

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION**

School Name: Jackson Alternative School	District Name: Jackson
Principal: Laurence S. Pender III	Superintendent: Lee Miller
SAC Chair: Michele Laramore	Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

**Student Achievement Data:**

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](#)

**Highly Effective Administrators**

List your school’s highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Laurence S. Pender III	BA in Social Science and MS in Educational Leadership	1	9	Year-Grade-AYP-School/Position 2012 – Still Pending 2011 – A - 90%-SHS/Principal; 2010 – C-82%-SHS/Principal
Assistant Principal	Charles Williams	Agriculture 6-12, Education Leadership K-12	4	11	JAS is given a ranking instead of traditional school grade because we meet the criteria as an alternative school. Year – Ranking/Grade – Position 09/10 – Declining in Math & Reading – AP/JAS 10/11 – Declining in Math & Reading – AP/JAS 11/12 – Declining in Math & Reading – AP/JAS

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

### Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 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)
N/A					

### Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Recruit- Jackson County works with Chipola College to recruit newly graduated teachers. Jackson County is also a partner with the Panhandle Area Education Consortium that advertises job openings for the district that is accessible on the World Wide Web.	Deputy Superintendent- Larry Moore; Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal – Laurence Pender	August 2012-June 2013	
2. Retain- Newly hired teachers are provided a mentor and district support through the beginning teacher program.	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- Laurence Pender	July 2012-June 2013	
3. Retain- Professional development opportunities through the coordination of local, state, and federal funds sources to increase teacher effectiveness and retain qualified teachers by providing a conducive environment for improving professional knowledge	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
4. Retain- provide resources (tutoring for subject area exams, reimbursement for reading endorsement, reimbursement for college courses, etc.) for teachers to obtain their professional teaching certificate; become highly-qualified in subject areas taught; and renewal of professional certificates for veteran teachers	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
5. Retain- Support teachers to improve instructional practices through the evaluation process developed through Race to the Top using the Marzano Frameworks.	Director of Elementary Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Teacher Evaluation Manager- Don Wilson; Principal- Laurence Pender	September 2012- June 2013	

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

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
Michele Laramore	Professional; ESE K-12, Middle Grades Integrated	Credit Recovery Program	Working toward Reading Endorsement
Gary Martin	Professional; Social Science 6-12, ESE K-12, Six Traits of Writing	ACE/ESE 6-12	Currently taking classes toward his Ed.D
Ashley McDonald	Professional; English 6-12, ESE K-12, PreK-3, Elem. Ed	CACL 9-12	Currently working toward Master degree in Guidance Counseling
Linda Sims	Professional; ESE K-12	CACL Pre-Voc 8-12	Currently working on Reading Endorsement
Tammy Yates	Professional; ESE K-12, Middle Grades Int., Biology 6-12	CACL 7-8	Currently taking Reading Endorsement classes and is school Lesson Study Facilitator and NG-CARPD
Brian Bowman	Temporary; ESE K-12, Middle Grades Integrated	ACE 10-12	Brian and has taken and passed Professional and General Knowledge exams and is currently enrolled in the his final course to complete requirements for his Professional certificate.
Ray Lawson	Temporary; ESE K-12	CACL 3-5	Currently taking classes toward Professional certificate
Peggy Ingram	Professional; Family & Consumer Sciences 6-12, Guidance and Counseling PK-12, ESE K-12	CACL 6-9	Currently working toward Reading Endorsement

### *Staff Demographics*

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
14	0	36%	43%	21%	29%	43%	7%	0%	14%

### *Teacher Mentoring Program*

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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
N/A			

## 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 - Services are provided to ensure students receiving additional remediation are assisted through services such as after-school program. The district coordinates with Title II, Title VI, and School Improvement Initiative to ensure staff development needs are provided
Title I, Part C- Migrant - Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. Contact is maintained with Maria Pouncey, Migrant Program Coordinator. Established collaboration includes but is no limited to: a) supplemental educational materials for teachers serving migrant students. Migrant staff will monitor grades, attendance and confer, as needed, with teachers and parents regarding academic progress. Supplementary tutorials are offered to students on a regular basis during the school year, all other migrant students will receive tutorial services as needed. Home visits are conducted as needed based on grades and attendance, and to offer health education and assistance to meet social service needs. In home tutorials with highly qualified personnel are offered during the summer for migrant eligible students. The curriculum is designed to improve reading comprehension, language expression, and writing.
Title I, Part D - Supplemental support is provided for our Teen Parenting Program with the addition of a computer lab and supports Level I and Level II middle/high school students with access to ClassWorks and after-school tutoring.
Title II - To improve and increase teacher knowledge of academic subjects and enable teachers to become highly qualified. Give teachers and principals the knowledge and skills to help students meet challenging State academic standards. Improve classroom management skills by: Making sure the in-services or trainings are sustained, intensive and classroom-focused and are not one-day or short-term workshops. To provide incentives for teachers to add reading endorsement to their certificates. Funds were used to pay the salaries for extra teachers to help reduce the teacher student ratio and 6 teachers received \$2400.00 as a one-time bonus for adding reading endorsement to their certificate. Funds were also used to provide supplemental professional development activities during the summer that assisted teachers and staff with understanding how to use technological tools with their academic subjects.
Title III
Title X- Homeless - Homeless District Liaison works with schools to provide resources for students who are identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - Funds are provided to enrich the remediation opportunities for students.
Violence Prevention Programs - The district promotes a Safe Drug Free Environment at all schools. Random drug testing for students involved in extra-curricular activities.
Nutrition Programs - Our district supports the Jackson County Wellness Policy
Housing Programs

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

<p>Head Start - The school district of Jackson County provides early childhood programs serving children birth to 5 years old. These programs consist of Early Head Start, Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education.</p> <p>Early Head Start serves children from birth to 3 years old who meet eligibility requirements mandated by federal regulations. Early Head Start in Jackson county grants priority and ensures services to children of mothers who participate in the district's Teenage Parenting Program.</p> <p>The Jackson Cottony School District prekindergarten program serves children who meet eligibility requirements for Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education programs at six different sites. Although funded separately, all preschool programs complement one another in many ways and are integrated to provide the most developmentally appropriate environment for three and four year old children. These programs share staff implement a common curriculum and follow the same daily schedule of activities both indoors and outdoors within their individual school sites. Comprehensive health and family services are provided to all families, although only required for Head Start. This collaboration makes available many inclusion opportunities for children with disabilities simultaneously meeting Head Start federal regulations for enrollment opportunities.</p>
<p>Adult Education - Adult Education offers programs in: Adult Basic Education, High School Credit Completion and GED (General Educational Development) Study.</p>
<p>Career and Technical Education - Career and Technical Education programs integrate essential skills in an applied setting, thus strengthening and supporting a rigorous and relevant curriculum. Jackson County School District further utilizes form JC-346 (Vocational Component of an ESE student's IEP) to coordinate teaching methods between the individual school's ESE department and the Career and Technical Education departments.</p>
<p>Job Training</p>
<p>Other</p>

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <p>Instructional Leader/Resource Allocation – (principal) – Laurence Pender ensures fidelity of the MTSS/RtI process, sets regularly scheduled times for the team to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered to struggling students.</p> <p>MTSS/RtI Team Leader – Shannon Sewell directs the activities of the team, receives referrals to the MTSS/RtI team from staff or parents, sets meeting times, and ensures that the proper documentation and data collection (including progress monitoring information) are maintained, and sets dates/times for timely follow ups.</p> <p>Data Mentor – Jane Creamer (technology coordinator) – is the person with expertise in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing, and interpreting data. This person should not be the sole person who works with the data, but rather should assist all in understanding and using data. The data mentor should have the necessary skills to present data in easily understandable visual displays.</p> <p>Content Specialist – Liz Wilson assists in making key decisions, about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies instructional interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, collaborates and provides training as needed.</p>

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

Staff Liaison – Ashley McDonald is the key communicator with staff who are not members of the MTSS/RtI school based team. This person should be able to establish procedures to gain staff input and communicate with staff members.

Record Keeper – Ashley McDonald documents and completes required paperwork, serves as a timekeeper, announces agreed upon time periods for discussion and other activities, and informs the team when time is running short.

Behavior Specialist – Laurence Pender and Lane Dykes assist in identifying function of inappropriate or problem behaviors and in designing Behavior Intervention Plans when necessary, also collaborates and provides training when necessary.

In addition to the core MTSS/RtI team, the following individuals should be invited to the meetings: Teacher of the student whose needs are being addressed, Parent/Guardian of the students whose needs are being addressed, Speech/Language Pathologist as needed, and ESE teacher as needed (if not already included in the core team).

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS/RtI team uses data-based methods of student performance such as universal screening results, standardized test scores, diagnostic assessment scores, and ongoing progress monitoring reports to determine the percentage of students whose needs are being met in core instruction and to identify those “at risk” in academics and/or behavioral domains.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the MTSS/RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school based MTSS/RtI team makes data-based decisions for students who are struggling in academic and/or behavioral domains through an effective problem-solving method. Once “specific” academic and/or behavioral deficits have been identified, the team develops an intervention plan matched to student deficits, and determines how student progress will be monitored throughout the intervention period. Teachers/Interventionists implementing T1, T2, and T3 will be provided support and resources needed to implement the interventions.

### MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), and JC Writes.

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FAIR, FCAT, JC Writes, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), and Stanford 10 (08-09).

Midyear: FAIR, Thinklink.

End of year: PMRN, FAIR, FCAT.

Frequency of Data Days: 3X a year, approximately 1 1/2 hours)

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the RtI Leadership Team meetings. The MTSS/RtI team, or members of, will attend state and regional trainings and district provided trainings.

The Staff Liaison on the SST will continue to collaborate with grade groups on the PS/RtI process. District PS/RtI Coordinator will continue to provide training and consultation with the school-based SST throughout the school year. New teachers will receive training on the PS/RtI process as needed.

### ***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

#### **School-Based Literacy Leadership Team**

JAS school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal – Laurence Pender, Assistant Principal – Charles Williams, Technology Coordinator – Jane Creamer, Guidance Counselor – Shannon Sewell, Elementary Teacher – Debbie Lollie, Middle School Teacher – Lizabeth Wilson, High School Teacher – Brian Bowman

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT will meet monthly, if needed, and discuss varying topics depending on past events as well as upcoming events such as testing dates and data results. Discussions will include but not be limited to, FAIR testing dates, scheduling, and data results, curriculum issues, reading intervention, and reading strategies to be used in other content areas.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives will be to work on incorporating FAIR results into Reading lessons and implementing Reading strategies into all content area courses.

### ***Public School Choice***

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

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

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

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

The School District of Jackson County provides various early childhood programs serving children birth to 5 years old. These programs consist of Early Head Start, Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education.

Early Head Start serves children from birth to 3 years old who meet eligibility requirements mandated by federal regulations. Early Head Start in Jackson County grants priority and ensures services to children of mothers who participate in the district's Teenage Parenting Program.

The Jackson County School District's prekindergarten program serves children who meet eligibility requirements for Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education programs at six different sites. Although funded separately, all preschool programs complement one another in many ways and are integrated to provide the most developmentally appropriate environment for three and four year old children. These programs share staff, implement a common curriculum and follow the same daily schedule of activities both indoors and outdoors within their individual school sites. Comprehensive health and family services are provided to all families, although only required for Head Start. This collaboration makes available many inclusion opportunities for children with disabilities simultaneously meeting Head Start federal regulations for enrollment

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



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

opportunities.

At Jackson Alternative School, incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten, at their basic schools. This process determines individual needs and assist in the development of instructional/intervention programs. In addition to academic/school readiness assessments, all incoming Kindergarten students will be assessed in the area of social/emotional development, in which all will be applied to an IEP for each specific child. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Social skills will be reinforced daily through the use of common language, re-teaching, and positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior, provided in a specialized level-based operations manual/system used at JAS. Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the school year to determine student learning gains and the need for changes to the instruction/intervention programs.

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

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

NG CAR- PD (Next Generation Content Area Professional Development) – Cheryl will train staff

### **\*High Schools Only**

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(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?

JAS offers students classes that integrate curriculum such as, Liberal Arts Math, Integrated Math, and Integrated Science.

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?

JAS provides career planning classes where students research career options and interests. The students are then given assistance in choosing what courses they need to take for graduation requirements or postsecondary school requirements for their interest. Teachers incorporate job skills and interviewing skills into academic lessons. Also, JAS may offer foreign language courses to meet college requirements via on-line courses.

### **Postsecondary Transition**

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

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

Due to the nature of our special center school, AP courses and dual enrollment opportunities are not available. Jackson Alternative School does provide all courses required for standard diploma and is working to increase those offerings to include courses required for Bright Futures Scholarships. For exceptional education students on a special diploma track, we offer pre-vocational courses, which will provide them with pre-requisite work skills. After obtaining specific pre-requisite skills these ESE students have an opportunity to be placed on Option II diploma track for supported competitive employment.

**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
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1a.1. Limited technology and access to resources	1a.1. Buying new computers for the classrooms. And implement FAIR, ThinkLink, and Lexia to monitor student progress	1a.1. Principal, Guidance Counselor, Teachers	1a.1. Review data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to district schedule	1a.1. Print-out of assessment reports
<b>Reading Goal #1a:</b> 20% (16) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 15% (12)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 20% (16)					
			1a.2. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	1a.2. Include higher order thinking questions in delivery of lessons	1a.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	1a.2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to principal weekly	1a.2. Classroom walkthrough logs and submitted lesson plans
			1a.3. Inadequate planning time for a number of courses taught	1a.3. Develop an IFC for Reading classes	1a.3. Guidance Counselor and Teacher	1a.3. Administration will be aware of the IFC’s upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs	1a.3. Success will be determined through assessment results
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	1b.1. Include higher order thinking questions in delivery of lessons	1b.1. Principal and Assistant Principal	1b.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to principal weekly	1b.1. Classroom walkthrough logs and submitted lesson plans
<b>Reading Goal #1b:</b> The percentage of students scoring Levels 4,5, and 6 in Reading will decrease from 60% (3) to 40% (2) on the administration of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 60% (3)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 40% (2)					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

<b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</b>			2a.1. Limited technology and access to resources	2a.1. Implement FAIR, ThinkLink, and Lexia to monitor student progress	2a.1. Principal, Guidance Counselor	2a.1. Review data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to district schedule	2a.1. Print-out of assessment reports
<b>Reading Goal #2a:</b> 5% (4) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 & 5) in Reading on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 5% (4)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 8% (6)					
			2a.2. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	2a.2. Include higher order thinking questions in delivery of lessons	2a.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	2a.2. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to principal weekly	2a.2. Classroom walkthrough logs and submitted lesson plans
			2a.3. Inadequate planning time for a number of courses taught	2a.3. Develop an IFC for Reading classes	2a.3. Guidance Counselor and Teacher	2a.3. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs	2a.3. Success will be determined through assessment results
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	2b.1. Include higher order thinking questions in delivery of lessons	2b.1. Principal and Assistant Principal	2b.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted to principal weekly	2b.1. Classroom walkthrough logs and submitted lesson plans
<b>Reading Goal #2b:</b> The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 will increase from 40% (2) to 60% (3) on the administration of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 40% (2)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 60% (3)					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>			3a.1. Planning time and reading FAIR, ThinkLink, Lexia results	3a.1. Student achievement chats will be conducted with students following FAIR, ThinkLink and Lexia assessments.	3a.1. Reading teachers, Guidance counselors, Principal	3a.1. Administrators will review chat logs during classroom walkthroughs	3a.1. Administrators will arbitrarily ask students how they performed on their most recent assessment to determine if chats are successful
<b>Reading Goal #3a:</b> 50% (40) of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading test	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 41% (33)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50% (40)					
			3a.2. Reading Fluency	3a.2. Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers will use Reading benchmarks targeted in lesson plans and instructional delivery.	3a.2. Principal, Reading teachers, Social Studies teachers, Science teachers, and Math teachers	3a.2. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators will focus on the frequency in which teachers have explicitly addressed Reading benchmarks in lessons.	3a.2. FAIR assessments will be disaggregated by Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers to determine the effectiveness of Reading benchmark instruction in their content areas.

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

			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>			3b.1. Reading Fluency	3b.1. Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers will use Reading benchmarks targeted in lesson plans and instructional delivery.	3b.1. Principal, Reading teachers, Social Studies teachers, Science teachers, and Math teachers	3b.1. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators will focus on the frequency in which teachers have explicitly addressed Reading benchmarks in lessons.	3b.1. FAIR assessments will be disaggregated by Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers to determine the effectiveness of Reading benchmark instruction in their content areas.
Reading Goal #3b: 20% (1) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	20% (1)					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4a.1. Lack of student motivation and behavior that interfere with learning	4a.1. All Level 1 and Level 2 students will be required to take part in an intensive Reading class	4a.1. Principal, Guidance counselor, and Reading teachers	4a.1. Student progress will be monitored from assessment results 3x per year to ensure adequate progress toward benchmarks.	4a.1. Assessment results from FAIR, ThinkLink, and Lexia
Reading Goal #4a: 30% (10) of the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains on the administration of the 2013 FCAT Reading test	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21% (7)	30% (10)					
			4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.
			4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.
<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4b.1. Reading Fluency	4b.1. Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers will use Reading benchmarks targeted in lesson plans and instructional delivery.	4b.1. Principal, Reading teachers, Social Studies teachers, Science teachers, and Math teachers	4b.1. During classroom walkthroughs, administrators will focus on the frequency in which teachers have explicitly addressed Reading benchmarks in lessons.	4b.1. FAIR assessments will be disaggregated by Social Studies, Science, and Math teachers to determine the effectiveness of Reading benchmark instruction in their content areas.
Reading Goal #4b: 20% (1) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	20% (1)					
			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.
			4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 2016-2017

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

<p><b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 15%</p>	<p>22%</p>	<p>29%</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>43%</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>58%</p>
<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>  By 2016-17 Jackson Alternative School will decrease non-proficient students by 50%.</p>							
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	
<p><b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>		<p>5B.1. Perceived language variances (dialects)</p>	<p>5B.1. Design supplemental instruction and/or intervention for students not responding to core instruction.</p>	<p>5B.1. Principal, Reading Teachers, Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>5B.1. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests</p>	<p>5B.1. FAIR and ThinkLink results</p>	
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>  The percentage of student subgroups not making satisfactory progress in reading should decrease by at least 6%.</p>		<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White: 54% (26/48) Black: 63% (15/24)</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White: 48% (23/48) Black: 50% (12/24)</p>				
		<p>5B.2. Limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and understanding cultural differences among students with diverse backgrounds</p>	<p>5B.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink</p>	<p>5B.2. Principal, Reading Teachers, Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>5B.2. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests</p>	<p>5B.2. FAIR and ThinkLink results</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	

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

<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C:  N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Vocabulary knowledge and fluency levels	5D.1. Determine core instructional needs based on assessment data and plan differentiated instruction and/or intervention within intensive reading class for students not responding to core instruction.	5D.1. Reading teachers	5D.1. Student progress assessed and progress calculated from FAIR and ThinkLink results	5D.1. FAIR and ThinkLink data
Reading Goal #5D:  The percentage of student with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading should decrease by at least 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	52% (17/33)	47% (15/33)					
			5D.2. Limited student experiences or background knowledge	5D.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink	5D.2. Reading teachers	5D.2. Student progress assessed and progress calculated from FAIR and ThinkLink results	5D.2. FAIR and ThinkLink data
			5D.3	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Motivation, participation, limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and	5E.1. Determine core instructional needs based on assessment data and plan differentiated instruction and/or intervention within intensive reading class for	5E.1. Reading teachers	5E.1. Student progress assessed and progress calculated from FAIR and ThinkLink results	5E.1. FAIR and ThinkLink data
Reading Goal #5E:  The percentage of	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading should decrease by at least 6%.	60% (40/60)	54% (36/67)	understanding cultural differences among students from diverse backgrounds.	students not responding to core instruction.			
			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 Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kathy Oropollo	K-12	Principal	Common Core	At least 3 meetings	Classroom visits	Principal

### Reading 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	
Lexia Reading	Computer- based remediation program	Title I A and ID and IDEA for ESE	5 seats X \$500 per seat = \$2500	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Classroom instruction	Computers	Title I and ½ cent sales tax	\$8500	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Kathy Oropollo	Training/In-service	Title I	\$1500/day	
Common Core Institute	Training/In-service	Race to the Top	\$2000	
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other				

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.</b>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text 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
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</b>		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					



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

N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*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
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1a.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	1a.1. Use county-wide adopted materials.	1a.1. Principal, math teacher, guidance counselor.	1a.1. ThinkLink assessment data	1a.1. Success determined through teacher observations and ThinkLink data.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
33% (3) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math test	0% (0/9)	33% (3/9)					
			1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1b.1. N/A	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1b</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2a.1. Length of stay at JAS; effectiveness and longevity of instruction	2a.1. Include higher order questions in delivery of lessons.	2a.1. Principal & Assistant Principal	2a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be submitted weekly	2a.1. Classroom walkthrough logs and observations.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
22% (2) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) on the	0% (0/9)	22% (2)					
			2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.

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

2013 administration of the FCAT Math test			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			3a.1. Student attendance; effectiveness and longevity of instruction	3a.1. All Level 1 & Level 2 students will be required to take 45 min a day in intensive math class.	3a.1. Principal, math teacher, guidance counselor	3a.1. Use ThinkLink during math remediation to monitor student progress	3a.1. ThinkLink data
<u>Mathematics Goal #3a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
22% (2/9) will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of FCAT Mathematics test.	11% (1)	22% (2)					
			3a.2. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3a.2. Seniors offered tutoring to prepare for FCAT retakes	3a.2. Math tutors	3a.2. Learning gains on FCAT test	3a.2. FCAT retake results
			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					

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

		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>		4a.1. Lack of parental support	4a.1. Inform parents of testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home.	4a.1. Guidance counselor, teachers	4a.1. Parental contact and input	4a.1. FCAT scores	
Mathematics Goal #4a: 33% (3/9) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of FCAT Mathematics test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0)	33% (3/9)					
		4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	
		4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	
<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>		4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>  <b>6%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>53%</b>

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By 2016-17 Jackson Alternative School will decrease non-proficient students by 50%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5B.1. Perceived language variances (dialects)	5B.1. Design supplemental instruction and/or intervention for students not responding to core instruction.	5B.1. Principal, math teachers, guidance counselor	5B.1. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests	5B.1. FAIR and ThinkLink results
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> The percentage of student subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics should decrease by at least 33%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	White: 100% (3) Black: 67% (2)	White: 67% (2) Black: 33% (1)					
			5B.2. Limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and understanding cultural differences among students with diverse backgrounds	5B.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink	5B.2. Principal, math teachers, Guidance Counselor	5B.2. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests	5B.2. FAIR and ThinkLink results
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

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

<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	5D.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	5D.1. Math teachers	5D.1. ThinkLink data	5D.1. ThinkLink
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#5D:</b> The percentage of student with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics should decrease by at least 13%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 88% (7/8).	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 75% (6/8)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	5E.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	5E.1. Math teachers	5E.1. ThinkLink data	5E.1. ThinkLink
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#5E:</b> The percentage of economically disadvantages students not making satisfactory progress in reading should decrease by at least 11%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 89% (8/9)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 78% (7/9)					
			5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

**Middle School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Middle School Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1a.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	1a.1. Use county-wide adopted materials	1a.1. Principal, math teacher, guidance counselor	1a.1. ThinkLink data	1a.1. Success will be determined through teacher observations and ThinkLink data and FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#1a:</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *					

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

20% of students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on 2013 administration of FCAT Math	12% (4/33)	20% (7/33)					
			1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	1b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	1b.1 Math Teachers	1b.1 ThinkLink data	1b.1. ThinkLink and FAA
<u>Mathematics Goal #1b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
0% of students will score Levels 4, 5, or 6 on the administration of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	50% (1/2)	0% (0/2)					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2a.1. Length of stay at JAS; effectiveness & longevity of instruction	2a.1. Include higher order questions in delivery of lessons	2a.1. Principal & Asst Principal	2a.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and observations	2a.1. Classroom walkthroughs and observations.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
15% of students will score above proficiency (Level 4 or 5) on 2013 administration of 2013 FCAT math test	6% (2/33)	15% (5/33)					
			2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	2b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	2b.1. Math teachers	2b.1. ThinkLink data	2b.1. ThinkLink data
<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
100% of students will score above Level 7 on the administration of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	50% (1/2)	100% (2/2)					
			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
<b>3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			3a.1. Student attendance; effectiveness & longevity of instruction	3a.1. All Level 1 & 2 students will be required to take in Intensive Math course	3a.1. Principal, math teachers, guidance counselor	3a.1. ThinkLink	3a.1. ThinkLink
Mathematics Goal #3a:  45% of students will achieve learning gains on the administration of the 2013 Math FCAT	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	33% (11/33)	45% (15/33)					
			3a.2. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	3a.2. Seniors offered tutoring to prepare for FCAT retakes	3a.2. Math tutors	3a.2. Learning gains on FCAT test	3a.2. Results of FCAT retakes
			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.
<b>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			3b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3b.1. Math teachers	3b.1. ThinkLink Data	3b.1. ThinkLink Data
Mathematics Goal #3b:  50% of students will make learning gains on the administration of 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment in Math	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0/0)	50% (1)					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4a.1. Lack of parental support	4a.1. Inform parents of testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home.	4a.1. Guidance counselors, teachers	4a.1. Parental contact and input	4a.1. FCAT Scores
Mathematics Goal #4a:  20% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9% (3/33)	20% (7/33)					



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

FCAT Math test.		4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	
		4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	
<b>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>		4b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	4b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	4b.1. Math teachers	4b.1. ThinkLink data	4b.1. ThinkLink data	
Mathematics Goal #4b: 50% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment in Math	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0/0)	50% (1/0)					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> <b>6%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>53%</b>
Mathematics Goal #5A: By 2016-17 Jackson Alternative School will decrease non-proficient students by 50%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5B.1. Perceived language variances (dialects)	5B.1. Design supplemental instruction and/or intervention for students not responding to core	5B.1. Principal, math teachers, guidance counselor	5B.1. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests	5B.1. FAIR and ThinkLink results		

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

<b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b> The percentage of student subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics should decrease by at least 7%	2012 Current Level of Performance: * White: 71% (15) Black: 60% (6)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * White: 64% (11) Black: 50% (5)		instruction.			
			5B.2. Limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and understanding cultural differences among students with diverse backgrounds	5B.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink	5B.2. Principal, math teachers, Guidance Counselor	5B.2. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests	5B.2. FAIR and ThinkLink results
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #5C:</b> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance: * N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * N/A					
			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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	5D.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	5D.1. Math teachers	5D.1. ThinkLink data	5D.1. ThinkLink
<b>Mathematics Goal #5D:</b> The percentage of student with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics should decrease by at least 9%	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 64% (7/11)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 55% (6/11)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

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

			5D.3	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> <b>Mathematics Goal #5E:</b> The percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics should decrease by at least 11%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	5E.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	5E.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	5E.1. Math teachers	5E.1. ThinkLink data	5E.1. ThinkLink
	65% (20/31)	58% (18/31)					
			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*

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>High School Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b> <b>Mathematics Goal #1:</b> 100% of students taking the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment will achieve Level 4, 5, or 6.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	1.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	1.1. Math teachers	1.1. ThinkLink data	1.1. ThinkLink data
	67% (2/3)	100% (3/3)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	2.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction.	2.1. Math teachers	2.1. ThinkLink data	2.1. ThinkLink data
<b>Mathematics Goal #2:</b> 67% of students taking the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment will score above Level 7.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 33% (1/3)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 67% (2/3)					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3.1. Math teachers	3.1. ThinkLink data	3.1. ThinkLink data
<b>Mathematics Goal #3:</b> 33% of students taking the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment will make learning gains.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 0% (0/3)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 33% (1/3)					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning	4b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core	4b.1. Math teachers	4b.1. ThinkLink data	4b.1. ThinkLink data
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b> 33% of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 0% (0/3)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 33% (1/3)					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

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

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*

**Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<b>Algebra EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>					
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	
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.</b>			1.1 Not enough instructional time for student’s to master standards	1.1. Schedule more time for core instruction & computer-assisted instruction available	1.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal	1.1. ThinkLink data	1.1. EOC assessment scores; ThinkLink data	
<b>Algebra Goal #1:</b> 40% of students will achieve Level 3 on the 2013 Algebra EOC	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
	30% (6/20)	40% (8/20)						
			1.2. Lack of parental awareness	1.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home.	1.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal	1.2. Parental Contact and input	1.2. EOC assessment scores; ThinkLink data	
			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	
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.</b>			2.1. Not enough instructional time for student’s to master standards	2.1. Schedule more time for core instruction & computer-assisted instruction available	2.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal.	2.1. ThinkLink data	2.1. EOC assessment scores; ThinkLink data	
<b>Algebra Goal #2:</b> 10% of students will achieve at or above Levels 4 or 5 on the 2013 Algebra EOC.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
	0% (0/20)	10% (2/20)						
			2.2. Lack of parental awareness	2.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home.	2.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, principal	2.2. Parental contact and input	2.2. EOC assessment scores; ThinkLink data	
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>

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

<p><b>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b></p>	<p><b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6%</b></p>	<p><b>14%</b></p>	<p><b>22%</b></p>	<p><b>30%</b></p>	<p><b>37%</b></p>	<p><b>45%</b></p>	<p><b>53%</b></p>
<p><u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u> By 2016-17 Jackson Alternative School will decrease non-proficient students by 50%.</p>							
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	
<p><b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b></p>		<p>3B.1. Perceived language variances (dialects)</p>	<p>3B.1. Design supplemental instruction and/or intervention for students not responding to core instruction.</p>	<p>3B.1. Principal, math teachers, guidance counselor</p>	<p>3B.1. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests</p>	<p>3B.1. FAIR and ThinkLink results</p>	
<p><u>Algebra Goal #3B:</u> The percentage of student subgroups not making satisfactory progress in Algebra should decrease by at least 14%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>White: 92% (11/12) Black: 100% (7/7)</p>	<p>White: 75% (9/12) Black: 86% (6/7)</p>					
			<p>3B.2. Limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and understanding cultural differences among students with diverse backgrounds</p>	<p>3B.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink</p>	<p>3B.2. Principal, math teachers, Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>3B.2. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests</p>	<p>3B.2. FAIR and ThinkLink results</p>
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>		<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	
<p><b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b></p>		<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	

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

Algebra Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>			3D.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3D.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3D.1. Math teachers	3D.1. ThinkLink data	3D.1. ThinkLink
Algebra Goal #3D: The percentage of student with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Algebra should decrease by at least 17%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	100% (6/6)	83% (5/6)					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</b>			3E.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3E.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3E.1. Math teachers	3E.1. ThinkLink data	3E.1. ThinkLink
Algebra Goal #3E: The percentage of economically disadvantages students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra should decrease by at least 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	95% (19/20)	90% (18/20)					
			3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3

*End of Algebra EOC Goals*

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

**Geometry End-of-Course Goals**

\* 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	
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</b>			1.1. Not enough instructional time for student's to master standards	1.1. Schedule more time for core instruction and computer-assisted instruction available	1.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal.	1.1. ThinkLink data	1.1. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data	
Geometry Goal #1: 13% of students taking 2013 Geometry EOC will score achievement Level 3	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
	7% (1/15)	13% (2/15)						
			1.2. Lack of parental awareness	1.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home	1.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal	1.2. Parental contact and input	1.2. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data	
			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	
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>			2.1. Not enough instructional time for student's to master standards	2.1. Schedule more time for core instruction and computer-assisted instruction available	2.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal.	2.1. ThinkLink data	2.1. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data	
Geometry Goal #2: 7% of students taking 2013 Geometry EOC will score at or above achievement Level 4 or 5	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
	0% (0/15)	7% (1/15)						
			2.2. Lack of parental awareness	2.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home	2.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, principal	2.2. ThinkLink data	2.2. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data	
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>



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

<b>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>  6%	14%	22%	30%	37%	45%	53%
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> <b>By 2016-17 Jackson Alternative School will decrease non-proficient students by 50%.</b>							
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	
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>		3B.2. Limited knowledge of teaching strategies specific to minority groups and understanding cultural differences among students with diverse backgrounds	3B.2. Focus explicit and modeled instruction along with guided and independent practice on assessment results of FAIR and ThinkLink	3B.2. Principal, math teachers, Guidance Counselor	3B.2. Assessment results and progress monitoring from FAIR and ThinkLink tests	3B.2. FAIR and ThinkLink results	
<u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u> The percentage of student subgroups not making satisfactory progress in Geometry should decrease by 0%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White: 0% (0/10) Black: 0% (0/5)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White: 0% (0/10) Black: 0% (0/5)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>		3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	
<u>Geometry Goal #3C:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	N/A	N/A					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3D.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3D.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3D.1. Math teachers	3D.1. ThinkLink data	3D.1. ThinkLink
<b>Geometry Goal #3D:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in Geometry should decrease by 0%	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 0% (0/5)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 0% (0/5)					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3E.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	3E.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/ intervention for students not responding to core instruction	3E.1. Math teachers	3E.1. ThinkLink data	3E.1. ThinkLink
<b>Geometry Goal #3E:</b> The percentage of economically disadvantages students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry should decrease by at least 50%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 100% (10/10)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50% (5/10)					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

**Mathematics Professional Development**

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Linda Walker	K-12	Principal	Common Core	At least 3 meetings	Classroom visits	Principal

**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
Linda Walker – Common Core	Training/ In-service	Title I	\$1100/day
Think Through Math	Computer-based	Title I A and ID and IDEA for ESE	\$1250
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>
--	--

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:							
<b>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1a.1. Available technology and resources	1a.1. Utilize educational websites to give extra interactive instruction	1a.1. Teacher, tech coordinator	1a.1. Assessments on websites and teacher made tests	1a.1. Web-based or teacher made tests
Science Goal #1a: 32% of students will score achievement level 3 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science test	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21% (4/19)	32% (6/19)					
			1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	1b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction.	1b.1. Science teachers	1b.1. ThinkLink data	1b.1. ThinkLink data
Science Goal #1b: 50% of students will score at Level 4, 5, or 6 on 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
<b>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2a.1. Available technology and resources	2a.1. Available technology and resources	2a.1. Teacher, tech coordinator	2a.1. Assessments on websites and teacher made tests	2a.1. Web-based or teacher made tests
Science Goal #2a: 5% of students will score at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 on administration of 2013 FCAT Science test	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0% (0/19)	5% (1/19)					
			2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.
			2a.3.	2a.3.	2a.3.	2a.3.	2a.3.
<b>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2b.1. Lack of student motivation; behaviors that interfere with learning.	2b.1. Arrange supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core	2.1. Science teachers	2b.1. ThinkLink data	2b.1. ThinkLink data

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

<b>Science Goal #2b:</b> 50% of students will score at or above Level 7 on the 2013 administration of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 50% (1/2)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 50% (1/2)					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

**Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals**

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Science Goal #1:</b> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance: * N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Science Goal #2:</b> N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance: * N/A.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * N/A					

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

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

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

**Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

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

<b>Biology EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.</b>			1.1. Not enough instructional time for student's to master standards	1.1. Schedule more time for core instruction and computer-assisted instruction available	1.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal.	1.1. ThinkLink data	1.1. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data
<u>Biology Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
15% of students taking 2013 Biology EOC will score at achievement Level 3.	5% (1/20)	15% (3/20)					
			1.2. Lack of parental awareness	1.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home	1.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal	1.2. Parental contact and input	1.2. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data
			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.</b>			1.1. Not enough instructional time for student's to master standards	1.1. Schedule more time for core instruction and computer-assisted instruction available	1.1. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal.	1.1. ThinkLink data	1.1. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data
<u>Biology Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
10% of students taking 2013 Biology EOC will score at or above achievement Level 4 and 5.	0% (0/20)	10% (2/20)					
			1.2. Lack of parental awareness	1.2. Inform parents of importance of EOC & testing dates and provide practice work that can be completed at home	1.2. Guidance counselor, teachers, Principal	1.2. Parental contact and input	1.2. EOC assessment scores, ThinkLink data
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

*End of Biology EOC Goals*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	6-12	Bio-Scopes	Science Resource Team (Bio-Scopes)	At least 3 meetings	Classroom visits	Principal

**Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Resource Teacher	Training/ In-service	Title I	\$3000
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Science Goals*

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

### Writing Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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
<b>1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1a.1. Up-to-date available resources	1a.1. Update materials through textbooks and/or technology	1a.1. Teacher, tech coordinator, Principal	1a.1. Compare data scores from previous years to current	1a.1. FCAT scores, JC Writes
Writing Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
49% of students will score achievement level 3.0 or higher on 2013 FCAT Writing	40% (14/35)	49% (18/35)					
			1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
<b>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1b.1. Truancy	1b.1. Report students to proper authorities	1b.1. Principal, teacher, SRO	1b.1. Student attendance improvement	1b.1. Daily attendance (Pinnacle)
Writing Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
9% of students will score 4.0 or higher on 2013 FCAT Writing	6% (2/35)	9% (3/35)					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.

### Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
JC Writes	K-12	L. Miller	K-12	At least 3x a year	Progress monitoring/ increased writing scores	Principal, School writing chairman
Six Traits	K-12	Principal	School writing chairman	On-going training	Teachers scoring JC Writes	Principal, School writing chairman



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

**Writing Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of Writing Goals*

**Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

\* 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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			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:*					

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

	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			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:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

**Civics Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Civics Goals*

**U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals**

\* 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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>			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:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>			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:*					
	N/A	N/A					

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

	N/A	N/A					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

**U.S. History Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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 next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1. Students suspended from riding on the bus	1.1. Suggest bus drivers receive training in behavior management.	1.1. Attendance clerk	1.1. Attendance clerk will calculate attendance rate each 9 weeks	1.1. AS400 and Pinnacle
Attendance Goal #1: JAS will increase attendance rate by 5% by June 2013	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	88% (79/89)	93% (82/89)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	103	95					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
2	0						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rtl	K-12	Principal	RtI team	As needed	Meeting logs	RtI team/Principal

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

Handle w/Care	K-12	HWC trainer	All staff	Annually	Correct usage of HWC	Principal, HWC trainer

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Attendance Goals*

**Suspension Goal(s)**

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. Failed usage of Handle With	1.1. ART and Social skills training to be taught in the	1.1. Administration, teachers	1.1. Total number of suspensions will be monitored	1.1. AS400 and Pinnacle

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

<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b> JAS will decrease the total number of suspensions by more than 10% by June 2013	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Care by staff members	classroom; and Handle with Care will be used by all staff members			
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	0	0					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	Number of days (21)	Maintain 21 days or less					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	Number of students (7)	Maintain 7 students or less					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Handle w/Care	K-12	HWC trainer	All staff	Annually	Correct usage of HWC	Principal, HWC trainer

**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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b> Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>		1.1. Limited seats in Credit Recovery class	1.1. Increase number of available computers in each classroom in order for students to work individually on credit recovery.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Success of CPR program	1.1. Lower dropout rate
JAS is a behavioral based alternative school that provides	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	N/A	N/A				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				



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

services district wide in order to reduce student drop-out rates throughout the county	N/A	N/A	1.2. Improved communication between school systems, parents and state agencies	1.2. JAS composed of three programs that address major areas contributed to increased drop-out rates	1.2. MIS	1.2. Lower dropout rate	1.2. data provided by MIS
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Odyssey Training	5-9	Tech coordinator, Odyssey facilitator	All teachers	On-going	Classroom visits	Principal
Lexia Reading & Think through Math programs	K-12	Tech Coordinator, Principal	All teachers	On-going	Classroom visits	Principal

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b> <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		1.1. Work and Transportation	1.1. Communication tools, such as newsletters and e-mails	1.1. Teachers, Principals	1.1. Number and frequency of contacts will be analyzed	1.1. Communication logs	
Parental involvement will increase to 75% by offering various methods of communication.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* 46%	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* 75%					
			1.2. Lack of internet at home for parents and students to use	1.2. Offer parents to complete on-line survey while attending regular meetings; or send hard copy of surveys home.	1.2. Teachers, principals	1.2. Number and frequency of contacts will be analyzed	1.2. Communication logs and hits on computer website
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
How can we make our campus more parent-friendly						
Communicate strategies for teachers to conduct better parent conferences	Funding 5555					
Community Partners						

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>

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

**Total:**

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

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>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

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

**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

**Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)**

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

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:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

**CTE Professional Development**

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

**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
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>
--	--

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>							
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
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

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

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

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

**Final Budget**(Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.

<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Grand Total:</b>	



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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes       No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Communicate to parents about SAC news and activities. Give advice to school staff on how best practices can be applied, using knowledge of our students and community. Work with school administration in the development and implementation of our School Improvement Plan for continuous improvement.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
No funds available	\$0.00