

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: : Dr. Phillips High School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Eugene P. Trochinski	Superintendent: Barbara M. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Robin & Riley O' Donnell	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Eugene P. Trochinski	Bachelor of Science-Physical Education Master of Education-Educational Leadership Certifications – Physical Education K- 8 Physical Education 6-12 Drivers Education Endorsement School Principal all levels	11.5	13.5	<p>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)</p> <p>2011-2012 – “A” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “B” – AYP 67% (Dr. Phillips HS) 55% of students reading at or above grade level 76% of students at or above grade level in math 80% of students at or above grade level in writing 50% of students at or above grade level in science 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 46% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2009-2010 – “B” – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 56% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 50% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2008-2009 – “B” – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 80% of students at or above grade level in math 90% of students at or above grade level in writing</p>

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

					<p>59% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 42% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2007-2008 – "A" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 60% of students reading at or above grade level 81% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 61% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 48% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2006-2007 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 54% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 41% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 45% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2005-2006 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 51% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2004-2005 – "B" – AYP 70% (Dr. Phillips HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 70% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

					<p>74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2003-2004 – "C" – AYP 57% (Dr. Phillips HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 94% of students at or above grade level in writing 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 39% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2002-2003 – "B" – (Dr. Phillips HS) 43% of students reading at or above grade level 69% of students at or above grade level in math 94% of students at or above grade level in writing 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 51% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2001-2002 – "C" – (Dr. Phillips HS) 40% of students reading at or above grade level 64% of students at or above grade level in math 95% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 67% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 49% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2000-2001 – "A" – (Dr. Phillips HS) 1999-2000 – "B" – (Southwest MS)</p>
Assistant Principal	Bridget O. Bresk	Bachelor of Science- Social Sciences Master of Science- Educational Leadership Certifications – Social Science 6-12 School Principal all levels	1.25	1.25	<p>2011-2012 – "A" – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes</p>

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

					<p>AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “A” – AYP 77% (Winter Park HS) 65% of students reading at or above grade level 83% of students at or above grade level in math 84% of students at or above grade level in writing 60% of students at or above grade level in science 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 45% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>
Assistant Principal	Alisa N. Dorsett	<p>Bachelor of Science – Accounting Master of Education- Educational Leadership Certifications – Mathematics 5-9 School Principal all levels</p>	8	8	<p>2011-2012 – “A” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “B” – AYP 67% (Dr. Phillips HS) 55% of students reading at or above grade level 76% of students at or above grade level in math 80% of students at or above grade level in writing 50% of students at or above grade level in science 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 46% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2009-2010 – “B” – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 56% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>

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

					<p>50% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2008-2009 – "B" – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 80% of students at or above grade level in math 90% of students at or above grade level in writing 59% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 42% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2007-2008 – "A" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 60% of students reading at or above grade level 81% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 61% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 48% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2006-2007 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 54% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 41% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 45% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2005-2006 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 51% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2004-2005 – “B” – AYP 70% (Dr. Phillips HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 70% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p>
Assistant Principal	Lenore A. Guastella	<p>Bachelor of Arts – Mathematics Education Master of Education- Mathematics Education Doctor of Education- Educational Leadership Certifications – Mathematics 6-12 School Principal all levels</p>	10	14	<p>2011-2012 – “A” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “B” – AYP 67% (Dr. Phillips HS) 55% of students reading at or above grade level 76% of students at or above grade level in math 80% of students at or above grade level in writing 50% of students at or above grade level in science 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 46% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2009-2010 – “B” – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 56% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>

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

					<p>50% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2008-2009 – "B" – AYP 74% (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 80% of students at or above grade level in math 90% of students at or above grade level in writing 59% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 42% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2007-2008 – "A" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 60% of students reading at or above grade level 81% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 61% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 48% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2006-2007 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 54% of students reading at or above grade level 78% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 41% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 45% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2005-2006 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 51% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>76% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 56% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2004-2005 – “B” – AYP 70% (Dr. Phillips HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 70% of students at or above grade level in math 88% of students at or above grade level in writing 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 58% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2003-2004 – “C” – AYP 57% (Dr. Phillips HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 94% of students at or above grade level in writing 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 39% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2002-2003 – “B” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 43% of students reading at or above grade level 69% of students at or above grade level in math 94% of students at or above grade level in writing 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 51% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2001-2002 – “A” – (Southwest MS) 67% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students at or above grade level in math 90% of students at or above grade level in writing 71% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 75% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading</p> <p>2000-2001 – “A” – (Southwest MS) 1999-2000 – “B” – (Southwest MS) 1998-1999 – “B” – (Southwest MS)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

Assistant Principal	Douglas Ralph	<p>Bachelor of Science-Industrial Technology Masters of Science-Management Doctor of Education-Educational Leadership Certifications – Technology Education 6-12 School Principal all levels</p>	1.25	13	<p>2011-2012 – “A” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “C” – AYP 62% (East River HS) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 41% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 72% of students at or above grade level in math 69% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 81% of students are meeting state standards in writing 34% of students at or above grade level in Science 50% of 11th and 12th grade students passed the FCAT Reading Retake 49% of 11th and 12th grade students passed the FCAT Math Retake</p> <p>2009-2010 – “D” – AYP 59% (East River HS) 40% of students reading at or above grade level 45% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 42% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 71% of students at or above grade level in math 69% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 82% of students are meeting state standards in writing 30% of students at or above grade level in Science</p> <p>2008-2009 – “A” – AYP 85% (Maitland MS) 78% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 57% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in</p>
---------------------	---------------	---	------	----	---

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

					<p>reading 79% of students at or above grade level in math 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 92% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2007-2008 – "A" – AYP 97% (Maitland MS) 83% of students reading at or above grade level 70% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 85% of students at or above grade level in math 81% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 98% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2006-2007 – "A" – AYP 87% (Maitland MS) 78% of students reading at or above grade level 62% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 80% of students at or above grade level in math 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 94% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2005-2006 – "C" – AYP 74% (Edgewater HS) 42% of students reading at or above grade level 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 73% of students at or above grade level in math 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 84% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2004-2005 – "C" – AYP 73% (Edgewater HS) 37% of students reading at or above grade level 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 69% of students at or above grade level in math 78% of students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

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

					<p>82% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2003-2004 – “D” – AYP 50% (Edgewater HS) 39% of students reading at or above grade level 51% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 49% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of students at or above grade level in math 72% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 93% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2002-2003 – “C” – AYP N/A (Edgewater HS) 38% of students reading at or above grade level 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 49% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of students at or above grade level in math 68% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 91% of students are meeting state standards in writing</p> <p>2001-2002 – “N/A” – AYP N/A (Hungerford Prep. HS) 33% of students reading at or above grade level 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of students at or above grade level in math 73% of students making a year's worth of progress in math</p>
Assistant Principal	Jackie S. Ramsey	<p>Bachelor of Science- Social Sciences Master of Science- Educational Leadership Certifications – Social Science 6-12 Athletic Coaching Endorsement School Principal all levels</p>	3	6	<p>2011-2012 – “A” – (Dr. Phillips HS) 57% of students reading at or above grade level 57% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing NA of students at or above grade level in science 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 62% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “B” – AYP 69% (Freedom HS) 50% of students reading at or above grade level 75% of students at or above grade level in math 92% of students at or above grade level in writing 51 of students at or above grade level in science</p>

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

					<p>54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 78% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 49% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2009-2010 – "A" – AYP 69% (Freedom HS) 50% of students reading at or above grade level 76% of students at or above grade level in math 87% of students at or above grade level in writing 49% of students at or above grade level in science 55% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 78% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 50% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 61% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2008-2009 – "B" – AYP 90%(Freedom HS) 51% of students reading at or above grade level 77% of students at or above grade level in math 78% of students at or above grade level in writing 47% of students at or above grade level in science 58% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 80% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 52% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2007-2008 – "A" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 60% of students reading at or above grade level 81% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 53% of students at or above grade level in science 61% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 48% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math</p> <p>2006-2007 – "B" – AYP 69% (Dr. Phillips HS) 54% of students reading at or above grade level</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

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

					78% of students at or above grade level in math 89% of students at or above grade level in writing 41% of students at or above grade level in science 57% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 45% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math
--	--	--	--	--	---

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)
Biology (6-12) Earth/Space (6-12) Mathematics (5-9)	Sarah B. Baxter	B.S. Secondary Science and Mathematics Teaching M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction	1	2	<p>2011-2012 – “B” – AYP 62% (East River High School) 38% of students reading at or above grade level 64% of students at or above grade level in math 94% of students at or above grade level in writing 34 % of students at tier 1, 31% of students at tier 2, and 35% of students at tier 3, with an average of 49% in Biology 47 % of students at tier 1, 35% of students at tier 2, and 18% of students at tier 3, with an average of 45% in Geometry 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 41% of the lowest 25% students making a year's worth of progress in reading 55% of the lowest 25% students making a year's worth of progress in math AMO Math Target Met – Yes AMO Reading Target Met - No</p> <p>2010-2011 – “C” – AYP 62% (East River High School) 45% of students reading at or above grade level 46% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 41% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 72% of students at or above grade level in math 69% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 55% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 81% of students are meeting state standards in writing 34% of students at or above grade level in Science 50% of 11th and 12th grade students passed the FCAT Reading Retake 49% of 11th and 12th grade students passed the FCAT Math Retake</p> <p>2009-2010 – “D” – AYP 59% (East River High School) 40% of students reading at or above grade level 45% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 42% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 71% of students at or above grade level in math 69% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 82% of students are meeting state standards in writing 30% of students at or above grade level in Science</p> <p>2008-2009 Timber Creek High School was a B (505 points) 69% AYP 2007-2008 Timber Creek High School was a C (533 points) 74% AYP 2006-2007 Timber Creek High School was a B (512 points) 85% AYP</p>

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

					2005-2006 Timber Creek High School was a C (394 points) 74% AYP

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Mentor-Mentee training(via Title II) for teachers who are new to teaching	Reading Coach	May 2013
2. Send teachers to conferences/ trainings within district	Reading Coach	May 2013
3. Provide in- house training sessions for teachers	Reading Coach, Testing Coordinator, RTI Coordinator	May 2013
4. Rigorous hiring process matching certification to position	Administrative team	Ongoing

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None out of field	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
198	6.5%[13]	44%[88]	28%[55]	21[42]	44%[88]	98%	7%[14]	6%[12]	9%[18]

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
Priscilla Long	Oleysa Benson	Long is an experienced science teacher who will help Benson learn the Physical Science curriculum, order of instruction, and other science teaching best practices.	OCPS Great Beginnings, New Teacher Orientation, Beginning Teacher Portfolio, PLC meetings, monthly new teacher trainings and meetings with embedded FEAP coverage.
Elvira Tomlin	Jiordnie Francois	Tomlin is an experienced science teacher who will help Francois learn the Chemistry	OCPS Great Beginnings, New Teacher Orientation, Beginning Teacher

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

		curriculum, order of instruction, and other science teaching best practices.	Portfolio, PLC meetings, monthly new teacher trainings and meetings with embedded FEAP coverage.
Teresa Ault	Christine Gutierrez	Ault is an experienced math teacher who will help Gutierrez learn the Algebra II curriculum, order of instruction, and other math teaching best practices.	OCPS Great Beginnings, New Teacher Orientation, Beginning Teacher Portfolio, PLC meetings, monthly new teacher trainings and meetings with embedded FEAP coverage.
Gregory Keith	Traci Cole	Keith is an experienced math teacher who will help Highland learn the Geometry and Algebra II curriculum, order of instruction, and other math teaching best practices.	OCPS Great Beginnings, New Teacher Orientation, Beginning Teacher Portfolio, PLC meetings, monthly new teacher trainings and meetings with embedded FEAP coverage.
Joel Dobrowolski	Letitia Branz	Dobrowolski is an experienced math teacher who will help Branz learn the Geometry and Prob. & Stat. curriculum, order of instruction, and other math teaching best practices.	OCPS Great Beginnings, New Teacher Orientation, Beginning Teacher Portfolio, PLC meetings, monthly new teacher trainings and meetings with embedded FEAP coverage.

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Principal Reading /Instructional Coach School Psychologist District RtI Coordinator ESOL Compliance Specialist Speech and Language Pathologist Inclusion Coach New Horizon Counselor Staffing Specialist Deans and Counselors</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?</p> <p>RtI team members meet during Educational Planning Team meetings to discuss individual students' progress and plan twice/month and as needed by request of parents. RTI Coordinator and Reading/Instructional Coach provide Tier III intervention sessions to selected few students on every Tuesdays and Thursdays (1 hour/day; 4 hours/week). RtI Coordinator and Reading/Instructional Coach provide Tier II interventions to selected 10th grade Language Arts teachers on Tuesdays and Thursdays (2 hours/day; 8 hours/week). RtI Coordinator and Reading/Instructional Coach provide RtI training and needs based tiered intervention support to all teachers.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>District RtI Coordinator and the Reading Coach will provide school-wide training on RtI to all instructional personnel, Deans, and Counselors. The District RtI Coordinator will meet with selected Language Arts teachers to review their class data will design an intervention map based on this data and student needs. Twice a week the RtI Coordinator and the Reading Coach will attend these identified classes and they will work with the identified teachers and students in reference to the tiered Instructional/Assessments setup, delivery and follow through. They will both work with selected students to provide Tier II intervention (one-on-one) twice weekly. The school RtI team will meet to de-brief, review, revise, and set-up interventions according to the needs of the students requiring interventions.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Reading - FAIR (lexile range and vocabulary level), FCAT (reading levels), and OCPS Benchmark Assessments. Mathematics - FAIR (lexile range and vocabulary level), FCAT (reading levels), FCAT (mathematics levels), Algebra I EOC (proficiency levels), Geometry EOC (proficiency levels), and OCPS Benchmark Assessments. Science - FAIR (lexile range and vocabulary level), FCAT (reading levels), Biology EOC (proficiency levels), and OCPS Benchmark Assessments. Writing - FAIR (lexile range and vocabulary level), FCAT (reading levels), and OCPS Benchmark Assessments. Behavior – Student Referrals and Detention Records</p>

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The RtI team will have the initial RtI training. Then the RtI Coordinator and Reading/Instructional Coach will conduct a school wide RtI training. Make-up sessions will be held after school the following week. Additional sessions after school will be provided based on an individual teacher's class data and their student's needs. Need-based tiered intervention support will be provided throughout the academic year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal Administrative Team Instructional/Reading Coach Media Specialist Curriculum Leaders PLC Leaders
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Leadership Team will meet once a month to discuss the literacy needs of our students, provide examples of research-based strategies and review data to ensure that literacy is a focus in all content areas. The Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Curriculum Leaders, and PLC Leaders will share the information learned at the LLT Meetings with the faculty.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? An intense focus on student achievement via literacy within all content areas including, but not limited to, school-wide Literacy Activities such as: Student Reader of the Month Faculty Reader of the Month Author's Visits (Neal Shusterman – Unwind and Unwholly) Reading Class Mentors Book Reviews

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

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

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

**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?

Implementation of Common Core Literacy Standards

Progress monitoring of student success in reading via Benchmark/ FAIR Assessment data(PLC/LG based)

Sharing of FCAT Reading, FAIR data via PLC/LG to design data driven instructions (emphasis on effective reading) in all content areas

Sharing of FCAT Reading data to ALL teachers via PLC/LG to identify level 1 and 2 students, identify their learning needs to design lessons accordingly(skill specific) and to improve their Reading skills.

**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?

Students can take a variety of vocationally based classes that incorporates academic classes with the practical experiences. Dual enrollment classes at vocational centers, vocational classes at exceptional education centers, curriculum based instructional classes at local businesses and vocational type classes at the school site give students experiences to apply academics learned to future job experiences.

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?

Students meet several times each year with their guidance counselors to update their high school graduation plan. During the spring counselors work with students in the selection process of classes to meet their 4 year plan as well as post high school plans. The guidance department provides for students meeting times with college visitation/ recruiters from various colleges through the year.

Postsecondary Transition

October 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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](#).

Students are strongly encouraged to take rigorous classes that prepare them for college/Bright Futures award, dual enrollment classes, advanced placement /advanced level courses, and vocational/ technical education. All 10th grade students take the PSAT to prepare for the SAT. All students completing Algebra II are encouraged to take the College Placement test (PERT) for eligibility college readiness or college level classes. School trend data show that from 2008 – 2010 an increase each year in the number of graduates completing a college prep curriculum, increase number of graduates eligible for Maximum Bright Futures award and increased number of graduates completing at least one AP, AICE, or dual enrollment class.

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. Drop in attendance/enrollment in rigorous classes.	1A.1. Monitor students movement/class changes	1A.1. Assistant principal for Instruction Guidance department	1A.1. Work with guidance to have a consistent schedule change policy.	1A.1. list / percentage of students with schedule changes
Reading Goal #1A: <i>By July 2013, 24%[450] of all students taking the FCAT Reading test will score at Level 3</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 22% [412]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 24% [450]					
			1A.2. Incorporating new reading programs using differentiated instruction	1A.2. Monitored through 9 th Grade Language Arts LG 10 th Grade Language Arts LG Reading LG	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	1A.2. 9 th and 10 th grade English teachers collaborate in LGs to create mandatory common assessments, 3 per 9 weeks.	1A.2. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
			1A.3. Increase student performance with Informational Text and the Research Process	1A.3. School wide focuses on Reading in the Content. Reading and Common Core Literacy Standards staff development for Core content departments by Reading Coach and Common Core team.	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	1A.3. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	1A.3. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. Increased ESE population with variety of disabilities.	1B.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	1B.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	1B.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	1B.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
Reading Goal #1B: <i>By July 2013, 55% [13] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Reading test will score above Level 3.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 50% [12]	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 55% [13]					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Increased use of rigorous content	2A.1. School wide focuses on Reading in the Content. Reading and Common Core Literacy Standards staff development for Core content departments by Reading Coach and Common Core team.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	2A.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	2A.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 35% [656] of all students taking the FCAT Reading test will score at or above Level 4.</i>	35%[656]	35%[656]					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. . Incorporating rigorous reading programs using differentiated instruction	2B.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	2B.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	2B.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	2B.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 30% [8] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Reading test will score at or above Level 7.</i>	28%[7]	30%[8]					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. . Incorporating new reading programs using differentiated instruction	3A.1. . Monitored through 9 th Grade Language Arts LG 10 th Grade Language Arts LG Reading LG	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	3A.1. 9 th and 10 th grade English teachers collaborate in LGs to create mandatory common assessments, 3 per 9 weeks.	3A.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 66% [1237] of all students will make learning gains in FCAT Reading.</i>	64%[1199]	66% [1237]					
			3A.2. Increase student performance with Informational Text and the Research Process	3A.2. . School wide focuses on Reading in the Content. Reading and Common Core Literacy Standards staff development for Core content departments by Reading Coach and Common Core team.	3A.2. . Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	3A.2. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	3A.2. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. Incorporating rigorous reading programs using differentiated instruction	3B.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	3B.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	3B.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	3B.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments, data from Alternative Assessment report
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 75% [19] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Reading test will make learning gains.</i>	71%[18]	75%[19]					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Use of new program Achieve 3000 and delayed computer labs to support reading programs.	4A.1. Use of 9 th grade reading programs Academy of Reading, Journeys for ELL students and Achieve 3000. In 10 th grade reading programs Fast Forward Achieve 3000 and Journeys.	4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	4A.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	4A.1. Data from: programs summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> <i>By July 2013, 66% [1237] of all students identified in the lowest 25% taking the FCAT Reading test will make learning gains.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 64% [1199]	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 66% [1237]					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2010-2011	Reading- Target AMO 62%		Reading- Target AMO 66%	Reading- Target AMO 69%	Reading- Target AMO 73%	Reading- Target AMO 76%	Reading- Target AMO 80%	
	Reading Goal #5A: <i>By July 2013, the Reading Annual Measurable Objective is 66%[1237].</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. Intensive reading enhancement from pairs of administration and support personnel.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	5B.1. LG Meetings	5B.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments	
Reading Goal #5B: <i>By July 2013, the current level of performance for each subgroup in Reading will increase.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White:83% Black:40% Hispanic:60% Asian:74% American Indian: NA	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White:84% Black:45% Hispanic:63% Asian:77% American Indian:NA						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	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. Diverse nature of transient and immigrant population.	5C.1. Provide sheltered classes as needed.	5C.1. . ESOL English teachers	5C.1. One on one with ESOL and reading teacher	5C.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
Reading Goal #5C: <i>By July 2013, the Annual Measurable Objective for ELL students in Reading is 43%[168]</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 38%[148]	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 43%[168]					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.Limited support through inclusion model	5D.1. Inclusion model and learning strategies classes	5D.1.English and ESE consultation teachers	5D.1. Monitoring by Inclusion coach	5D.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
Reading Goal #5D: <i>By July 2013, the Annual Measurable Objective for SWD students in Reading is 40%[118]</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 34% [100]	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 40% [118]					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Increased homeless population	5E.1. Intensive reading enhancement from pairs of administration and support personnel.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ Reading Reading Coach LG Leaders English Dept Chair	5E.1. LG Meetings	5E.1. Data from: Common formative and summative assessments Edusoft Benchmark Exams Edusoft Mini-Assessments
Reading Goal #5E: <i>By July 2013, the Annual Measurable Objective for ED students in Reading is 51% [886]</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	46% [799]	51% [886]					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FastForward	9-12	Ann Barber, consultant	9-12 Reading teachers	October 30	PLC meetings, data meetings	Reading Coach/ API
Achieve 3000	9-10	Laura Hunt, consultant	9-10 Reading teachers	October 15	PLC meetings, data meetings	Reading Coach/ API
Benchmark analysis	9-10	Reading Coach	9-10 Reading teachers	ongoing	PLC meetings, data meetings	Reading Coach/ API

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Reading Goals

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

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. Diverse nature of transient and immigrant population.	1.1. Provide sheltered classes as needed.	1.1. ESOL English teachers	1.1. One on one with ESOL and reading teacher	1.1. Class participation, class assessments
CELLA Goal #1: <i>By July 2013, the number students identified as of proficient in listening/speaking in grades 9-12 will increase by 7.3% [28]</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 50.9% in grades 9-12[198]					
	1.2. Computer use for 25% of current LY students are in non-verbal phase.	1.2. Computer use for 25% of current LY students are in non-verbal phase.	1.2. Provide computer program Rosetta Stone for students with less than 6 months in ESOL	1.2. Reading teachers	1.2. Quality and rate of speech	1.2. Level attained in Rosetta Stone program
		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. Impact of new ESOL reading program and reading blocks of time on reading pace.	2.1. Students placed in centers based on reading skill	2.1. LEP teacher	2.1. FCAT reading administered to all LY students regardless of LOA to assess reading program and reading time block.	2.1. FCAT practices, Journeys 10 th grade, Teacher observation, students portfolio, CELLA results, FAIR
CELLA Goal #2: <i>By July 2013, the number students identified as of proficient in reading in grades 9-12 will increase by 6.8% [27]</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 21.3% grades 9-12[83]					
	2.2. Approximately 5% considered having some "illiteracy"	2.2. More time or blocks of reading time as needed	2.2. LEP teacher	2.2. One on one teacher time	2.2. formative and summative assessments, FCAT fall and spring results, FAIR	
	2.3. Lack of help from parents- low proficiency in reading	2.3. Informational meetings to connect parents to school activities	2.3. CCT teacher	2.3. PLC meetings	2.3. attendance sheets	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Nature if immigrant population make writing more challenging, i.e. syntax is different	2.1. Students placed in centers based on writing skill	2.1. LEP teacher	2.1. Coordination with ESOL English teacher	2.1. FCAT practices, Journeys 10 th grade, Teacher observation, students portfolio, CELLA results
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
<i>By July 2013, the number students identified as of proficient in writing in grades 9-12 will increase by 5.2% [20]</i>	27.9% [108]	2.2. Lack of practice writing skills	2.2. Cross curriculum practice	2.2. LEP teacher	2.2. one on one teacher time	2.2. formative and summative assessments, FCAT fall and spring results

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E:	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
N/A			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes.	1.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 74% [18] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Mathematics test will score above Level 3.</i>	71%[17]	74%[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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes	2.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	2.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	2.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
Mathematics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 35% [9] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Mathematics test will score at or above Level 7.</i>	28%[7]	35%[9]					
			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 the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes	3.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	3.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	3.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	3.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 74% [19] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment Mathematics test will make learning gains.</i>	71%[18]	74%[19]					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School AMO Mathematics Goals

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011		Math- Target AMO 51%	Math- Target AMO 56%	Math- Target AMO 60%	Math- Target AMO 65%	Math- Target AMO 69%	Math- Target AMO 74%	
	HS Mathematics Goal A: <i>By July 2013, the Annual Measureable Objective is 56%.</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		
B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	HS Mathematics Goal B: <i>By July 2013, the current level of performance for each subgroup in Math will be increased.</i>		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. Provide Intensive math class for struggling /level 1 students	3B.1. Intensive Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	3B.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter and benchmark tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards to compare level of success to student not in Intensive math class.	3B.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White:66 Black:41 Hispanic:48 Asian:68 American Indian:na	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White:69 Black:47 Hispanic:53 Asian:71 American Indian:na							
			3B.2. Lack of transportation for students to stay after school to attend.	3B.2. Provide tutoring 3 days a week for students.	3B.2. Math department teachers	3B.2. Attendance in tutoring sessions	3B.2. Chapter test results, grade in mathematics class		
		3B.3. Lack of motivation of students to commit to class expectations.	3B.3. Provide incentives throughout the grading periods	3B.3. Intensive Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	3B.3. Increased level in engagement in completion of homework/classwork.	3B.3. Classwork/homework grades			

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3C.1. Language barrier interferes with attainment of mathematics content.	3C.1. Provide ELL paraprofessionals to assist students in classes with high concentration of ELL students.	3C.1. CCT teacher/ Assistant Principal	3C.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter and benchmark tests	3C.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
<u>HS Mathematics</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<u>Goal C:</u>	38%[148]	43%[168]					
<i>By 2013 the Annual Measurable Objective for ELL students is 43%[168]</i>			3C.2. Language barrier interferes with attainment of mathematics content.	3C.2. Provide content / worksheets in native language as well as English when available.	3C.2. Classroom teacher/ ELL paraprofessional	3C.2. Analysis of daily formative assessments	3C.2. Formative assessments
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3D.1. Disability interferes with attainment of Mathematics content.	3D.1. Provide ESE support facilitative teachers to assist students in classes with high concentration of ESE students.	3D.1. ESE Inclusion coach	3D.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter and benchmark tests	3D.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
<u>HS Mathematics</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<u>Goal D:</u>	32%[94]	38%[112]					
<i>By 2013 the Annual Measurable Objective for ELL students is 38%[112]</i>			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
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			3E.1. Unable to attain necessary materials needed for a mathematics classroom.	3E.1. Provide pencils, paper, etc. to students who lack the supplies to be successful in the math classroom.	3E.1. Algebra teachers/ SAFE coordinator/ Assistant principal	3E.1. Students will be given donated supplies to use in classroom.	3E.1. Formative assessments
<u>HS Mathematics</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Goal E:	45%[782]	50%[869]					
<i>By 2013 the Annual Measurable Objective for ELL students is 50%[869]</i>			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of HS Mathematics AMO Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes plus Knowledge level of EOC test expectations	1.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC with opportunities for test corrections to relearn material to mastery	1.1. Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards.	1.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 48% [434] of all students taking the Algebra EOC test will score at Level 3.	47%[425]	48%[434]					
			1.2. Computer testing format	1.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	1.2. Algebra teachers	1.2. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests given on computer.	1.2. Chapter test results
			1.3. Instructional Calendar timeline with EOC scheduled test	1.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	1.3. Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.3. Formative/ Benchmark assessments	1.3. Results of formative assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes plus Knowledge level of EOC test expectations	2.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC.	2.1. Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	2.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards.	2.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 11% [100] of all students taking the Algebra EOC test will score at or above Level 4.	10%[90]	11%[100]					
			2.2. Computer testing format	2.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	2.2. Algebra teachers	2.2. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests given on computer.	2.2. Chapter test results
			2.3. Instructional Calendar timeline with EOC scheduled test	2.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	2.3. Algebra teachers/ Assistant Principal	2.3. Formative/ Benchmark assessments	2.3. Results of formative assessments

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes plus Knowledge level of EOC test expectations	1.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC with opportunities for test corrections to relearn material to mastery	1.1. Geometry teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards.	1.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 48% [465] of all students taking the Geometry EOC test will score at Level 3.	NA	48%[465]					
			1.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	1.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	1.2. Geometry teachers	1.2. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests given on computer.	1.2. Chapter test results
			1.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	1.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	1.3. Geometry teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.3. Formative/ Benchmark assessments	1.3. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. . Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous math classes plus Knowledge level of EOC test expectations	2.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC with opportunities for test corrections to relearn material to mastery	2.1. Geometry teachers/ Assistant Principal	2.1. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards	2.1. Chapter test results, Benchmark results
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By July 2013, 11%[107] of all students taking the Geometry EOC test will score at or above Level 4.	NA	11%[107]					
			2.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	2.2. Get students familiar with testing format on computers	2.2. Geometry teachers	2.2. Analysis of student success on Chapter tests given on computer.	2.2. Chapter test results
			2.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	2.3. Infuse instruction prior to testing the EOC testing objectives that are scheduled to be taught after the testing administration.	2.3. Geometry teachers/ Assistant Principal	2.3. Formative/ Benchmark assessments	2.3. Chapter test results, Benchmark results

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Formative & Summative Assessments	9-12 Math	PLC/LG team leaders	9-12 math teachers	Wednesday (after school)September 2012- May 2013 PLC/LG team meetings	Monthly PLC/LG feedback	PLC/LG Team leaders, Administrative team
Pre- test/data/ lesson plan	9-12 Math	PLC/LG team leaders	9-12 math teachers	Wednesday (after school)September 2012- May 2013 PLC/LG team meetings	Monthly PLC/LG feedback	PLC/LG Team leaders, Administrative team
Common Core Standards	9-12 Math	Common core facilitator	9-12 math	4 th Wednesday afterschool	Math Department meetings	Math Department Chairperson/ Assistant principal- Math

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attend FCTM conference	substitutes	Title II money	1,000.00
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous science classes	1.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	1.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	1.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
Science Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 50% [12] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Science test will score at or above Level 4.</i>	50%[12]	50%[12]					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. Lack of preparation of students for more rigorous science classes	2.1. Monitored through TMH Autistic units LG	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal/ESE TMH & Autistic team teachers	2.1. LG Meetings Formal and informal classroom observations	2.1. Data from: formative and summative assessments
Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 3% [1] of all students taking the Florida Alternate Science test will score at or above Level 7.</i>	0%	3%[1]					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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. Knowledge level of test expectations	1.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC.	1.1. Biology teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.1. Analysis of student success on department common Assessments with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards.	1.1. Formative and summative assessments, Benchmark tests
Biology 1 Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 38% [368] of all students taking the Biology 1 EOC test will score at Level 3.</i>	35%[339]	38%[368]					
			1.2. Student challenge: reading science text	1.2. weekly LG meetings	1.2. Biology teachers/ Assistant Principal	1.2. Analysis of student success on district benchmark Assessments	1.2. Edusoft test data
			1.3. Inconsistencies in Lesson planning	1.3. Instructional focus calendar	1.3. Assistant Principal	1.3. Classroom observations and data disaggregated.	1.3. Common assessment
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. Knowledge level of test expectations	2.1. Students master the standards tested on the EOC.	2.1. Biology teachers/ Assistant Principal	2.1. Analysis of student success on department common tests with specific emphasis on EOC tested standards.	2.1. Formative and summative assessments
Biology 1 Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By July 2013, 12% [116] of all students taking the Biology 1 EOC test will score at or above Level 4</i>	11%[106]	12%[116]					
			2.2. Increased rigor and relevance	2.2. Use of higher order questioning	2.2. Biology teachers/, curriculum leader, Assistant Principal	2.2. classroom observations, district benchmark common assessments	2.2. Edusoft data
			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
Instructional focus calendar	Biology	Downs	All Biology teachers	Preplanning	Assistant principal will review quarterly	Assistant Principal, curriculum leader
Common assessment	Biology	Downs	All Biology teachers	3 times per month	Monitor LG meeting	Assistant Principal, curriculum leader

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Science Goals

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

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

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1.	1A.1. Provide periodic writing prompts through English classes as mini assessments	1A.1. Language Arts teachers/ Assistant Principal for Instruction	1A.1. Monitor progress on prompts	1A.1. Prompts evaluations
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 89% [862] of all students taking the FCAT Writes test will score at or above Level 3.</i>	87%[843]	89%[862]					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Varied abilities of ESE students	1B.1. Provide daily writing activities	1B.1. ESE teachers	1B.1. Evaluate writing activities	1B.1. Score on Writing exercises
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>By July 2013, 100% [25] of all students taking the FCAT Writes test will score at or above Level 4.</i>	100%[25]	100%[25]					
			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
Webbs' depth of Knowledge	9-12	PLC/LG leader	PLC/LG teams	Ongoing Wednesday afternoons	Monthly PLC/LG feedback	PLC/LG leader
FCAT 2.0 Expectations & requirements	9-12	PLC/LG leader	PLC/LG teams	Ongoing Wednesday afternoons	Monthly PLC/LG feedback	PLC/LG leader

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

	Total:
--	---------------

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Student challenge: connecting with curriculum and extra curriculum programs.	1.1. Reward good attendance with incentives.	1.1. Assistant Principal – Attendance; Attendance clerks	1.1. Review attendance records for monthly trend data	1.1. Attendance Reports
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
<i>Increase attendance by 1% to YTD average daily attendance of 94% for the school year.</i>	93.08	94					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	1678	1661					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
167	165						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Response to Intervention follow-up	9-12	Assistant Principal	Deans, Counselors	Once each semester	Review of students attendance records	Assistant Principal

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Student challenges: lack of comprehension for Code of Conduct	1.1. Review the Code of Conduct of each grading period.	1.1. Assistant Principal , Deans	1.1. Decrease in referrals	1.1. Discipline reports
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
<i>Reduce the number of out of school suspensions by 2%.</i>	518	508					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	301	271					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	514	504					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
300	270						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Response to Intervention	9-12	Instructional Coach	Grade level deans	Bi-monthly meetings	Review of student’s detention, referral, and suspension records	Deans/ assistant principal - discipline

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Proper identification of drop out students vs. withdrawn students	1.1. Monitor the withdrawal coding of students	1.1. Assistant Principal for Instruction, Registrar	1.1. Monthly review of withdrawal data	1.1. Drop out data reports
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: By June 2013, reduce the dropout rate by 0.1 *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	0.2	0.1					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	91%	92%					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Lack of time for parents to volunteer their time to the school	1.1. Provide numerous opportunities for parents to participate in school organizations i.e. Boosters, SAC PTSA, PLC, magnet programs.	1.1. ADDitions coordinator	1.1. Monitor hours parent donate to school activities	1.1. ADDition's time roster.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>By June 2013, parent involvement through ADDition volunteer program will increase by 1%.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 13,958 hours	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 14,097 hours					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Open House	9-12	Principal	Parents	October 2, 2012		Principal
Orientation	9-12	Assistant Principal for Instruction	Parents	August 15, 2012		Principal
Magnet Open Houses	9-12	Magnet directors	Parents & students	September 18, 2012		Assistant Principal
Athletic meetings	9-12	Athletic director	Parents & students	Ongoing throughout sports seasons		Athletic director

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: <i>Increase the number of students earning 5 credits of mathematics by graduation by 1%</i>	1.1. Students not taking high school math class at middle school level	1.1. Vertical articulation with feeder middle school s	1.1. Assistant principal	1.1. Monitor students' academic plans	1.1. Class lists
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Articulation meeting with middle school	8-12	Math department chairs	MS & HS math teachers	November 1, 2012	Email communications with feeder schools	Principals/ assistant principal

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: <i>By June 2013, increase the percentage of students passing the Career Pathways and Industry Certification exams by 1%. Exams on funding list for 2012-2013 create additional funding from DOE.</i>	1.1. Cost of exams	1.1. Increase in percentage of passing creates more funding from DOE.	1.1. Career and Technical Education Specialist	1.1. End of year data describing students who have taken and passed an exam	1.1. End of the year data used to add funding to next year budget. (line item #14 on budget shows income)
	1.2. Creation of curriculum to prepare for exams	1.2. Increase the number of students taking the exams	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Strategies for teaching content and passing exams	Grades 9-12 Business / drafting Ag.	PLC department leads – Barber, Lychako, Smith	Vocational/Business Education teachers	May 2013 PLC/LG Wednesday meetings	Daily monitoring by CTE Specialist, Carol Broussard	CTE Specialist, Carol Broussard Assistant Principal, Bridget Bresk

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
Set up hydroponic garden in AG and Environmental Science	Materials to create hydroponic garden	Perkins Grant	\$12,000.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use 32 new computers for office model	New computers	Perkins Grant	\$36,642.00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
IT Microsoft Training – 7 hours	Online access to teaching Microsoft for I.C.	Perkins Grant	Unknown - district
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. 1.1. Lack of preparation for advanced level classes	1.1. Active recruitment of students from faculty recommendations to take high level courses	1.1. . Ramona Mauro, AVID coordinator	1.1. Quarterly monitoring of AVID students' progress/ completing honors or advanced level courses	1.1.. Student schedules of AVID students.
Additional Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	1.2. 1.2. Lack of motivation for advanced level classes	1.3. Active recruitment. Mentorships of students from faculty recommendations	Ramona Mauro, AVID coordinator		Report card grades/ GPA
<i>By July 2013, increase the percent of AVID (acceleration participation) students in the honors or Advanced Placement courses</i>	82%	85%					
Additional Goal #2:			2.1. Lack of motivation for advanced level classes	2.1. Active recruitment.	2.1. Assistant Principal for Instruction	2.1. Monitoring progress by AP teachers/ Mock exams	2.1. AP Annual Report
<i>By July 2013, increase the percent of students passing Advanced Placement courses(scoring 3 or higher) by 3%</i>	65%	68%					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Qualifications for AVID students	9-12	Ramona Mauro	Faculty	ongoing		Assistant Principal - AVID
Motivational ideas	9-12	Ramona Mauro	AVID students	ongoing		Assistant Principal - AVID

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
School Advisory Council will participate on committees, review data and develop reports as they monitor school progress of the 2012-13 School Improvement Plan. The school Advisory Council will participate in the development of the 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
SAC will co- fund school planners for the 2013-2014 to help students with time management and academic planning.	\$2,400.00
SAC will provide mini grants for teaching materials for teachers’ class goals to meet a SIP goal.	\$2,500.00