using the Calibration Papers	Gr. 4 & 8	CRT	Fourth and eighth grade teachers	Fall 2012	Teachers will score essays from each other's class	CRT
Collaborative Learning Teams NGSSS & FCAT Item Specifications	Instructional Staff K – 8 & ESE	CLT Leader	Members of Collaborative Team which is Grade Level and Support Team Members	First Wednesday of every month through June	Review of Collaborative Team Notebook including Meeting Documentation Forms	Tammy Carver, CRT Paige Tracy, Principal

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total: $0

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	*N/A*	*N/A*					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	*N/A*	*N/A*					
			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
N/A						

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Parent knowledge in the correlation of attendance, tardiness and academic achievement. Family vacations	1.1. Communicate with parents via phone calls, letters, RTI meetings, child study meetings, and parent conferences about the importance of attending school every day as well as being on time and the impact it has on a child's education. Communicate Florida attendance laws with parents. Review with parents acceptable reasons for excused absences and tardies	1.1. Classroom teachers, Staffing Specialist, Attendance Clerk, SAFE Coordinator, School Social Worker Administration, School Social Worker, Attendance Clerk Attendance Clerk, Administration	1.1. Monthly monitoring of student attendance and excessive tardies on SMS or EDW Documentation of parent communications and meetings Documentation of communication with parents. Documentation of communication with parents.	1.1. SMS OCPS Enterprise Data Warehouse screens on attendance
Attendance Goal #1: *Increase student attendance by 3% and decrease students with excessive tardies by 3%.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *95% [777]*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *98% [748]*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *24% [196]*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *21% [160]*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *12% [99]*	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *15% [114]*					
			1.2. Lack of motivation to attend school or be on time for school.	1.2. Recognition for perfect attendance every 9 weeks. Bullying prevention lessons	1.2. Administration, Attendance Clerk, SAFE Coordinator	1.2. Encourage teachers to motivate students to achieve perfect attendance recognition and decrease tardiness to school.	1.2. Number of perfect attendance recognitions given every 9 weeks.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
Parent focus-education on the importance of good attendance as it relates to academic growth	K-8	Mary Cole (SAFE Coord.)	parents	Once every quarter	Monitor attendance & RTI meetings	Classroom teachers

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Staff expertise in the implementation of de-escalation strategies and valuable classroom management techniques	1.1. Provide teachers with strategies to be used in the classroom. Staff training on the OCPS Code of Conduct Assist teachers with developing individual behavior charts for repeat offenders. Refer students with multiple offenses to the RTI team and to counseling and/or SAFE Coordinator. Weekly behavior team and monthly RTI team meetings	1.1. Dean, Behavior Specialist, SAFE Coordinator, AP, Principal	1.1. We will monitor our suspension data quarterly. We will conduct weekly behavior team meetings to look at data and discuss and evaluate the effectiveness of strategies being used. We will conduct monthly RTI team meetings to look at data and discuss and evaluate the effectiveness of strategies being used.	1.1. We will use the data collected from SMS and EDW to determine if the 3% decrease goal was met.
Suspension Goal #1: *To reduce the number of both students involved and incidents resulting in In and Out of School Suspensions by at least 3%.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	91 (12%)In-School Suspensions were assigned	*80(10.5%) In-School Suspensions are expected*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	61 (8%) students served In-School Suspension	*50 (6.5%) students are expected to serve in ISS.*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	11 (1.4%)Out-of-School Suspensions assigned	*8 (1%)Out-of-School Suspensions expected*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	9 (1.1%) students served Out-of School Suspension.	*7(0.9%) students expected to serve Out-of-School Suspension.*					
			1.2. Parent knowledge of behaviors deemed inappropriate by Arbor Ridge School and OCPS.	1.2. Review the OCPS Student Code of Conduct as well as expectations with the parents at open house.	1.2. Classroom teachers	1.2. We will monitor our suspension data quarterly.	1.2. We will use the data collected from SMS and EDW to determine if the 3% decrease goal was met.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
Developing a School-Wide Positive Discipline Plan	K-8	Dean, Behavior Specialist	Leadership Team , RTI team	Monthly RTI meetings	RTI PLC meeting discussions	Behavior Specialist, Dean, RTI Team
Behavior de-escalation strategies	K-8	Behavior Specialist	School-Wide	October 2012	RTI PLC meeting discussions	Behavior Specialist, Dean, RTI Team

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:

Total:$0

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Attendance	1.1. Communicate with parents the importance of attending school and showing up on time.	1.1. Classroom Teachers, Maria Rodriquez (Attendance Clerk), Mary Cole (SAFE Coordinator), Jennifer Stever D'Andrea, Dean	1.1. Attendance Records	1.1. EDW
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *The percentage of students who are retained will decrease by 1%.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *1.98% [15] students retained.* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *98% [742] students promoted*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *1.7% [13] students retained* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *98.3% [753] students promoted*					
			1.2. Possible retention candidates need extra support to improve academic skills	1.2. Incorporate small group instruction and intensive intervention in daily instruction	1.2. Classroom teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Coach, Reading Coach, ESE support teachers	1.2. Review the daily/weekly/monthly data meetings, or RtI meetings, or through Collaborative Team Meetings to adjust instruction based on needs.	1.2. Reports, lesson plans from small group instruction
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teacher focus on district guidelines	K-8	Mary Cole (SAFE Coord.)	Classroom teachers	Once every quarter	Monitor attendance & RTI meetings	Classroom teachers
Parent focus-education on the importance of good attendance	K-8	Mary Cole (SAFE Coord.)	parents	Once every quarter	Monitor attendance & RTI meetings	Classroom teachers

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Shift work schedules and additional time restraints	1.1. Conduct meetings and schedule events at various times throughout the day.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Attendance at meetings and functions.	1.1. Meeting minutes and attendance sheets.
Parent Involvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
We would like to increase our membership in PTSA by 10% this year.	*382 (74%) members/families in PTSA*	*440 (84%) members/families in PTSA*					
			1.2. Parent's lack of interest with events that don't specifically involve their child.	1.2. Present a variety of sessions for parents during the year. LEP information, FCAT topics, how to help with homework, cyber safety, families building better readers.	1.2. Administration, Alina Davis (CCT), ADDitions Coordinator	1.2. Monitor our volunteer hours monthly and promote the use of volunteers with our teachers.	1.2. Copies of agendas, sign-in sheets, and handouts.
			1.3. Parents that do not speak or understand English.	1.3. Send Connect Orange calls before every event in English and Spanish, post events on school website, and have translators available at meetings.	1.3. Administration, Alina Davis (CCT), ADDitions Coordinator	1.3. Connect Orange call results, reports of volunteer hours.	1.3. Meeting minutes and attendance sheets.

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
Middle School Orientation	6-8	Stever D'Andrea (Administrative Dean)	Teachers, Parents	9/10 6:30-8:00pm	Available for questions as needed	Stever D'Andrea (Administrative Dean)
ADDitions Staff Development	K-8	Jakubcin (A.P.)	Teachers	ongoing	Team Meetings as needed	Administration, ADDitions Coordinator

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: ***Based on last year's FCAT scores, 49% of our 5th grade students scored a level.3.*** ***Based on last year's FCAT scores, 38% of our 8th grade students scored a level 3.*** ***Our goal is to increase the number of students proficient on Science FCAT 2.0. This year, 52% of 5th grade students will score a level 3 on the Science FCAT 2.0 and 41% of students in 8th grade will score a level 3 on Science FCAT 2.0***	1.1. Lack of instructional time to teach science at the elementary level.	1.1 Incorporate STEM across all content areas K-5 to ensure that each year builds upon the next.	1.1. Principal, assistant principal, classroom teachers, science department chairs	1.1. Classroom visits, lesson plans, Review data monthly to track students' increase in STEM knowledge.	1.1. Lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data from both informal and formal observations Results of both school, district and state assessments
	1.2. Limited Technology	1.2. Provide all instructional staff with professional development opportunities on how to utilize current technologies that are available.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers, science department chairs, Technology Specialist	1.2. Classroom visits, lesson plans, review data monthly to track students' increase in STEM knowledge, increased use of technology resources.	1.2. Classroom walk through documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD
	1.3. Second year implementation of STEM, many teachers are still learning how to incorporate STEM strategies.	1.3. Provide all instructional staff with professional development opportunities on how to incorporate STEM strategies.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers, science department chairs	1.3. Classroom visits, lesson plans, review data monthly to track students' increase in STEM knowledge.	1.3. Classroom walk through documentation, copies of lesson plans, sign in sheets from PD, agenda from PD, 2013 FCAT 2.0

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
Interactive Notebooks	k-8	Science contact	School-wide	Early Release Day	Follow-up survey	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Collaborative learning teams	k-8	Team leaders and department chairs	School-wide	Early Release Elective Time Special Area Time	Review of Collaborative Team Notebook including Meeting Documentation Forms	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher

Science Fusion	k-8	Science contact	Grade level teachers	Early Release Elective Time Special Area Time	Lesson Plans; Surveys; Benchmark Assessment Results; classroom assessments	Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *N/A*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Math intervention time not included in the school wide schedule.	1.1. Implement small group intensive intervention for math strategies, e.g. "triple i" time, school wide.	1.1. CRT, Math contacts, classroom teachers	1.1. Continuous collaboration through PLCs and RtI team meetings	1.1. progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the Envision math program and FCAT
Additional Goal #1: Elem. ***Students will increase fluency in math operations.***	2012 Current Level :* ***75% (158) of students grades 3-5 scored a level 3 or above on the math FCAT..***	2013 Expected Level :* ***78% of students grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or above on the math FCAT.***					
			1.2. The Envision Math program is still fairly new some teachers are still learning how to use it.	1.2. Provide opportunity for ongoing collaboration to build knowledge based in the Envision Math program through PLCs.	1.2. CRT, Math contacts, classroom teachers	1.2. continuous collaboration through PLCs	1.2. progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the Envision math program and FCAT
			1.3. Students do not have multiple opportunities to build math fluency in and outside of the classroom.	1.3. Offer math events for building fluency, for example, Fast Fact Fiesta,	1.3. Math contacts and grade level chairs, classroom teachers	1.3. continuous collaboration through PLCs	1.3. progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the Envision math program and FCAT

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							
Additional Goal #2: Elem. *Increase by 3 to 5%-The Percent of VPK students who will enter Elementary school ready based on FLKRS data (score 70% and above)*	2012 Current Level :* *n/a*	2013 Expected Level :* *n/a*					

N/A-OCPS does not sponsor VPK on our campus.							

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							
Additional Goal #3: Elem. *Increase by 3 to 5%-Students Who Read on Grade Level by Age 9* **See SIP Goal #1A & #2A above.**	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

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							
Additional Goal #4: Elem. *Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016.* **See SIP Goal #5A-E for both Reading & Math**	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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							
Additional Goal #5: Elem. Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentages N/A-100% of our elementary students is enrolled in both Music and Art classes. They attend each of these classes once per week.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

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			6.1Finding presenters for Teach-In. 6.2 Disruption to the academic school day.	6.1 Have each presenter visit 2 classrooms or more instead of just one. 6.2 Schedule presenters during social studies time if possible.	6.1 CRT, Reading Coach, SAFE Coordinator	6.1. Students/Teachers surveys.	6.1. Students/Teachers surveys.
Additional Goal #6: Elem. ***Increase College and Career Awareness*** ***We will increase the number of presenters we have for Teach-In***	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	12 presenters visiting 12 classrooms.	***15 presenters visiting 30 classrooms***					

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			7.1Gen. Ed. Teachers need more PD in the area of ESE	7.1 Pick one ESE area each month and highlight its characteristics/traits at that month's staff meeting	7.1. CRT, Staffing Specialist	7.1. RtI Process	7.1. School Data
Additional Goal #7: Elem. ***Decrease Disproportionate***	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

Classification in Special Education *We have a disproportionate number of minorities compared to white students in almost every exceptionality area.* *Our percentage is not extremely high-40% which equates to approximately 4 students.*	*Our largest disproportionate number in any exceptionality area is 40%-4 students.*	*Decrease this by 10%-1 student.*					
			7.2 Monitor the referral process more carefully	7.2 Staffing Specialist becomes more involved with the data meetings	7.2.CRT, Staffing Specialist	7.2 RtI Process	7.2 School Data

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Collaborative Learning Teams NGSSS & FCAT Item Specifications	Instructional Staff K – 8 & ESE	CLT Leader	Members of Collaborative Team which is Grade Level and Support Team Members	First Wednesday of every month through June	Review of Collaborative Team Notebook including Meeting Documentation Forms	Tammy Carver, CRT Paige Tracy, Principal
Envision Math	K – 5	Kelly Peters	Members of Grade Levels K – 4; Fifth Gr. Math	Early Release Elective Time Special Area Time	Lesson Plans; Surveys; Benchmark Assessment Results	Tammy Carver, CRT Kelly Peters, Math Specialist
ESE Characteristics/Traits	K-5	Pat Weber	All General Education Classroom Teachers K-5 MTSS Team	During MTSS monthly meetings	RtI/MTSS team will continuously monitor the referral process throughout the year	Pat Weber-Staffing Specialist

* 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

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

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 Additional Goal #1: MS			1.1 Students need more time to learn the new material associated with high school level math and science standards	1.1. Science club will be offered after school to allow students to broaden their understanding of the earth and science standards	1.1. Middle School Science teachers	1.1. continuous collaboration through PLCs	1.1. progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the science curriculum and end of course exams.
There will be an increase in the number of students at Arbor Ridge scoring above 80% on high school level course exams	2011 Current Level :* *64% (63) of 7th and 8th grade students taking Algebra I and Earth/Space Science scored above 80% on EOCs*	2012 Expected Level :* *67% of 7th and 8th grade students taking Algebra I and Earth/Space Science scored above 80%on EOCs*					
			1.2 Students need more time to learn the new material associated with high school level math and science standards	1.2 Math tutoring will be offered after school to help students who are struggling with the NGSS in algebra.	1.2 Middle School Math teachers	1.2 continuous collaboration through PLCs	1.2. progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the math curriculum and end of course exams.

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							
Additional Goal #2: MS *Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016* See SIP Goal #5A-E for both Reading & Math	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				

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

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			3.1 Students need more time to learn the new material associated with advanced /honors classes.	3.1 Science club will be offered after school to allow students to broaden their understanding of the earth and science standards	3.1 Middle School Teachers and Dean	3.1continuous collaboration through PLCs	3.1. Enrollment reports, progress monitoring, formative and summative assessments from the science and language arts curriculum.
Additional Goal #3: MS ***Increased by 3 to 5%-Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs***	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	62% (164) were enrolled in advanced LA courses ***42% (36) of our 8th graders were enrolled in Earth/Space Honors***	***65% will be enrolled in advanced LA courses*** ***64% (one additional class) of our 8th graders were enrolled in Earth/Space Honors***					

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			4.1Finding presenters for Teach-In. 4.2 Disruption to the academic school day.	4.1Have each presenter visit 2 classrooms or more instead of just one.	4.1 Middle School Teachers, Dean, SAFE Coordinator	4.1. Students/Teachers surveys.	4.1. Students/Teachers surveys.
Additional Goal #4: MS Increase College and Career Readiness We will increase the number of presenters we have for Teach-In We will continue our 8th grade programs: Trust Day & Etiquette	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	5 presenters visiting 5 classrooms	***6 presenters visiting 12 classrooms***					

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

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

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			5.1Students need to find their own transportation either before or after school in order to participate. 5.2 Students will need to budget their time and choose between many options including sports.	5.1 Middle School teachers will help guide students through picking their extracurricular activities 5.2 Teachers will host information nights for parents/students so they know the commitment level involved in each activity. 5.3 Ms. Jordan will offer morning rehearsal times as well as 2 productions per year-fall & spring.	Middle School Teachers, Grace Jordan, Dean	Enrollment reports, student surveys	Enrollment reports, student surveys
Additional Goal #5: MS Increase Fine Arts Enrollment We will increase the number of students involved in our extracurricular Fine Arts Programs	2012 Current Level :* *20% (53)*	2013 Expected Level :* *25%*					

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							
Additional Goal #6: MS Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education N/A-A disproportionate classification of minorities does not exist in our middle school-we will continue to monitor these numbers yearly.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

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
N/A						

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
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
No Funds Needed.			
			Subtotal:
			Total:$0

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:$2,800
CELLA Budget
Total:$0
Mathematics Budget
Total:$2,800
Science Budget
Total:$0
Writing Budget
Total:$0
Civics Budget
Total:$0
U.S. History Budget
Total:$0
Attendance Budget
Total:$0
Suspension Budget
Total:$0
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:$0
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:$0
STEM Budget
Total:$0
CTE Budget
Total:$0
Additional Goals
Total:$0
Grand Total:$5,600

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent
N/A	N/A	N/A

- 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.
Meets Monthly. Establishes committees and parent groups for the purpose of accomplishing school goals and objectives. Disseminates implements and evaluates the School Improvement Plan and reviews mid-year progress. The committee also serves in an advisory role each year when the school budget is discussed. Makes recommendations for the remaining use of School Improvement Funds.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
To continue to use the computerized reading intervention/enrichment program iStation K-5	$5,689
