Florida Department of Education

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Jere L. Stambaugh Middle School	District Name: Polk
Principal: Robert J. Hartley	Superintendent: Dr. Sherrie Nickell
SAC Chair: Susan Wasnorowicz	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

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

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

Principal	Robert J. Hartley	B.A. Physical Education, M.Ed. Educational Leadership/ Math 5-9, Physical Education K-8, Physical Education 6-12, Driver's Education Endorsement, Athletic Coaching Endorsement, School Principal	2	12	Stambaugh Middle 2011-2012: School Grade C, Percentage meeting High standards in reading 38%, Math 38%, Writing 68%, Science 28%, Learning Gains reading 55%, Math 61% Stambaugh Middle 2010-2011: School Grade C, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 52%, math 46%, writing 75%, science 29%, % learning gains: reading 54%, math 56%, adequate progress of lowest %: 66% reading, 66% math, AYP 79%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2009-2010: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 77%, math 73%, writing 86%, science 54%, % learning gains: reading 70%, math 70%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 63% reading, 60% math, AYP 72%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 20008-2009: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 76%, math 73%, writing 91%, science 53%, % learning gains: reading 66%, math 72%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 65% reading, 61% math, AYP 92%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2007-2008: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 74%, math 71%, writing 90%, science 52%, % learning gains: reading 64%, math 74%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 59% reading, 69% math, AYP 85%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2006-2007: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 75%, math 72%, writing 92%, science 54%, % learning gains: reading 63%, math 71%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 57% reading, 64% math, AYP 90%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2005-2006: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 73%, math 71%, writing 91%, % learning gains: reading 70%, math 74%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 76% reading, AYP 95%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2004-2005: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 67%, math 67%, writing 90%, % learning gains: reading 57%, math 68%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 61% reading, AYP 80%. Lakeland Highlands Middle 2003-2004: School Grade A, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 72%, math 71%, writing 91%, % learning gains: reading 67%, math 78%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 63% reading, AYP 80%.

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

APC	Todd Bennett	B.A. Biology, M. Ed. Educational Leadership/ Biology 6-12, Educational Leadership K-12	3.5	3.5	Stambaugh Middle 2011-2012: School Grade C, Percentage meeting High standards in reading 38%, Math 38%, Writing 68%, Science 28%, Learning Gains reading 55%, Math 61% Stambaugh Middle 2010-2011: School Grade C, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 52%, math 46%, writing 75%, science 29%, % learning gains: reading 54%, math 56%, adequate progress of lowest %: 66% reading, 66% math, AYP 79%. Stambaugh Middle 2009-2010: School Grade C, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 55%, math 54%, writing 87%, science 31%, % learning gains: reading 63%, math 66%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 65% reading, 63% math, AYP 79%. Stambaugh Middle 2008-2009: School Grade B, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 57%, math 54%, writing 89%, science 34%, % learning gains: reading 61%, math 68%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 68% reading, 72% math, AYP 82%.

APA	Angela Vincent	M.ED Ed. Leadership, coursework completed for doctorate in Organizational Leadership	1	11	Stambaugh Middle 2011-2012: School Grade C, Percentage meeting High standards in reading 38%, Math 38%, Writing 68%, Science 28%, Learning Gains reading 55%, Math 61% **School Grades Dennison Middle School** **2007 C, 2008 C, 2009 B, 2010 C, 2011 C,**

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Math/ Reading	Robin Hummel	M. Ed Elementary Education/Elementary Education K-6, ESOL, Middle Grades Mathematics 5	3	2	Stambaugh Middle 2011-2012: School Grade C, Percentage meeting High standards in reading 38%, Math 38%, Writing 68%, Science 28%, Learning Gains reading 55%, Math 61% Stambaugh Middle 2010-2011: School Grade C, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 52%, math 46%, writing 75%, science 29%, % learning gains: reading 54%, math 56%, adequate progress of lowest %: 66% reading, 66% math, AYP 79%. Stambaugh Middle 2009-2010: School Grade C, Percentage meeting high standards in reading 55%, math 54%, writing 87%, science 31%, % learning gains: reading 63%, math 66%, adequate progress of lowest 25%: 65% reading, 63% math, AYP 79%.

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. Regular meetings of new teachers with administrative team and/ or Academic Intervention Facilitator	Assistant Principal, AIF	On-going
2. Provide Professional Educator Competency (PEC) for qualifying teachers	Assistant Principal, AIF	PRN Basis
3. Review of C, Q, and HQ applicant list provided by the district office	Principal, Assistant Principal	PRN Basis

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

4. Soliciting referrals from colleagues and current employees	Principal, Assistant Principal	PRN Basis

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
5	All teachers who are out of field are completing their plan of study to resolve their out of field status.

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
54	4% (2)	50% (27)	31% (17)	15% (8)	30% (16)	100% (54)	19% (10)	0	20% (11)

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

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
Robin Hummel	Leigh Killian Kelly Deese Jennifer Hudson Lisa Rasnake-Henry	New Teacher/ Math/Reading AIF	Weekly Meetings

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-***Title I Schools Only**

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

Title I, Part A Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Stambaugh Middle School. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, support provides after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant students enrolled in Stambaugh Middle School will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

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

Title I, Part D Title I, Part D, provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.
Title II Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. Funds available to Stambaugh Middle School are used to purchase PD-360 for all staff members.
Title III Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff.
Title X- Homeless The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI unit(s) provided to Stambaugh Middle will enhance student achievement by providing an additional math teaching unit and a Math AIF to accommodate the learning needs of low performing students.
Violence Prevention Programs Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc.
Nutrition Programs This school is a summer funding program for the community.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. **Principal**: (**Required Member**) The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision –making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of PS/RtI; ensures that the school-based team is implementing PS/RtI; conducts assessment of PS/RtI skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support PS/RtI implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of PS/RtI school-wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based PS/RtI plans and activities. **Assistant Principal:** Assists Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of PS/RtI, further assists the principal in the assessment of PS/RtI skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning PS/RtI plans and activities. **Selected General Education Teachers**: (Recommend at least one Primary Teacher and one Intermediate Teacher) – Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2/3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. **Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers:** Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials/ instruction in tiered interventions; collaborates with general education teachers. **Academic Intervention Facilitator:** Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk," assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. **School Psychologist:** Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. **PS/RtI Behavior Representative (PBS):** Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. **Speech Language Pathologist:** Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills. **Guidance Counselor:** Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. **Technology Specialist:** Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display.

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/ coordinate MTSS efforts? The PS/RtI Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model. The PS/RtI Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities: ○ Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available. ○ Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement. ○ Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. ○ Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring. Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.
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 PS/RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.
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. Baseline data is gathered through August and September using Discovery Education and writing samples. Sixth through Eighth grade instructional data is also gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores. Progress Monitoring data is gathered mid-year and prior to FCAT through the Discovery Education assessment and additional writing samples. Other Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress as well as monitoring student behavior. Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through Discovery Education. End of Year data is gathered through FCAT. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the PS/RtI Leadership Team Meetings.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional learning will be provided during the teachers' common planning time and sessions will occur throughout the year. The PS/RtI Overview will be provided in mid-August/September. The District has five other mini-modules that will be provided throughout the year. The PS/RtI Leadership Team will evaluate additional staff Professional Learning needs during the monthly PS/RtI Leadership Team meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. An administrator will be present at each monthly PBS/MTSS meeting. Student and faculty incentives will be planned and implemented monthly. The PBS/MTSS team will solicit business partners to aide in providing incentices to students and teachers.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). ● Robert Hartley, Principal ● Todd Bennett, APC ● Robin Hummel, Math AIF ● Sharon Buss, LEA Facilitator ● Sharon Hood, Media Specialist ● Helen Bertges, ESOL Teacher ● Mark Fazio, Elective Department Chair ● Shermaine Gary, Science Department Chair ● Ismael Portillo, Social Studies Department Chair
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) generates aptitude of literacy knowledge within the school and to agree on literacy concerns at the school, create a plan, and course of action for addressing those concerns. . The Literacy Leadership Team meet once a month to discuss the impact of the initiatives set in place and continues to revisit our Literacy Action Plan and course of action for addressing those concerns.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? ● School-Wide Reading Literacy Initiative, whereas the content area and elective educators focus on extended reading passages on a revolving schedule. ● CISM implementation 1 time per month in reading, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science classrooms ● AR implementation in all Language Arts and Reading Classrooms. ● School-Wide Writing Literacy Initiative, whereas the content area and elective educators focus on daily summary point writing as well as writing to summarize from the extended reading passages. The Assistant Principal and AIF provides the staff with strategies, resources, and support to assist with implementing the Reading and Writing Initiative

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.

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

Our standards based curriculum emphasizes a school-wide rigorous reading initiative for all students, at all levels, and in every content area. Every teacher is expected to implement research-based instructional strategies identified by *Learning-Focused Solutions* into daily lessons. This implementation is ensured through daily classroom walk throughs and regularly scheduled lesson plan reviews.
All teachers are required to participate in professional development through PLCs, PD-360 and the Successful Practices Network to further enhance the use of research-based instructional strategies.
We adhere to the District's FCIM mini lessons in all subjects. While the reading teachers explicitly teach the monthly skill, all content area and elective teachers are expected to embed the skill within their daily lessons.
In addition all teachers are expected to participate in the reading and writing initiatives set forth by the Literacy Leadership Team.

High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Most students have limited vocabularies and limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level.	1A.1. Teachers plan and implement strategies for explicitly teaching vocabulary in context and building academic background knowledge	1A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) , and Discovery data.	1A.1 Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Reading Goal #1A: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 3 on FCAT Reading in 2012 will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 3 students increasing to 34% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24% (204)	**34% (292)**					
		1A.2. Some students are not authentically engaged.	1A.2. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies which authentically engage students. . Implement CISM in all content area classes A/R reading 25 minutes per day in L/A – Reading classes.	1A.2. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1A.2. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	1A.2. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	1B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	1B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	1B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	1B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		

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

16

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

Reading Goal #1B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 4,5, and 6 on FAA Reading in 2012 will score a level 4,5,6 or higher on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 4& 5.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100 % (12)	100% (12)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Most students are not reading and engaging with long, complex texts across the content areas and writing about what they're reading	2A.1. Teacher plan and implement Extended Reading Passages with FCAT STEMs and Write to Summarize Activities weekly in all reading classrooms and bi-monthly in all Science, Social Studies and Elective classes.	2A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning(Weekly), and Discovery data	2A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	
Reading Goal #2A: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 4 on FCAT Reading in 2012 will score a level 4 or higher on FCAT Reading in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 4 students increasing to 23% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	13% (114)	**23% (194)**				
		2A.2. Most students are not actively engaged in grade level, student centered activities across all content areas.	2A.2. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies to increase student engagement, teach the assessed curriculum and make grade level assignments for all students in all content areas	2A.2. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2A.2. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	2A.2 Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	

		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	2B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	2B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	2B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	2B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Reading Goal #2B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 7 on FAA Reading in 2012 will score a level 7 or higher on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 7 students increasing to 70% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	60% (9)	**70% (10)**					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement	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

for the following group:							
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills.	3A.1. Schedule AL 1 students in a blocked intensive reading class and all AL 2 students in an intensive reading class for explicit instruction in and time to read, comprehend, and write about the long, complex text they're reading. A/R reading 25 minutes per day in L/A – Reading classes.	3A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Reading Goal #3A: By spring 2013, 65% of all students will make learning gains as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55% (484)	**65% (572)**					

		3A.2. Some students may experience difficulty in thinking critically while reading, writing and/or understanding math and science.	3A.2. Teachers plan, integrate, and model Think-Aloud strategies in their classrooms. Implement CISM in all content area classes	3A.2. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3A.2. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3A.2. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.**	3B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	3B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	3B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	3B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	3B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Reading Goal #3B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students made gains on FAA Reading in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 35% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	25% (3)	35% (4)					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Students have difficulty making connections to the content.	4A.1. Teachers plan and teach students a structured approach for reading extended reading passages, and CISM. A/R reading 25 minutes per day in L/A – Reading classes.	4A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	4A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning(weekly), and Discovery data	4A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Reading Goal #4A: By spring 2013, 64% of all students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54% (118)	**64% (143)**					

		4A.2 . Students may have low reading comprehension and are unable to paraphrase and/or summarize text.	4A.2. Teachers plan and implement effective learning strategies including the use of graphic organizers and summarizing.	4A.2. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	4A.2. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	4A.2. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	4B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	4B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	4B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	4B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Reading Goal #4B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students made gains on FAA Reading in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 100% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75% (3)	100% (4)					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		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** **56%**	**38%**	**43%**	**48%**	**53%**	**58%**	**63%**
Reading Goal #5A: By the 2016-17 school year 63% (580) of the students will be at the proficient level in Reading.							
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. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Most students have limited vocabularies and limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level	5B.1. Teachers plan and implement strategies for explicitly teaching vocabulary in context and building academic background knowledge	5B.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5B.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

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

Reading Goal #5B: **By Spring 2013 all subgroups will meet their AMO as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White:44% Black:32% Hispanic:27% Asian:N/A American Indian:N/A	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: 55% Black: 35% Hispanic: 42% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A				
		5B.2. Students may have low reading comprehension and are unable to paraphrase and/or summarize text.	5B.2. Teachers schedule time for students to read in class where students choose what they read and are provided time to think and talk about the text using various instructional approaches such as Reciprocal Teaching, Literature Circles, Collaborative Pairs and/or Jigsaw.	5B.2. Same as above.	5B.2. Same as above.	5B.2. Same as above.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Most students have limited vocabularies and limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level	5C.1. Teachers plan and implement strategies for explicitly teaching vocabulary in context and building academic background knowledge	5C.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5C.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5C.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Reading Goal #5C: **By Spring 3013, 27% of ELL students will be proficient in Reading as evidenced on FCAT**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15%	26%					
		5C.2. Students may have low reading comprehension and are unable to paraphrase and/or summarize text.	5C.2. Teachers schedule time for students to read in class where students choose what they read and are provided time to think and talk about the text using various instructional approaches such as Reciprocal Teaching, Literature Circles, Collaborative Pairs and/or Jigsaw.	5C.2. Same as above.	5C.2. Same as above.	5C.2. Same as above.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.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		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Most students have limited vocabularies and limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level	5D.1. Teachers plan and implement strategies for explicitly teaching vocabulary in context and building academic background knowledge SWD will receive extra instruction on an individual level through the use of support facilitators in the regular ed. classroom and in pull-out sessions Implement Fast For Word strategies and best practices in L/A and reading classes daily.	5D.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF, LEA	5D.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5D.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Reading Goal #5D: **By Spring 3013, 27% of SWD students will be proficient in Reading as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	19%	27%					
		5D.2. Students may have low reading comprehension and are unable to paraphrase and/or summarize text.	5D.2. Teachers schedule time for students to read in class where students choose what they read and are provided time to think and talk about the text using various instructional approaches such as Reciprocal Teaching, Literature Circles, Collaborative Pairs and/or Jigsaw.	5D.2. Same as above.	5D.2. Same as above.	5D.2. Same as above.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Most students have limited vocabularies and limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level	5E.1. Teachers plan and implement strategies for explicitly teaching vocabulary in context and building academic background knowledge	5E.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5E.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5E.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Reading Goal #5E: **By Spring 3013, 40% of Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35%	40%					
		5E.2. Most students limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level.	5E.2. Teachers plan and implement strategies for building academic background knowledge.	5E.2. Same as above.	5E.2. Same as above.	5E.2. Same as above.	

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

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

		5E.3. Most students have limited receptive/ expressive language skills to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level.	5E.3. Teacher plan and implement strategies to address gaps in students' expressive and receptive language.	5E.3. Same as above.	5E.3. Same as above.	5E.3. Same as above.	

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
CISM	ALL	Mrs. Hummel	All teachers except PE	1 time per week in grade level subject area.	Classroom observations	Principal, APC
Collaborative Planning	ALL	Mrs. Hummel/Mr. Bennett	All Teachers	1 time per week in grade level subject area	Classroom observations	Principal, APC

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1,1A.2,1A.3,2A.2,2A.3,3A1,4A1,5A 1,5B1,5C1,5D1, 5E,1,5E2, 5E3	CISM	Title II	
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1,1A.2,1A.3,2A.2,2A.3,3A1,4A1,5A 1,5B1,5C1,5D1, 5E,1,5E2, 5E3	A/R license	Title I	3,500.00
Subtotal: 3,500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1,1A.2,1A.3,2A.2,2A.3,3A1,4A1,5A 1,5B1,5C1,5D1, 5E,1,5E2, 5E3	AIF Salary	Title I	54,000.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A.1,1A.2,1A.3,2A.2,2A.3,3A1,4A1,5A 1,5B1,5C1,5D1, 5E,1,5E2, 5E3	Reading Materials	Title I	8,000.00
Subtotal: 8,000.00			
67,500.00 Total:			

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level. Students have difficulty making connections to the content.	1.1. Utilize LFS strategies such as posting and referring to the LEQ during instruction, connecting to prior knowledge, and embedded assessments (assessment prompts, distributed summarization) to provide a focus to the lesson	1.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	1.1. Discovery, FCAT, and CELLA Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation	
CELLA Goal #1: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored proficient in listening / speaking in 2012 will score proficient in listening/ speaking in 2013with the overall percentage of proficient students increasing to 100% as evidenced by the CELLA Data Report.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	92% (11)					

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

		1.2. Most students have limited receptive/expressive language skills to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level.	1.2. Teacher plan and implement strategies to address gaps in students' expressive and receptive language.	1.2. Same as above.	1.2. Same as above	1.2. Same as above.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level. Students have difficulty making connections to the content.	2.1. Utilize LFS strategies such as posting and referring to the LEQ during instruction, connecting to prior knowledge, and embedded assessments (assessment prompts, distributed summarization) to provide a focus to the lesson	2.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	2.1. Discovery, FCAT, and CELLA Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation	
CELLA Goal #2: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored proficient in reading in 2012 will score proficient in reading in 2013 with the overall percentage of proficient students increasing to 70% as evidenced by the CELLA Data Report.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	58% (7)					

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

		2.2. Most students have limited receptive/expressive language skills to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level.	2.2. Teacher plan and implement strategies to address gaps in students' expressive and receptive language.	2.2. Same as above.	2.2. Same as above.	2.2. Same as above.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Most students have limited background knowledge to allow teachers to provide instruction at the grade or course level. Students have difficulty making connections to the content.	2.1. Utilize LFS strategies such as posting and referring to the LEQ during instruction, connecting to prior knowledge, and embedded assessments (assessment prompts, distributed summarization) to provide a focus to the lesson	2.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	2.1. Discovery, FCAT, and CELLA Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation	
CELLA Goal #3: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored proficient in writing in 2012 will score proficient in writing in 2013 with the overall percentage of proficient students increasing to 80% as evidenced by the CELLA Data Report.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	67% (8)					

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

		2.2. Students may have low reading comprehension and are unable to paraphrase and/or summarize text	2.2. Teachers schedule time for students to read in class where students choose what they read and are provided time to think and talk about the text using various instructional approaches such as Reciprocal Teaching, Literature Circles, Collaborative Pairs and/or Jigsaw.	2.2. Same as above.	2.2. Same as above.	2.2. Same as above.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
1.1,2.1	CISM	Title II	
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collaborative Planning	AIF Salary	Title I	54,000.00
1.1,2.1			
Subtotal: 54,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1,2.1	ELA Materials	Title I	3,000.00
Subtotal: 3,000.00			
57,000.00 Total:			

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

End of CELLA Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Most students are not actively engaged in the learning process.	1A.1. Teachers plan and implement instructional strategies to increase student interest and engagement using cooperative learning, interactive/ kinesthetic activities, student use of technology, and visual models/graphic organizers. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	1A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	1A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 3 on FCAT Math in 2012 will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 3 students increasing to 47% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report. *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
	37% (211)	47% (399)					
		1A.2. Low level of rigor and relevance in math classes	1A.2. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies to promote rigor and relevance by using HOT/Extended Thinking questions and increasing the use of real world problems. In addition, teachers plan and teach the **assessed curriculum** and make **grade level assignments** for all students in all math courses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	1A.2. Same as above.	1A.2. Same as above.	1A.2.. Same as above.	

		1A.3. Most students possess limited reading and writing skills.	1A.3. Teachers teach and use math vocabulary in context, implement word walls, and integrate the use of word problems, summarizing and summary point writing in daily lessons. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	1A.3. Same as above.	1A.3. Same as above.	1A.3. Same as above.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	1B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	1B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	1B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	1B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 4,5, and 6 on FAA Math in 2012 will score a level 4,5,6 or higher on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 4,5, and 6 students increasing to 100% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (12)	**100% (12)**					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1 Most students are not authentically engaged.	2A.1. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies which authentically engage students. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	2A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2A.1 Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	2A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 4or above on FCAT in 2012 will score a level 4 or higher on FCAT Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 4 or higher students increasing to 22% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	12% (100)	**22% (110)**					

		2A.2. Most students are not challenged with activities that require students to reason & problem solve.	2A.2. Teachers extend the assessed curriculum by focusing on college readiness standards, incorporating student centered learning/discovery and providing greater exposure to advanced problem solving technology. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	2A.2. Same as above.	2A.2. Same as above.	2A.2. Same as above.	
		2A.3. Low level of rigor in advanced math courses.	2A.3. Teachers extend the assessed curriculum and create advanced assignments in all advanced math courses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	2A.3. Same as above.	2A.3. Same as above.	2A.3. Same as above.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	2B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	2B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	2B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	2B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Mathematics Goal #2B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 7 on FAA Math in 2012 will score a level 7 or higher on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 7 students increasing to 76% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	66% (8)	76% (9)				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts.	3A.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3A.1 Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: By spring 2013, 71% of all students will make learning gains as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	61% (536)	**71% (624)**					

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

		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		Some students may need additional time to learn.	Schedule all AL 1 students into an intensive math block and all AL 2 students into a grade level math course with embedded intensive instruction for the purpose of explicit instruction, remediation and previewing of grade level content. Hire additional math teacher to accommodate the math blocks. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above	
		3A.3. Some students may experience difficulty in thinking critically while reading, writing and/or understanding math and science.	3A.3. Teachers plan, integrate, and model Think-Aloud strategies in their classrooms and require students to write to summarize daily. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3A.3. Same as above	3A.3. Same as above	3A.3. Same as above	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	3B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	3B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	3B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	3B.1 Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		

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

Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By spring 2013, 100% of all students made gains on FAA Math in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 35% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.							
	25% (3)	35% (5)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

4A. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4A.1. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts.	4A.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	4A.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	4A.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	4A.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	
Mathematics Goal #4A: By spring 2013, 72% of all students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	62% (136)	**72% (158)**				
		4A.2. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	4A.2. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	4A.2. Same as above.	4A.2. Same as above.	4A.2. Same as above.
		4A.3. Some students may need additional time to learn	4A.3. Provide before school tutoring to students.	4A.3. . Same as above.	4A.3. Same as above.	4A.3. Same as above.

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	4B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	4B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	4B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	4B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Mathematics Goal #4B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students made gains on FAA Math in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 75% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (2)	75% (3)					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 52%	38%	43%	48%	53%	58 63 %%	38%	43%	52%	53%	58 63 %%	38%	43%	58%	53%	58 63 %%	38%	43%	64%	53%	58 63 %%	3 8 %	4 3 %	7 0 %	5 5 3 8 %	6 8 3 %	3 8 %	4 3 %	7 6 %	5 5 3 8 %	6 8 3 %
Mathematics Goal #5A: By the 2016-17 school year 76% (672) of the students will be at the proficient level in Math.																															
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	**Anticipated Barrier**	**Strategy**					**Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring**					**Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy**					**Evaluation Tool**														

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts. 5B.2. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	5B.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF. 5B.2. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5B.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF 5B.2. Same as above.	5B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data 5B.2. Same as above.	5B.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Mathematics Goal #5B: **By Spring 2013 all subgroups will meet their AMO as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 42% Black: 22% Hispanic: 37% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 48% Black: 30% Hispanic: 42% Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A					
		5B.3. Some students may need additional time to learn	5B.3. Provide before school tutoring to students.	5B.3. Same as above.	5B.3. Same as above.	5B.3. Same as above.	

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. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts.	5C.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5C.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5C.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5C.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: **By Spring 3013, 34% of ELL students will be proficient in math as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29%	**34%**					

		5C.2. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	5C.2. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5C.2. Same as above.	5C.2. Same as above.	5C.2. Same as above.
		5C.3. Some students may need additional time to learn	5C.3. Provide before school tutoring to students.	5C.3. Same as above.	5C.3. Same as above.	5C.3. Same as above.
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. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts.	5D.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5D.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5D.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5D.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.	

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: **By Spring 3013, 31% of SWD students will be proficient in math as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18%	31%					
		5D.2. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	5D.2. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5D.2. Same as above.	5D.2. Same as above.	5D.2. Same as above.	
		5D.3. Some students may need additional time to learn	5D.3. Provide before school tutoring to students.	5D.3. Same as above.	5D.3. Same as above.	5D.3. Same as above.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Some students begin school year with below grade level skills and may not have mastered previous math concepts.	5E.1. Math teachers group students for differentiated instruction based upon student strengths and weaknesses. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5E.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	5E.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	5E.1. Discovery and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: **By Spring 3013, 40% of Economically disadvantaged students will be proficient in math as evidenced on FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	34%	40%					
		5E.2. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	5E.2. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	5E.2. Same as above.	5E.2. Same as above.	5E.2. Same as above.	

		5E.3. Some students may need additional time to learn	5E.3. Provide before school tutoring to students.	5E.3. Same as above.	5E.3. Sign-in sheets will be maintained to monitor student attendance in school tutoring.	5E.3. Sign-in Sheets.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	1.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	1.1 Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	1.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #1: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 3 on EOC in 2012 will score a level 3 or higher on EOC Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 3 or higher students increasing to 77% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	77% (94)	77% (100)				
		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	

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1	2.1. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	2.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	2.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	2.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	2.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Algebra Goal #2: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 4 on EOC in 2012 will score a level 4 or higher on EOC Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 4 or higher students increasing to 31% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	22% (21)	31% (23)					

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** **97%(94)**	**97**	**97**	**97**	**98**	**98**	**98**
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: By the 2016-17 school year 98% (95) of the students will be at the proficient level in Algebra I.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	3B.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3B.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3B.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	3E.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3E.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3E.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3E.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

* 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. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	1.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	1.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	1.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	1.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Geometry Goal #1: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 3 on EOC in 2012 will score a level 3 or higher on EOC Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 3 or higher students increasing to 95% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	95%(18)	**95% (18)**				
		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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
Geometry Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	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.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012** **94%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**97%**	**98%**	
Geometry Goal #3A: By the 2016-17 school year 98% (95) of the students will be at the proficient level in Geometry I.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	3B.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3B.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3B.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		
Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	

		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1. Students do not understand the math skills they are learning and/or have difficulty making connections to new math material.	3E.1. Teachers plan and implement effective and explicit instructional strategies to address the needs of struggling students and build academic background knowledge which include Think Aloud, Note-Taking, Graphic Organizers and Summarizing. Weekly planning sessions with Math AIF.	3E.1. Principal, APC, APA, AIF	3E.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly), and Discovery data	3E.1. Discovery, EOC, and FCAT Data, Stage 1 of teacher evaluation.		

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

Geometry Goal #3E: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who scored a level 3 on EOC in 2012 will score a level 3 or higher on EOC Math in 2013 with the overall percentage of level 3 or higher students increasing to 95% as evidenced by the FCAT Trend Data Report	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	95% (18)	100% (20)					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						

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

PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Collaborative Planning	ALL	Mrs. Hummel/Mr. Bennett	Math Teachers	1 time per week in grade level subject area	Classroom observations	Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF
Spring Board Training	ALL	District Office	Math Teachers	August – October 2012	Classroom observations and lesson plan analysis	Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.2	Big Ideas Textbooks/resources	Textbook funds	9042.00
Subtotal: 9042.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	Collaborative Planning	Title I	54,000.00
Subtotal: 54,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	Math Materials	Title I	1,800.00
	Before School Tutoring (teacher supplement)	Title I	6,850.00
	2 Additional Math Teachers	Title I	96,000.00
Subtotal: 158,650			Subtotal: 104,650.00
Total: 167,692.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Most students are not actively engaged in the learning process.	1A.1. Teachers plan and implement instructional strategies to increase student interest and engagement using cooperative learning, interactive/ kinesthetic activities, student use of technology, lab activities with written reports and visual models/graphic organizers.	1A.1. Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF, Department Chairs	1A.1. The Principal, APC, & APA walk through classrooms daily and do targeted observations at least monthly to coach and monitor teachers' in their implementation of the school's target strategies. Monthly PLCs will be held to make instructional decisions based upon review and discussion of baseline data, common assessments data (unit related and course pre-summative), and student work samples including, portfolios, journals/notebooks, reports, and projects.	1A.1. Administer Formative assessments to students in August/September, November/ December and February 2012-2013 (Discovery data) Administer Summative assessment (FCAT) in April 2013		

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

Science Goal #1A: By Spring 2013, 38% of the 8th grade students will score at or above an AL 3 in science as evidenced by FCAT Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	28% (80)	38% (108)					
		1A.2. Low level of rigor and relevance in science courses.	1A.2. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies to promote rigor and relevance by engaging students in scientific inquiry and scientific processes, collecting, using, and manipulating data and emphasizing real life relevance of science. In addition, teachers plan and teach the **assessed curriculum** and make **grade level assignments** for all students in all science courses.	1A.2. Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF, Department Chairs	1A.2. Same as above	1A.2. Same as above	
		1A.3. Most students possess low reading and writing skills.	1A.3. All science teachers plan and implement **Comprehension Instructional Sequence Module strategies** to make reading materials and reading and writing activities relevant to these students.	1A.3. Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF, Department Chairs	1A.3. Same as above	1A.3. Same as above	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	1B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	1B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	1B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	1B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		

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

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

Science Goal #1B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students made 4,5, and 6 on FAA Science in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2012 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 35% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	35 % (4)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Most students are not authentically engaged.	2A.1. Using the EATS lesson plan model, teachers plan and integrate effective instructional strategies which challenge and authentically engage students.	2A.1. Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF, Department Chairs	2A.1 The Principal, APC, & APA walk through classrooms daily and do targeted observations at least monthly to coach and monitor teachers' in their implementation of the school's target strategies. Monthly PLCs will be held to make instructional decisions based upon review and discussion of baseline data, common assessments data (unit related and course pre-summative), and student work samples including, portfolios, journals/notebooks, reports, and projects.	2A.1. Administer Formative assessments to students in August/September, November/ December and February 2012-2013 (Discovery data) Administer Summative assessment (FCAT) in April 2013		

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

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

Science Goal #2A: By Spring 2013, 5% of the 8th grade students will score an AL of 4/5in science as evidenced by FCAT Trend Data Report	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	4% (12)	5% (14)					
		2A.2. Most students are not challenged with activities that require critical thinking skills.	2A.2. Teachers extend the assessed curriculum by focusing on college readiness standards, incorporating student centered learning/discovery and providing greater exposure to advanced problem solving technology, and make advanced assignments in all advanced science courses.	2A.2. Same as above.	2A.2. Same as above.	2A.2. Same as above.	
		2A.3. Low level of writing expectations for advanced science courses.	2A.3. Writing will be infused into science classes regularly by students learning to draft and write within inquiry based activities. Some examples include: lab reports, reflection journals, technical writing, and other scientific and literature based writings.	2A.3. Same as above.	2A.3. Same as above.	2A.3. Same as above.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	2B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	2B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	2B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	2B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		

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

Science Goal #2B: By spring 2013, 100% of all students who made 4,5, and 6 on FAA Science in 2012 will make gains on the FAA in 2013 with the overall percentage of students making gains to 40% as evidenced by the FAA Trend Data Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% (4)	40% (5)					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Biology 1 Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	Science Materials	Operational Supply	5,442.00
Subtotal: 5,442.00			
Total: 5,442.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT: **Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.**	1A.1. Most students possess low writing skills.	1A.1. Implement RAFT (Role-Audience-Format-Topic) in LA classes & non-LA for helping students acquire voice and respond to Essential Questions and HOT questions. Implement summary writing in content area classes based on response to EQ's, acquisition point questions, and HOT questions.	1A.1. Administer Formative assessments to students in August/September, October, and January/February 2012-2013 Administer Summative assessment (FCAT) in February/March 2013	1A.1. The Principal, APC, & APA **walk through** classrooms **daily** and do targeted **observations** at least **monthly** to **coach** and **monitor** teachers' in their implementation of the school's target strategies. Monthly PLCs will be held to make instructional decisions based upon review and discussion of baseline data, common assessments data (unit related and course pre-summative), and student work samples including, portfolios, journals/notebooks, reports, and projects	1A.1. Principal, APC, APA, Math AIF		
Writing Goal #1A: By spring 2013, 90% of all 8th grade students will score an AL 3.0 or higher as evidenced by the School Grade Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 68% (193)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 90% (256)					

		1A.2. Most students are not actively engaged in grade level, authentic writing activities across all content areas.	1A.2. Implement research writing activities in content area classes based on response to Essential Questions and HOT questions, formatted as 4-paragraph essay.	1A.2. Same as above	1A.2. Same as above	1A.2. Same as above	
		1A.3. Low expectations of written work.	1A.3. Implement the use of a **standard rubric** for writing across the curriculum in all **content areas**	1A.3. Same as above	1A.3. Same as above	1A.3. Same as above	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**	1B.1. Failure to implement the curriculum provided by the district: PCI, Sonday, TouchMath, MEville to WEville, Access Science	1B.1. Implement the curriculum by the district and use pacing guide to ensure that all access points have been taught prior to the testing window.	1B.1. Principal, APC, APA, LEA	1B.1. Classroom Observations, Collaborative planning (weekly) and Data summary reports	1B.1. Data Summary reports, FAA data, and Stage 1 of teacher evaluation		
Writing Goal #1B: By spring 2012, 10% of all 8th grade students will score an AL 4.0 or higher as evidenced by the School Grade Report and Adequate Yearly Progress Report.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	**10% (2)**					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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
Collaborative planning	All Grade L/A	Mrs. Hummel & Mr. Bennett	L/A teachers	Weekly	Classroom observations, lesson plans, and Polk-Writes	Principal, APC, APA, AIF

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1A1, 1A2, 1A3	Collaborative planning (AIF)	Title I	54,000.00
Subtotal: 54,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: 54,000.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

Civics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
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:						
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.						
Civics Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

1.1,1.2,1.3,2.1,2.2	Smart response system	Title I	8,000.00
Subtotal: 8,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Attendance	1.1. Students feeling disenfranchised	1.1. Provide extra-curricular activities to promote student engagement/ involvement. Continue having Guidance Counselors monitor student grades, attendance, and behavior.	1.1. Principal, APA, APC, Deans, MTSS team	1.1. Attendance Records Data Collection will be used to monitor changes in attendance rates. All data will be reviewed and discussed by the MTSS Team during monthly meetings.	1.1. GENESIS Attendance Mgr. Reports		
Attendance Goal #1: Our goal at Stambaugh Middle School is to facilitate positive behavior change in our staff and students through the application of a "Response to Intervention" (RTI) approach to student attendance. Based on 2012 attendance data, by spring of 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive absences (376) by 15% By spring of 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive tardies (344) by 25%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	93.32% (823)	95% (840)					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	43% (376)	36% (319)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	39% (344)	25% (258)					
		1.2. No Parent Communication (Lack of Parental Involvement)	1.2. Utilize school social worker, Connect-ed, and other resources.	1.2. Same as above.	1.2. Same as above.	1.2. Same as above.	
		1.3. Students feeling bullied/ threatened/peer pressure	1.3. School-wide lessons and preventions are being taught during the first week of school and periodically throughout the school year.	1.3. Same as above.	1.3. Same as above.	1.3. Same as above.	

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						

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Procedures	All	APA	All Teachers	Monthly	Data reports monthly	APA

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.0,1.2,1.3	Incentives	Internal Accounts	700.00
Subtotal: 700.00			

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

	Total: 700.00			

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	

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

| 1. Suspension | 1.1.
Students lacking acceptable social skills. | 1.1.
Continuous Explicit Instruction of Appropriate/ Inappropriate Behaviors:

• Teachers will teach expectations (BARK) and social skills to all students in the first week of school and periodically throughout the school year.

• Grade level assemblies will be conducted to teach students expectations (BARK) and social skills.

• SMSTV will role play both examples and non-examples of student expectations. | 1.1.
Principal, APA, APC, Deans, MTSS team | 1.1.
Data Collection will be used to monitor changes in suspension rates. All data will be reviewed and discussed by the MTSS Team during monthly meetings. | 1.1.
GENESIS

Attendance Mgr. Reports | | |

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

Suspension Goal #1: Our goal at Stambaugh Middle School is to facilitate positive behavior change in our staff and students through the application of a "Response to Intervention" (RTI) approach to student behavior Based on the 2012 data, by spring of 2013, the number of "Out-of-School Suspensions" will be reduced by 10% (775). By spring of 2013, the number of Students Suspended Out-of-School will be reduced by 10% (220).	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	N/A	N/A					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	N/A	N/A					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	862	775					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	29% (245)	10% (220)					

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

| | | 1.2.
Peer Pressure | 1.2.
Students who display acceptable social skills will be rewarded by the school's "TOP DOG" program as well as the use of "STAR" cards. | 1.2.
Same as above. | 1.2.
Same as above. | 1.2.
Same as above. | |
| | | 1.3.
Students having difficulty handling adverse situation between themselves and adults | 1.3.
Implementation of PBS strategies consistently by all staff members. | 1.3.
Same as above. | 1.3.
Same as above. | 1.3.
Same as above. | |

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
Teacher managed vs. Office managed behaviors	All	APA	All Teachers	Monthly	Monthly	APA

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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
1.1,1.2,1.3	PBS Incentives	ESE Dept.	700.00
Subtotal: 700.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: 700.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1,1.2,1.3	Incentives	Internal Accounts	500.00
Subtotal: 500.00			
Total: 1,200.00			

End of Suspension Goals

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)).

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

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. Parents have problems participating in events after work because of dinner conflicts.	1.1. Provide dinner so that families can participate in academic meetings at school after work. Provide varied meeting times to ensure that there is a time for each family to participate in academic meetings after school.	1.1. Principal, APA, APC, Title I Facilitator	1.1. Sign-in sheets for meetings	1.1. Total the number of parents that participated in academic meetings at school.		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Participation by parents at building capacity activities will increase by 20% (from 10% to 30%)	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	10% (80)	30% (240)					

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

		1.2. Parents are not aware of meetings and activities at school.	1.2. Send a Title I newsletter quarterly, and send connected. messages each time there is a meeting.	1.2. Same as above.	1.2. Same as above.	1.2. Total the number of parents that participated in academic meetings at school.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1,1.2	Parent Report card nights	Title I	7,000.00
Subtotal: 7,000.00			
Total: 7,000.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Goal #1: **At Stambaugh Middle School we want to increase the number of STEM students from 18.6 % (165) to 25% (220) by the 2013 school year.**	1.1. Students lack the academic skills to be successful in the STEM program.	1.1. Teachers will increase the rigor for all students.	1.1. Principal, APC, APA, and AIF	1.1. Classroom observations and walk-throughs.	1.1. Teacher evaluations, Student enrollment in STEM program
	1.2. Students lack the drive to push themselves to be successful in the STEM program.	1.2. STEM students will be rewarded by our MTSS program for positive results in the STEM program.	1.2. Principal, APC, APA, and AIF	1.2. Grade reports, and behavior tracking	1.2. Top Dog program, and enrollment in STEM program
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: At Stambaugh Middle school we will provide a rigorous and relevant CTE curriculum leading to increased student achievement and graduation rates.	1.1. Plans lack alignment to state standards, lack rigorous learning, and do not permit valid and reliable assessment. There is a lack of alignment with secondary credit	1.1. Teachers will meet weekly in PLC's to align curriculum with standards.	1.1. Principal, APA, APC	1.1. Classroom observation and PLC/ Academy notes	1.1. Stage I evaluations and lesson plan/academy analysis
	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					

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

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

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
Coolaborative Planning	All	APC	All CTE/Academy Teachers	Weekly	Classroom observation/ PLC/Academy notes	Principal, APC, APA

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1	Computer lab	Perkins funding	28,000.00
Subtotal: 28,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1	WE3 Expo	FORD grant	5,500.00
Subtotal: 5,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
1.1	Textbooks for academy classes	Flex Textbook funds	6500.00
Subtotal: 6,500.00			
Total: 40,000.00			

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through						

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: 67,500.00
CELLA Budget
Total: 57,000.00
Mathematics Budget
Total: 167,692.00
Science Budget
Total: 5,442.00
Writing Budget
Total: 54,000.00
Civics Budget
Total: 8,000.00
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total: 700.00
Suspension Budget
Total: 1,200.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: 7,000.00
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total: 40,000.00
Additional Goals
Total:

| | | **Grand Total: 408,534.00** |

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	X Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

X▢ Yes   ▢ No

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

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

The School Advisory Council is a dedicated group of individuals comprised of community members, school staff, parents and students. This council is required to operate under the Sunshine Law; therefore, the date, time and place of all meetings are publicized. District and state guidelines for election and voting processes are strictly adhered to. A minimum of our meetings are held per year on Wednesday mornings at 7:30 a.m. in the school media center. Members of the SAC are elected by peer vote during the month of August. Parents and community members are elected by a peer parent group, and faculty members are elected by the faculty. Students are also encouraged to attend the meetings as voting members. One of the major duties of the SAC is to play an active part in contributing to and monitoring the School Improvement process. Throughout the school year, elements of the SIP are presented, reviewed, discussed and monitored for overall effectiveness. In addition, the SAC shares responsibility with the administrative team in creating school-based policies for Stambaugh Middle School.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
N/A	