FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Cheney Elementary	District Name: Orange County
Principal: Mrs. Tracey Gibson	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Shayda Borrero	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Tracey Gibson	• Master of Education- School Principal-All levels • Elementary Education Grades 1-6 • ESOL Certified	Less than 1 (July 17, 2012)	3- Principal 4- Assistant Principal	SY2011-2012 Deerwood Elem. School Grade A High Standards: Reading: 73% Math: 70% Writing: 80% Science: 69% SY2010-2011 Deerwood Elem. School Grade A AYP-74% 87% 89% 90% 75% SY2009-2010 Deerwood Elem. School Grade A AYP-97% 91% 91% 89% 76%

					Learning Gains: Reading: 71% Math: 66%	66% 65%	70% 72%
					Lowest 25%: Reading: 70% Math: 47%	51% 51%	63% 77%
Assistant Principal	Kahlil Ortiz	• Master in Educational Leadership • Elementary Education Grades 1-6 ESOL Certified	Less than 1 (August 22, 2012)	0- Assistant Principal	SY2011-2012 Hiawassee Elm. School Grade A High Standards: Reading: 54% Math: 52% Writing: 74% Science: 51% Learning Gains: Reading: 78% Math: 77% Lowest 25%: Reading: 78% Math: 77%	SY2010-2011 Hiawassee elm. School Grade C AYP-87% 59% 53% 84% 19% 60% 48% 54% 69%	

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Cynthia Schleier	BA-University of Colorado: Political Science: MSW: Social Work: University of Denver MBA: Southern Methodist University Certification: Elementary Education K-6, Exceptional Education ESOL, Reading Endorsement	11	2	2011-2012 Grade C Reading: 48% Math: 45% Writing: 61% Science:37% Learning Gains: Reading: 61% Math:52% Lowest 25%: Reading 70% Math:64% 2010-2011 Grade C Reading Mastery :77%, Math mastery: 74%, Writing Mastery 74%; Science Mastery: 43% AYP: 72% reading, 47% math, Hispanic: 58% reading, 62% math, Economically Disadvantaged: 62%% reading, 63% math: ELL; 45% reading, 56% math 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading mastery: 73%, Math mastery 76%, Writing: 64%, Science: 32%. AYP 77% Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP.
Title One Instructional Support	Margie Martinez-Colon	BA: Boston College: Elementary Education Professional Educator's Elementary Education 1-6, ESOL			2011-2012 Grade C Reading: 48% Math: 45% Writing: 61% Science:37% Learning Gains: Reading: 61% Math:52% Lowest 25%: Reading 70% Math:64% 2010-2011 Grade C Reading Mastery :77%, Math mastery: 74%,

					Writing Mastery 74%; Science Mastery: 43% AYP: 72% n reading, 47% math, Hispanic: 58% reading, 62% math, Economically Disadvantaged: 62%% reading, 63% math: ELL; 45% reading, 56% math
CRT	Yeida Padilla	BA- University Of Puerto Rico: Arts in Education, minor in Special Education MBA: Interamerican University of Puerto Rico: Arts in Education Certifications: Elementary Education from Pre-K-3rd, ESE K-12, ESOL K-12.	Started August 2012	Started August 2012	SY2011-2012 SY2010-2011 Deerwood Elem. Deerwood Elem. School Grade A School Grade A AYP-74% High Standards: Reading: 73% 87% Math: 70% 89% Writing: 80% 90% Science: 69% 75% Learning Gains: Reading: 71% 66% Math: 66% 65% Lowest 25%: Reading: 70% 51% Math: 47% 51%

<u>Effective and Highly Effective Teachers</u>

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Network with colleagues to recruit highly qualified teachers	Tracey Gibson, Principal	Ongoing as needed throughout the year.
2. Ongoing staff development	Principal, Classroom teachers, Leadership team	June 2013
3. Scheduled team planning and collaborative time weekly	Classroom teachers	June 2013
4. Professional Learning Communities	Principal, Classroom teachers, leadership team	June 2013
5. Continue hosting College Interns from local Colleges of Ed.	Margie Martinez Colon	On going

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Out of field due to ESOL- 2 (5%) Less than an effective rating- 12% 5/41	Attend ESOL offered trainings. Provide staff development on the Marzano Evaluation Protocols.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	5%-2	42%-18	42%-18	11%5	42%-18	88%-36	11%-5	5%-2	36

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Heidi Van Allen	Renae Hambey	Beginning Teacher	Mentoring and Coaching
Maria Moreno	Alice Ramirez	Beginning Teacher	Mentoring and Coaching
Kate Brietz	Charity Roberts	New Teacher to Cheney	Mentoring and Coaching
Audrey Jones	Cynthia Schleier	Beginning Teacher	Mentoring and Coaching

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

| Amanda Kling | Constance Malanga | Veteran teacher new to county | Mentoring and Coaching |
| Dominga Soto | Neima Edoo | Beginning Teacher | Mentoring and Coaching |

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 Cheney Elementary is a Title I school, therefore receives additional federal funding for use with high needs students. The majority of our Title I funds are used to fund staff positions to provide additional instructional support. The remainder of the funds are used for staff development, instructional materials and parental involvement activities. SES tutoring is funded by the federal government and provides tutoring for students on campus by state approved tutoring providers. The program takes place after school and is coordinated by two SES/Cheney facilitators.
Title I, Part C- Migrant: Cheney does not have any migrant students at this time. If migrant students enroll, we will obtain assistance through the districts liaison.
Title I, Part D - Our classroom teachers are fully funded through our school budget. Title One funds are not used to fund any classroom teacher or paraprofessional. Cheney maintains class size requirements by the State of Florida, K-3: 18 students,   4-5: 22 students.
Title II The district receives Title II funds which are subsequently distributed to schools to be utilized for staff development activities for school based staff. At Cheney, funds will be used to provide staff development to help improve student achievement and instruction.
Title III Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of English Language Learners. Any additional funds are distributed to the school for purchase of instructional materials. Cheney will be introducing the Tejas Lee program to our bilingual students using Title III funds for support of materials, training and substitutes.
Title X- Homeless Homeless district and school based personnel provide resources such as clothing, school supplies, social services referrals for students identified as homeless (under the McKinney-Vento Act). Cheney hosts a number of students classified as homeless.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - SAI funds will provide tutoring services for our level 1and 2 students in grades 4 and 5 and previously retained 3rd graders. The remainder of the funds will be used to purchase instructional materials.
Violence Prevention Programs The Orange County Sheriff Department provides a specific program under the MAGIC Program for fifth graders. The program culminates with the students signing a pledge to be drug and violent free. Our school has established a red ribbon campaign which promotes drug free attitudes.
Nutrition Programs- Our Physical Education department provides instruction in how to make healthy food choices. Students are given the opportunity to plan healthy meal selections for breakfast, lunch, snack and dinner. Food services manager displays the food pyramid which has suggested nutritional daily portion requirements for healthy eating. Cheney offers free breakfast for all students. Students are reminded each day on the morning announcement of their food choices for lunch.

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

Housing Programs N/A
Head Start Though Cheney does not provide Head Start services, we do host a Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program.
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. **Principal**: provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS/RTI. **Assistant Principal**-Supports common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS/RTI. **Instructional Support and RTI Coordinator:** provides services and expertise on interventions for individual students. **Reading Coach:** develops, leads and evaluates school core content for reading; identifies and analyzes student achievement data for reading. **Instructional Coach**: Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with teachers to identify appropriate intervention strategies. **CRT:** Designs and implements training on the implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis and assists with early interventions for students. **School Psychologist**: participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. **CT:** provides data and strategies for teachers working with ELL population and meets with parents to inform them of student progress/performance.
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? Teachers identify at risk students based on PLC data on classroom performance and periodic assessment. MTSS/ RTI team (includes teachers who work with the students) meets to discuss appropriate interventions and strategies to address identified needs. Principal assigns tasks to team members regarding instructional materials, who will provide intervention, and progress monitoring duties.

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? Members of the MTSS leadership team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help in the development of the SIP. The team shared data on Tier 1, 2 and 3 targets, spoke to the academic needs to be addressed and helped set clear expectations for rigorous and relevant instruction.

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 Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Kindergarten Readiness Survey (FLKRS) **Progress Monitoring**: PMRN, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), FCAT Explorer, Successmaker, EduSoft, Mini-Benchmark Exams Midyear: FAIR, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), EduSoft Benchmark Exams End of year: FAIR, DRA, FCAT **Behavior**: School wide Implementation of CHAMPS system to promote positive behavior.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The Cheney staff has been trained on the RtI process, but update trainings will be provided throughout the year. The MTSS Leadership team will evaluate the need for additional focused training during weekly meetings.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Teachers are provided ongoing training and support including problem solving, FCIM and data collecting. Regular MTSS meetings will be held to discuss academic and behavioral concerns with focused intervention and analysis.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Tracey Gibson, Principal; Cynthia Schleier, Reading Coach; Tanya Quinones, RTI Coach, CRT, Yeida Padilla, Instructional Support: Margie Martinez-Colon, Mabel Mejia,CT, Sheila Smith, Media Specialist, Susan Turner(K), Maria Collazo (1st) Deborah Davis (2) Primary Education teachers; Charity Roberts (3rd), Constance Malanga (4th) Sarah Kelly (5th), Upper Grade Teacher and Aurora Perez, Special Area teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team will meet monthly to review school reading trends and they will make recommendations for further interventions. They will discuss Literacy Activities that will address areas of deficits in reading and build literacy capacity. Information about the implementation of CCSS in cross curricular literacy will be addressed.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Provide training in the implementation of CCSS, literacy rigor, and increased focus on use of informational text with higher complexity/lexile levels. Increase Parent Involvement in Literacy Nights and activities.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Cheney currently makes home visits to establish relationships between home and school. Incoming kindergarten students were given the opportunity prior to the school year to be screened with our CORE and PAST assessment in helping identify student skill levels. Meet the Teacher was held before school started so that students could meet their teacher and get acquainted with their classroom and school surroundings.

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

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Inconsistencies between the Core Program and the NGSS and CCSS	1A.1. Provide Professional Development in the implementation of the CCSS	1A.1. CCSS Black Belt Team	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Informal Observations PLC meetings	1A.1. FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments
Reading Goal #1A: In June 2012, 28% of student in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 on FCAT reading. The reading goal for June 2013 is 31% of student in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 on FCAT reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 28% (62/272) of student in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 on FCAT reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 31% of student in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 on FCAT reading.					
			1A.2. Teacher misconceptions on the strategies and resources needed to provide differentiated instruction	1A.2. Provide Professional development and support in providing DI consistently.	1A.2. CRT Reading Coach	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Informal Observations PLC meetings	1A.2. FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments
			1A.3. Lack of opportunities for students to use higher order thinking skills and exposure to task that require more rigor	1A.3. Provide coaching and modeling opportunities to improve techniques.	1A.3. Classroom Teachers Reading Coach Leadership Team	1A.3. Lesson Plans PLC meetings	1A.3. Classroom Observations
			1A.4. Students have limited exposure to informational text	1A.4. Informational text (scholastic news) will be used to support reading proficiency	1A.4. Classroom teachers	1A.4. Progress Monitoring PLC meetings	1A.4. FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of*					

	performance in this box.	*performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Inconsistent use of enrichment.	2A.1. Students will be pulled for enrichment groups daily for 45 minutes.	2A.1. Leadership Team members	2A.1. Informal observations/progress monitoring	2A.1 Benchmark assessments, teacher feedback
Reading Goal #2A: In June 2012, 21% of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above level 4 on FCAT reading. The reading goal for June 2013 is 24% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above level 4 on FCAT reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 21% (58/272) of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above level 4 on FCAT reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 24% of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above level 4 on FCAT reading.					
			2 A.2 Students have limited exposure to informational text	2A.2. Informational text (scholastic news) will be used to support reading proficiency.	2A.2 Classroom teachers	2A.2 Progress Monitoring PLC meetings	2A.2 FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Lack of independent reading.	3A.1. Promote School wide and home support of Accelerated Reader, Scholastic News and My On Reader web based program.	3A.1 LLT and Classroom teachers, media specialist	3A.1. Monitoring of students' independent reading.	3A.1. AR test reports , My On Reader usage reports
Reading Goal #3A: **Enter narrative for the goal in this box** In June 2012, 61% of students taking the FCAT made learning gains in reading. The reading goal for June 2013 is 64% of students taking the FCAT will make learning gains in reading. **Additional Goal #2 Progress monitor students in K-5 for proficiency in reading by age 9 -increase proficiency level by 3%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 61% (66/272) of students taking the FCAT made learning gains in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 64% of students taking the FCAT will make learning gains in reading.					
			3A.2. Teachers unfamiliar with the newest components of the Teacher Assessment.	3A.2. Provide professional development on Design Questions 2,5, 7, 8	3A.2. Leadership team	3A.2. Informal and Formal observations	3A.2. Teacher Assessment
			3A.3 Teacher misconceptions on the strategies and resources needed to provide differentiated instruction	3A.3 Provide Professional development on new Kaleidoscope Intervention Program to be scheduled 45 minutes daily.	3A.3 CRT Reading Coach	3A.3 Progress Monitoring Informal Observations PLC meetings	3A.3 FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments
			3A.4 **High number of students below grade level in reading. Students are not on grade level by age 9.**	3A.4 Provide extra support during Intervention time-Hourly tutoring teachers	3A.4 Principal, classroom teachers	3A.4 Data meeting discussions	3A.4 Mini Benchmark assessments
			3A.5 Identified students tend not to participate in after school hour academic events.	3A.5 Provide one hour of free reading tutoring during Saturday School for 8 weeks.	3A.5 Classroom teachers, administration	3A.5 Weekly attendance records, progress monitoring	3A.5 Mini Benchmarks, Benchmark assessments
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Ineffective use of instructional match	4A.1. Strategically place students into correct Tier II and Tier III groups	4A.1. Classroom teachers, MTSS team.	4A.1. Progress Monitoring, informal observations	4A.1. FAIR Mini Benchmark Focus assessments
Reading Goal #4: In June 2012, 70% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. The reading goal for June 2013 is 73% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 70% (190/272) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 73% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.					
			4A.2. Ineffective use of MTSS process	4A.2. Provide professional development and ongoing support of the MTSS process.	4A.2. MTSS team, classroom teachers	4A.2. MTSS meetings and discussions	4A.2. MTSS summary reports
			4A.3. Inconsistent use of FCIM focus lessons and re-teaching	4A.3. Use of specific focus calendars and student monitor process	4A.3. Classroom teachers, CRT, Leadership team	4A.3. Progress monitoring/Data meetings	4A.3. Mini Benchmark Focus assessments, Informal Observations, Benchmark Assessments

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	48	60	64	68	72	76
Reading Goal #5A: **In six years school will reduce their achievement gap 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 subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5A.1. Hispanic: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children White/ Black/Multi-racial: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children	5A.1. Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home. Provide curriculum based nights along with PTA and Literacy committee to build capacity and family involvement	5A.1. PLC team members/Principal PTA, Literacy Team	5A.1. PLC feedback and/or survey Sign in Sheets for events	5A.1. Student data reports Parent Feedback	
Reading Goal #5B: In 2012, 63% of White students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for White students in 2013 is 70%. In 2012, 39% of Black students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for Black students in 2013 is 51%. In 2012, 41% of Hispanic students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for Hispanic students in 2013 is 56%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 the following percentage of students were proficient in their respective subgroups: White:63% 43/72 Black:39% Hispanic:41% 60/162	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate the following percentage of students will be proficient in their respective subgroups: White:70% Black:51% Hispanic:56%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. Communication gap between home and school.	5B.1. Provide translations of school/classroom communication to those who need another language: Monthly newsletter, Connect Orange phone messages	5B.1. Identified school personnel with translation abilities, classroom teacher.	5B.1. Parent feedback reports	5B.1. Percentage of parent involvement
Reading Goal #5C: In 2012, 27% of ELL students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for ELL students in 2013 is 26%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 27% (32/120)of the ELL students were proficient.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate that 46% of the ELL students will be proficient.					
			5C.2. Lack of instructional strategies and progress monitoring tools for students identified in the Bilingual Program.	5C.2. Introduce and train bilingual K-2 teachers in "Tejas Lee"	5C.2. Bilingual teachers, CCT	5C.2. Informal observations	5C.2. Tejas Lee reports
			5C.3. Language proficiency of students in the Sheltered ELL Model.	5C.3. Provide additional ESOL paraprofessional support for sheltered classrooms	5C.3. Administration	5C.3. Monitoring paraprofessional utilization and effectiveness	5C.3. Observation, teacher survey
			5C.4 Lack of vocabulary development	5C4 Consistently utilize the Imagine Learning web based program for ELL students	5C4 Sheltered and Bilingual teachers, CT, CRT	5C4 Progress monitoring	5C4 Program reports
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Scheduling of ESE students to maximize instructional time	5D.1. Adjust the ESE schedule to maximize instructional support	5D.1. Administration Mrs. Mason	5D.1. Review student performance	5D.1. Results of Benchmark Reports
Reading Goal #5D: In 2012, 13% of SWD students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for SWD students in 2013 is 22%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 13% 5/39 of the SWD students were proficient.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate that 22% of the SWD students will be proficient.					
			5D.2. Teacher misconceptions on the strategies and resources needed to provide differentiated instruction	5D.2. Provide Professional development and support in providing DI consistently.	5D.2. CRT Reading Coach	5D.2. Progress Monitoring Informal Observations PLC meetings	5D.2. FCAT Edusoft Assessments FAIR Imagine It Assessments

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

		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Limited literacy resources	5E.1. Create a Culture of Reading school wide, offering extended hours for the Media Center after school four days a week.	5E.1. Administration Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Participation in use of AR and MyOn Reader programs	5E.1. Circulation Report for Media Center
Reading Goal #5E: In 2012, 45% of Economically Disadvantaged students were considered proficient in reading. The reading proficiency goal for Economically Disadvantaged students in 2013 is %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 45% 110/245 of the Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate that 56% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient.					
			5E.2. Limited use of technology	5E.2 Provide use of Computer Labs for Tutoring before school. Using Success Maker	5E.2. Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Participation during morning lab time.	5E.2. Success Maker Reports
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kaleidoscope Intervention Program	3-5	Lorri Dempter/Media Specialist Stone Lakes	3-5 grade teachers, resource teachers and coaches, SLE teacher	September 5, 2012	Informal Observations, Data meeting discussions	CRT, Reading Coach
Tejas Lee	K-2	Title III	K, 1, and 2 Bilingual teachers, CT	September 10-13, 2012: October	October follow-up meeting with Title III	CT
MTSS Training/Update	K-5	MTSS team	K-5 Teachers	Wednesday Staff Development, TBA	PLC meetings	MTSS Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 Teachers	Wednesday Staff Development, TBA	PLC Meetings	Reading Coach
CCSS Training-Update	K-5	CC Black Belt Teams	K-5 Teachers	Wednesday Staff Development, TBA	PLC Meetings	CCSS Black Belt Team
Marzano Teacher Assessment Training	Instructional Staff	Administrators /PDS online	Instructional Staff	Wednesday Staff Development, TBA	Informal/Formal Observations	Teacher Assessment

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Comprehension /Decoding skills	MyOn Reader	Title 1	-
Intervention Program	Kaleidoscope	Title 1	$7292.20
Informational Text	Scholastic News	General	$2658.33
Instructional Focus NGSSS	Florida Ready	General	$8414.90
			Subtotal:$ 18365.43
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Imagine Learning for ELL students	Computer based program	Title III	$16,000
Kids College	Reading, math, science web-based support program	General Fund	-
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Intervention Strategies	Kaleidoscope Intervention Program	General Funds	-
Bilingual Diagnostic Assessments	Teja Lee (5 day training)	Title III, General	$1000.00
			Subtotal:$1000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading support	Hiring additional tutors for Intervention Time	SAI	$20,000.
Reading tutoring	Saturday School Tutoring Teachers and materials	SAI	$7,000.
			Subtotal: $27,000.
			Total:$46365.43

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: *In 2012 38% of the students tested scored Proficient on the Listening and Speaking. In 2013 41% of the students will score proficient in the Listening and Speaking section of the CELLA*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *K=13%-4/32* *1=43%- 20/46* *2=66%-31/47* *3=24%-9/38* *4=30%-9/3.*	1.1. Students coming from other countries with limited English proficiency	1.1. Consistently implementing ESOL strategies during all lessons	1.1. Administrator	1.1. Informal Observations	1.1. Lesson Plans
		1.2. Students have limited opportunities to practice English	1.2. Provide Instruction using Imagine Learning software that emphasizes conversational and academic language.	1.2. Classroom Teacher	1.2. Usage Reports	1.2. CELLA
		1.3. Inconsistent use of intervention program	1.3. Monitor use of Imagine Learning computer program	1.3. ELL Teachers, CT	1.3. PLC Meetings	1.3. Imagine Learning Reports
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: *In 2012 24% of the students scored proficient in the Reading section of the CELLA. In 2013 28% of the students will be proficient in the Reading section of the CELLA*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *K=0% 0/32* *1=16% 7/46* *2=63% 27/43* *3=22% 8/37* *4=23% 7/30*	2.1. Limited Vocabulary Development	2.1 Implement focused strategic vocabulary development plan. (word wall usage, word of the week)	2.1. Principal, classroom teachers	2.1. Informal observations	2.1. CELLA
		2.2. Lack of instructional strategies and progress monitoring tools for students identified in the Bilingual Program.	2.2. Introduce and train bilingual K-2 teachers in "Tejas Lee"	2.2. Bilingual teachers, CCT	2.2. Informal observations	2.2. Tejas Lee reports

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

		2.3. Inconsistent use of intervention program	2.3. Monitor use of Imagine Learning computer program	2.3. ELL Teachers, CT	2.3. PLC Meetings	2.3. Imagine Learning Reports

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: *In 2012 15% of the students scored proficient in the writing portion of the CELLA. In 2013 18% of the students will score proficient in the writing portion of the CELLA.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *K=0% 0/25* *1=20% 10/49* *2=38% 18/48* *3=3% 1/38* *4=25% 8/32*	2.1. Understanding of English grammar structure	2.1. Explicitly focus on LA/Grammar in scheduled ESOL time.	2.1. Classroom teachers	2.1. Administration collect school wide writing prompts each nine weeks.	2.1. CELLA, Quin School-wide writing prompts
		2.2. Limited vocabulary development	2.2. Use of word walls, "Word of the Week" and Thinking Maps	2.2. Classroom teachers, Principal	2.2. Number of students participating in "Word of the Week"	2.2. Observation
		2.3. Inconsistent use of Thinking Maps	2.3. Update teachers on use of Thinking Maps	2.3. CRT	2.3. Lesson Plans	2.3. Lesson Plans

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Bilingual Diagnostic Assessments	Tejas Lee	Title III, General	$1000 (Included Reading)
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Imagine Learning for ELL students	Computer based program	Title III	0
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing skills	Thinking Maps	Title One	Subs-$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:$500.00

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. **Students not fluent in math operations**	1A.1. Continue using Kids College and introduce Moby Math to all students K-3 and 4-5.	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Usage and Performance Reports Progress monitoring of K-5 students using both programs	1A.1. Benchmark Mini Assessments
Mathematics Goal #1A: In June 2012, 23% of the 3-5 grade students scored a level 3 on FCAT math. The goal for 2013 is 26% of the 3-5 grade students will score a level 3 on FCAT math. **Additional Goal #2 Progress monitor students in K-5 for proficiency in math operations- increase proficiency by 3%.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 23% (64/273) of the 3-5 grade students scored a level 3 on FCAT math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 26% of the 3-5 grade students will score a level 3 on FCAT math.					
			1A.2. Teacher misconceptions on the strategies and resources needed to provide differentiated instruction in Math	1A.2. Provide Professional development and support in providing DI consistently.	1A.2. CRT	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Informal Observations PLC meetings	1A.2. FCAT Edusoft Assessments Envision Math In Program Assessments
			1A.3. Automaticity of Math Facts	1A.3. Create math fact wall in the cafeteria	1A.3. Assistant Principal	1A.3. Weekly multiplication checks	1A.3. Benchmark assessments.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Not enough rigor in the curriculum	2A.1. Provide extension activities to accelerate math skills already mastered.	2A.1. CCSS Black Belt Team	2A.1. Informal Observations and use of FCAT Explorer	2A.1. FCAT Edusoft
Mathematics Goal #2A: In June 2012, 18% of the 3-5 grade students scored level 34 and 5 on FCAT math. The goal for 2013 is that 21% of the 3-5 grade students will score level 4 and 5 on FCAT Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 18% (48/273)of the 3-5 grade students scored level 34 and 5 on FCAT math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 21% of the 3-5 grade students will score a level 4 and 5 on FCAT math					
			2A.2. Lack of comprehensive understanding of math CCSS and NGSSS.	2A.2. Provide professional learning opportunities for teacher leaders to learn and transfer new learning to all teachers.(FCIM, Black Belt)	2A.2. CCSS Black Belt Team	2A.2. PLC, Informal observations	2A.2. Edusoft
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Limited use of technology to enhance instruction	3A.1. 4th -5th grade teachers will be given iPads to support instruction/Doceri App.	3A.1. Administration	3A.1. Observations	3A.1. FCAT Mini Benchmarks, Benchmark assessments
Mathematics Goal #3A: In June 2012, 52% of students taking the FCAT made learning gains in math. The goal for 2013 is for 55% of 3-5 grade students to make learning gains in math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 52% (145/273) of students taking the FCAT made learning gains in math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 55% of students taking the FCAT will make learning gains in math.					
			3A.2. Misalignment between NGSSS and Math program	3A.2. Continue to deconstruct math standards and develop appropriate instructional strategies	3A.2. Classroom teachers, CRT	3A.2. PLC meetings	3A.2. Lesson plans, informal observation
			3A.3 Lack of correct test taking strategies	3A.3 Purchase new FCAT Florida Ready materials for grades 3-5 to use during scheduled test taking prep time and small group instruction.	3A.3 Classroom teacher	3A.3 Progress monitor	3A.3 Mini Benchmarks, Benchmark assessments
			3A.4 Identified students tend not to participate in after school hour academic events.	3A.4 Provide one hour of free math tutoring during Saturday School for 8 weeks	3A.4 Classroom teachers, administration	3A.4 Weekly attendance records, progress monitoring	3A.4 Mini Benchmarks, Benchmark assessments
			3A.5. Teachers unfamiliar with the newest components of the Teacher Assessment.	3A.5. Provide professional development on Design Questions 2,5, 7, 8	3A.5. Leadership team	3A.5. Informal and Formal observations	3A.5. Teacher Assessment
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Automaticity of Math Facts	4A.1. Continue using Kids College and introduce Moby Math	4A.1. Administration	4A.1. Usage and Performance Reports	4A.1. Benchmark Mini Assessments
Mathematics Goal #4: In June 2012, 64% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math. The goal for 2013 is 67% of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June 2012, 64% (175/273) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June 2013, 67% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math.					
			4A.2. Inconsistent use of FCIM focus lessons and re-teaching	4A.2. Use of specific focus calendars and student monitor process	4A.2. Classroom teachers, CRT, Leadership team	4A.2. Progress monitoring	4A.2. Mini Benchmark Focus assessments, Informal Observations, Benchmark Assessments
			4A.3. Limited time for differentiating math instruction.	4A.3. Provide 60 minutes extra of Math Intervention for 3rd-5th grade level 1 and 2 students during Teacher Directed P.E. (PE Waiver)	4A.3. Classroom teachers	4A.3. Progress monitor	4A.3. Fl. Ready FCAT Edusoft

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	**Achieved Level: 45** **Target: 54**	**Target: 58**	**Target: 63**	**Target:67**	**Target: 71**	**Target: 75**
Mathematics Goal #5A: **In six years school will reduce their achievement gap 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 subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. Hispanic: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children White/Black /Multi-racial: Families misconceptions about school processes and ways to support their children	5B.1. Schedule Parent Leadership Council meetings to educate parents on strategies and technology components to support their children at home. Provide curriculum based math nights along with PTA to build capacity and family involvement	5B.1. PLC team members/Principal PTA,CRT	5B.1. PLC feedback and/or survey Sign in Sheets for events	5B.1. Student data reports Parent Feedback	
Mathematics Goal #5B: In 2012, 49% of White students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for White students in 2013 is 64%. In 2012, 50% of Black students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for Black students in 2013 is 51%. In 2012,41% of Hispanic students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for Hispanic students in 2013 is 58%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 the following percentage of students were proficient in their respective subgroups: White:49% 35/72 Black:50% 10/20 Hispanic:41% 67/163	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate the following percentage of students will be proficient in their respective subgroups: White:64% Black:51% Hispanic:58%						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Communication gap between home and school.	5C.1. Provide translations of school/classroom communication to those who need another language.	5C.1. Identified school personnel with translation abilities, classroom teacher.	5C.1. Parent feedback reports	5C.1. Percentage of parent involvement
Mathematics Goal #5C: In 2012, 33% of ELL students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for ELL students in 2013 is 53%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 33% 40/121 of the ELL students were proficient.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013, we anticipate that 53% of the ELL students will be proficient.					
			5C.2. Language proficiency of ELL students	5C.2 Provide opportunities for students to use oral language skills during math problem solving activities.	5C.2 Classroom teachers	5C.2 Progress monitoring	5C.2. Observation
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Scheduling of ESE students to maximize instructional time	5D.1. Adjust the ESE schedule to maximize instructional support	5D.1. Administration ESE Teacher Classroom teachers	5D.1. Review student performance	5D.1. Results of Benchmark Reports
Mathematics Goal #5D: In 2012, 16% of SWD students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for SWD students in 2013 is 30%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 16% 6/39 of the SWD students were proficient.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate that 30% of the SWD students will be proficient.					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Insufficient time for students to practice math facts and problem solving.	5E.1. Computer labs will be opened before school for students to work on Success Maker /Moby math.	5E.1. Administration	5E.1. Progress monitoring	5E.1. Success Maker reports
Mathematics Goal #5E: In 2012, 42% of Economically Disadvantaged students were considered proficient in mathematics. The mathematics proficiency goal for Economically Disadvantaged students in 2013 is 57%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 42% 103/246 of the Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013 we anticipate that 57% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient.					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: N/A							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Algebra 1 Goal #3A: **N/A**	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.** Algebra 1 Goal #3B: **N/A**	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: **N/A**						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Moby Math	K-5	CRT	K-5 Teachers	Grade Level Staff Development, September 13, 2012	PLC Meetings/Reports	Yeida Padilla-CRT
Doceri iPad Application	4-5	ELC 3-5 ElC Technology Support	4th and 5th grade teachers, Leadership team	Staff Development, TBA	Classroom observations	Administration
Marzano Teacher Evaluation	K-5	Administration	All staff	Staff Development, TBA	Classroom observations	Administration
CCSS/NGSSS	K-5	Black Belt Team/CRT	All staff	Staff Development, TBA	Classroom observations	Black Belt Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	CRT	K-5 Teachers	Wednesday Staff Development, TBA	PLC Meetings	CRT

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

__Mathematics Budget__ (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Test Taking Skills	Florida Ready Math	General	$8414.90
			Subtotal:$8414.90
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Automaticity of facts	Moby Math	County Funding	-
Problem solving	Kids College web based program	(Purchased 2011- for 3 years)	-
21st Century Technology	Doceri Whiteboard Application	Title One	$200.
21st Century Technology	iPads	Title One	$8451.30
			Subtotal:$8651.30
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Automaticity of facts	Moby Math	County	-
21st Century Technology	Doceri Whiteboard Application	Title One	-
21st Century Technology	iPads	Title One	-
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
			Total:$17066.20

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Elementary and Middle Science Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.**</td><td>1A.1.
Teachers not comfortable doing inquiry based lessons.</td><td>1A.1.
Provide support for teachers using Science Boot Camp program.</td><td>1A.1.
CRT</td><td>1A.1.</td><td>1A.1.

Science Benchmark Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>Science Goal #1A:

In 2012, 32% of the fifth grade students scored a level 3 on FCAT Science

In 2013, 33% of the fifth grade students will score a level 3 on FCAT Science</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

In 2012, 32% (31/98) of the fifth grade students scored a level 3 on FCAT Science.</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

In 2013, 33% of the fifth grade students will score a level 3 on FCAT Science</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>1A.2.
New Science Fusion Textbook Adoption</td><td>1A.2.
Ensure all teachers are trained in the new series.</td><td>1A.2.
Administration</td><td>1A.2.
Use of Science Lab and inquiry based activities</td><td>1A.2.
Attendance Records</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>1A.3.
Lack of knowledge of science equipment available for Essential Labs</td><td>1A.3.
Set up science resource room, train teachers on what is available for science use</td><td>1A.3.

CRT, Administration</td><td>1A.3.
Usage of resource room and equipment</td><td>1A.3.

Lesson Plans</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td><td>1B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Science Goal #1B:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td><td>1B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td><td>1B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Schedule does not allow for additional science enrichment	2A.1. Identified students going to the enrichment session of Intervention/Enrichment will include a focus on science content.	2A.1. Leadership team	2A.1. Informal Observations	2A.1. Science Benchmark tests
Science Goal #2A: *In 2012, 4% of the fifth grade students scored a level 4 and 5 on FCAT Science* *In 2013, 7% of the fifth grade students will score a level 4 and 5 on FCAT Science* / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012, 4% 4/98 of the fifth grade students scored a level 4 and 5 on FCAT Science* / 2013Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013, 7% of the fifth grade students will score a level 4 and 5 on FCAT Science*					
	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* / 2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
	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

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Fusion Curriculum	K-5	Mrs. Hotaling	School wide	08/09/12	PLC's	Coaches
Science Resources	K-5	CRT	School wide	9/19/12	PLC meetings	CRT
Science Boot Camp	5	CRT	5th grade teachers	TBA	Classroom observations	CRT
Safari Montage	K-5	District support	K-5 teachers	TBA	Usage of clips	Administration

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 Boot Camp	Hands on –Inquiry Based Science Program	Title I	$400
			Subtotal: $400
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Safari Montage	Extensive library of video clips	General	$1900.
			Subtotal: $1900
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Safari Montage	Video Clips	N/A	-
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
			Total:$2300

End of Science Goals

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

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

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1A: *In June 2012, 61% of 4th grade students scored Level 3.0 and higher on FCAT Writes. The writing goal for 2013 is that 64% of the students will score 3.0 or higher.* 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In June 2012, 61% (48/89) of 4th grade students scored Level 3.0 and higher on FCAT Writes.* 2013 Expected Level ofPerformance:* *The writing goal for 2013 is that 64% of the students will score 3.0 or higher.*	1.1. Expanded expectations for FCAT Writes/more stringent scoring criteria	1.1. Revaluate and adjust writing teaching strategies. Attend FCAT. 2.0 Writing Workshop	1.1. Classroom Teachers	1.1. Five school-wide writing prompts administered and reviewed by the principal.	1.1. Teacher writing prompt scores
	1.2. Weak writing vocabulary	1.2. Word of the Week	1.2. Principal	1.2. Word of the Week participation	1.2. Student use of Words of the Week in writing prompts
	1.3. Inconsistency between scoring techniques	1.3. Provide training on uniform rubrics for each grade level: Utilize Write Score for scoring 4th grade prompts.	1.3. Team Leaders	1.3. Teachers will exchange student papers to evaluate grade level consistency in scoring.	1.3. Comparison Data Reports
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1B: N/A 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Scoring/Rubrics	K-5	Administration	K-5 teachers, resource teachers	Pre- Preplanning August 2012	School wide writing prompts handing in to administration	Administration
45 Day Writing Plan	4	District	4 grade teachers	TBA	Lesson Plans	Administration
FCAT 2.0 Writing-Scoring	4	District	4th grade teachers	October 26, 2012-Engelwood	School wide writing prompts handing in to administration	Administration

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
Write Score, LLC	4th grade writing prompt scoring	General	$1496.03
			Subtotal: $1496.03
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
45 Day writing Plan	Writing Strategies	Title 1	Subs- 250.00
FCAT 2.0 Writing/Scoring	Writing Strategies	N/A	-
			Subtotal: $250.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:$1746.03
			Total:1746.03

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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			
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
			Total: 0

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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			
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Lack of school control over tardies and absences.	1.1. Communicate to parents/guardians the importance of all students arriving to school on-time using newsletters, agendas, Connect Orange, and through parent meetings. Communicate to parents/guardians the importance of regular attendance using newsletters, agendas, Connect Orange, and through parent meetings	1.1.Administration	1.1. Monitor attendance and tardy reports	1.1 Attendance records.
Attendance Goal #1: *In 2012, Cheney maintained an attendance rate of 95.02%. There were 177 students with excessive absences and 95 students with excessive tardies. In 2013 the number of tardies and absences will be reduced by 20%*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *95.02%* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *177 students had excessive absences* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *95 students had excessive tardies*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *98.%* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *By June 2013, Cheney will reduce the number of excessive absences by 20% (142)* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *By June 2013, Cheney will reduce the number of excessive tardies by 20% (76)*					
			1.2. Unclear expectations and knowledge on attendance procedures for teachers	1.2. Continuous communication between teachers, administration and registrar	1.2. Classroom teachers, administration and registrar	1.2. Monitor attendance records	1.2. Attendance records on Progress Book
			1.3. Very large percentage of student usage of school clinic	1.3. Partnership with Nemours and Winter Park Health to support	1.3. School nurse	1.3. Usage of both clinics	1.3. End of year usage data

		students, their families and staff with in house clinic			

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Procedures	Pre K–5 Teachers	Cathy Mott	Pre K–5 Teachers	Preplanning Meeting	Attendance Records	Cathy Mott
Attendance training	Registrar	District	Registrar	September 25, 2012	Attendance records	Principal

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance Procedures	Registrar Procedures and Progress Book	N/A	0
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
			Total: 0

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* During the 2011-2012 school year, 29 students received an in-school suspension and 34 total in school suspensions occurred. There were 35 out-of-school suspensions written, and 27students were suspended out-of-school. In 2013 the number of suspensions will be reduced by 20%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *There were 34 in school suspension in 2012.* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *29 Students were given in school suspension in 2012.* 2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *There were 35 out of school suspensions.* 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *27 students were given out of school*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions ***By June, 2013, Cheney will decrease incidents receiving in-school suspensions by 20%, (26)*** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School ***By June, 2013, Cheney will decrease the number of students receiving in-school suspensions by 20%, (30)*** 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions ***By June, 2013, Cheney will decrease incidents receiving out of school suspensions by 20%, (31))*** 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School ***By June, 2013, Cheney will***	1.1. Students unfamiliarity with the Student Code of Conduct/ School Discipline Plan	1.1. All teachers will review the Student Code of Conduct each nine weeks.	1.1. Classroom Teachers, Administration	1.1. Teachers will hold class meetings to discuss the Student Code of Conduct	1.1. Lesson Plans and Student Code of Conduct Report

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

	suspension.	*decrease the number of students receiving out of school suspensions by 20%, (24)*				
			1.2. Inconsistency with the school based discipline	1.2. Introduce teachers and students on the principles of CHAMPS through Staff Development.	1.2. CRT and CHAMPS Team	1.2. Observations	1.2. The number of suspensions and referrals throughout the year.
		1.3.Positive behavior support not used school wide	1.3. Implement school wide "Viking Bucks" to encourage positive behavior	1.3. CHAMPS team	1.3. Number of students visiting the Viking Variety Shop	1.3. Suspensions and referral data
		1.4 Students lack of knowledge of Character traits needed for success.	1.4 Implement Learning for Life school wide during Media Special Area time	1.4 Media Specialist	1.5 Lesson Plans	1.5 Pre-post LFL assessments

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CHAMPS	School wide discipline program	N/A	0
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CHAMPS	School wide discipline program	N/A	-
			Subtotal: 0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School wide behavior program	Positive behavior rewards	General-Internal	$2000.
			Subtotal: $2000.
			Total: $2000.

End of Suspension Goals

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1 ***During the 2011-2012 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers implemented Year One of Destination College. The goal is for all 3-5 grade students to receive training on Year Two of Destination College***	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *As an elementary school we do not have a dropout rate* 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *We will identify students at risk for dropping out of school, based on attendance and retention data* 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*	1.1. Teachers' misconceptions of the effect of elementary experiences on high school drop-out rates.	1.1. Implementation of Year Two: Destination College	1.1. Destination College Team	1.1. Observation / Lesson Plans Collection of evidence for use in the Year Two End-of-the-Year Destination College Binder	1.1. Year Two End-of-the-Year Destination College Binder
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Destination College	3-5	DC Team	3-5 Teachers	Early Release Wednesdays (TBA)	Collection of evidence for use in the Year Two End-of-the-Year	DC Team

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Destination College: Year Two	Destination College Plan (PDS Online)	N/A	0
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
			Total:0

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: ***During the 2011-2012 school year Cheney had 25% (120) parent participation in school wide activities. There were 380 registered volunteers and 8269 hours. During the 2012-2013 school year Cheney will have 28% parent participation in school wide activities and an 10% increase in registered volunteers.***	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* During the 2011-2012 school year Cheney had 25% (120) parental participation in school wide activities. (380 volunteers, 8269 hours)	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* During the 2012-2013 school year Cheney will have 28% (159) parental participation in school wide activities.	1.1. Communication gap between home and school	1.1. Principal will continue monthly Connect Orange phone calls, and distribute school wide newsletters to all families.	1.1. Administration and Title One Parenting Instructional Support	1.1. Connect Orange Messages and Monthly Newsletters	1.1. Connect Orange Messages and Monthly Newsletters
			1.2 Working parents unable to come to events during school hours.	1.2 Conduct parent workshop, activities at varying times to get parent participation	1.2 PTA, Administration	1.2 End of year surveys	1.2 End of year surveys
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
After hour curriculum nights/activities	Materials needed for curriculum nights in literacy, math, writing and science	Title 1	$5000.
			Subtotal:$5000
			Total: $5000.

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: To increase student participation in STEM lessons and activities	1.1. Teachers need more exposure and training in STEM method of instruction	1.1. Monthly professional development on STEM, attend FTCM conference	1.1. OCPS Science Coach	1.1. Teacher Formative Assessment	1.1. Science and Math FCAT Edusoft Fusion Program Assessments
	1.2. Lack of exposure to math, science and engineering concepts across the curriculum	1.2. Offer afterschool Lego/Robotics club for students K-5	1.2. Mrs. Butterfield	1.2. Attendance in club	1.2. Science and Math FCAT Edusoft
	1.3. Lack of student background knowledge in STEM	1.3. Implement the use of Safari Montage	1.3. CRT	1.3. Observations	1.3 Edusoft

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Fusion Curriculum	K-5	Mrs. Hotaling	School wide	08/09/12	PLC's	Coaches
Fusion Curriculum	K-5	County	School Wide	Summer 2012	PLC's	Coaches
FTCM Conference	Math	State facilitators	Identifed teachers, CRT	Oct 18-20, 2012	Lesson plans, PLC's	CRT
Safari Montage	K-5	District support	All staff	November 2012	Observation	CRT

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Safari Montage	Extensive library of video clips	General	$1900. (Included in Science)
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math strategies	FTCM Conference	Title 1	0
Science Boot Camp	Science strategies	N/A	-
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:0
			Total:0

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Increase the percentage of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready, based on FLKRS Data. (Score above 70%) Additional Goal #1: *During the 2011-2012 school year, 75% of the 2010-2011 VPK students at Cheney were ready for kindergarten. During the 2012-2013 school year, 78% of the 2011-2012 VPK students at Cheney will be ready for kindergarten.*	2012 Current Level :* *During the 2011-2012 school year, 75% of the 2010-2011 VPK students at Cheney were ready for kindergarten.*	2013 Expected Level :* *During the 2012-2013 school year, 78% of the 2011-2012 VPK students at Cheney will be ready for kindergarten.*	2.1. VPK students limited exposure to foundational readiness skills	2.1. Provide VPK students with caring, safe environment following the state mandated program guide to maximize student readiness for kindergarten.	2.1. VPK Teacher	2.1. Observation	2.1. FLKRS data
			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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal Increase by 3-5%- Students Who read on grade level by nine.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal # 2 See SIP Goal – Reading 3A	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal Increase by 3-5%-Students who become fluent in math operations.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #3: See SIP Goal- Math 1A	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #4: See SIP Goal-Reading/Math 5B, 5C, 5D, 5E	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5. Additional Goal Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage			2.1. Funds for Arts programs	2.1. Continue scheduling music and art on the special area schedule	2.1. Administration	2.1. Informal and formal observations	2.1. Progress Book Grades and Lesson Plans
Additional Goal #5: *During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% of Cheney students participated in music/art classes on a weekly basis. Thirty –five 4th and 5th grade students were*	2012 Current Level :* *During the 2011-2012 school year, Thirty-Five of the students were*	2013 Expected Level :* *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students in chorus will*					

members of the Cheney Chorus. The goal is for a 5% increase in participation in chorus	*members of the chorus.*	*increase by 5%.*					
			1.2. Lack of participation in chorus	1.2. Offer chorus to all interested 4th and 5th grade students after school two days a week.	1.2. Music Teacher	1.2. Attendance Rates/Chorus Performances	1.2. Participation rates
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
6. Additional Goal: Increase College and Career Awareness Additional Goal #6: *During the 2011-2012 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers implemented Year One of Destination College. During the 2012-2013 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers will implement Year Two of Destination College.*	2012 Current Level :* *During the 2011-2012 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers implemented Year One of Destination College.*	2013 Expected Level :* *During the 2012-2013 school year, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers will implement Year Two of Destination College.*	1.1. Implementation of new skills to an existing program.	1.1. Provide Staff Development for the Implementation of Year Two: Destination College	1.1. Destination College Team	1.1. Observation / Lesson Plans Collection of evidence for use in the Year Two End-of-the-Year Destination College Binder	1.1. Year Two End-of-the-Year Destination College Binder

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goal(s)			**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
7. Additional Goal Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education Additional Goal #7: *During the 2011-2012 school year, 33 students were classified as special education students (ESE).* *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students classified as special education students (ESE) will be reduced by 5% (31students).*	2012 Current Level :* *During the 2011-2012 school year, 33 students were classified as special education students (ESE).*	2013 Expected Level :* *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students classified as special education students (ESE) will be reduced by 5% (31students).*	2.1. RtI process was implemented inconsistently	2.1. Continued Staff Development supporting MTSS Process and Procedures Utilization of MTSS processes and procedures	2.1. Staffing Specialist, ESE teacher, and Regular Ed Teachers	2.1. PLC meetings, Staffings, and progress monitoring	2.1. MTSS Tools and evaluation forms
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

		PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
Destination College	3-5	DC Team	3-5 Teachers	Early Release Wednesdays (TBA)	Collection of evidence for use in the Year Two End-of-the-Year	DC Team

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:0
			Total:0

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:$46,365.43
CELLA Budget
Total:$500.
Mathematics Budget
Total:$17,066.20
Science Budget
Total:$2300
Writing Budget
Total:$1747.43
Civics Budget
Total: 0
U.S. History Budget
Total:0
Attendance Budget
Total:0
Suspension Budget
Total:$2000.00
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:0
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:$5000.
STEM Budget
Total:0
CTE Budget
Total:0
Additional Goals
Total:0
Grand Total: $75,000.

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		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☒Prevent

Are you reward school? ☐Yes   ☒No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council will meet each month to discuss the status of the school improvement plan as well as discuss strategies to be used to insure the plan is working for the benefit of our students.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Limited funds available through SAC.	

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