

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Wekiva High School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Dr. Doreen Elise Gruber	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Ms. Gigi Palmer	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. D. Elise Gruber	BA in English Language Arts Education (UCF) MA in English (UCF) MA in Humanities (University of Wales) EdS in Educational Leadership (Stetson) EdD in Educational Leadership (University of Florida) Certifications: English 6-12 Ed Leadership Endorsements: Gifted ESOL	6	18 yrs. as administrator 12 yrs. as Principal	<p>Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year: if applicable)</p> <p>2011-2012 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 48% Writing: 82% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math: 60% Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Math: 69%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 39% Math 74% Science: 42% Writing: 83% Learning Gains: Reading 46% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 42% Math: 70% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White ...No in all other categories</p> <p>2009-10 School Grade: D FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 70% Science: 32% Writing: 87% Learning Gains: Reading 48% Math: 72% Lowest 25%: Reading: 43% Math: 58% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2008-09 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency: Reading 43% Math 71% Science:</p>

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

					<p>29% Writing: 86% Learning Gains: Reading 51% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 47% Math: 65% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes, except Reading Hispanic AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in Total and White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2007-08 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency: Reading 43% Math 71% Science: 36% Writing: 79% Learning Gains: Reading 52% Math: 75% Lowest 25%: Reading: 41% Math: 68% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: N/A Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes, except Reading Hispanic AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in Total and White...No in all other categories</p>
Assistant Principal	George Kispert	BA in Spanish/Secondary Education MS in Educational Administration & Supervision Certifications: Ed Leadership	3	23 yrs. as administrator	<p>2011-2012 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 48% Writing: 82% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math: 60% Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Math: 69%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 39% Math 74% Science: 42% Writing: 83% Learning Gains: Reading 46% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 42% Math: 70% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No</p>

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

					AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White ...No in all other categories
Assistant Principal	Nykowanna Sloan	BA in Communication Arts MS in Educational Leadership Certifications: Drama Ed Leadership	4	5 years as an administrator	<p>2011-2012 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 48% Writing: 82% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math: 60% Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Math: 69%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 39% Math 74% Science: 42% Writing: 83% Learning Gains: Reading 46% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 42% Math: 70% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White ...No in all other categories</p> <p>2009-10 School Grade: D FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 70% Science: 32% Writing: 87% Learning Gains: Reading 48% Math: 72% Lowest 25%: Reading: 43% Math: 58% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2008-09 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency: Reading 43% Math 71% Science: 29% Writing: 86% Learning Gains: Reading 51% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 47% Math: 65% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes</p>

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

					<p>Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes, except Reading Hispanic AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in Total and White...No in all other categories</p>
Assistant Principal	Demetria Wilson	<p>BA in English Literature MS in Educational Leadership Certifications: Ed Leadership English 6-12</p>	2	5 yrs. as administrator	<p>2011-2012 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 48% Writing: 82% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math: 60% Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Math: 69%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 39% Math 74% Science: 42% Writing: 83% Learning Gains: Reading 46% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 42% Math: 70% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White ...No in all other categories</p> <p>Gateway High School (Osceola County) 2010-2011 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 44% Math 70% Science: 39% Writing: 75% Learning Gains: Reading 54% Math: 78% Lowest 25%: Reading: 52% Math: 65% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: Yes 95% Tested: Yes, except for Math Students with Disabilities AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: No</p>

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

Assistant Principal	Angela Clayton	BA: Business Administration M. Ed: K-8 Math & Science Education Certifications: Ed Leadership Elementary Ed K-6 ESOL K-12	0	0	<p>John Young Elementary 2011-2012 - School Grade A 569 points Curriculum Resource Teacher Reading High Standards 69% Reading Learning Gains 77% Reading Learning Gains lowest quartile 69% Math High Standards 72% Math Learning Gains 71% Math Lowest Quartile 67% Writing 93% Science 51%</p> <p>West Creek Elementary 2010-2011 School Grade A 624 points Curriculum Resource Teacher 100% AYP met Reading High Standards 90% Math High Standards 93% Writing 92% Science 78% Reading Learning Gains 71% Math Learning Gains 71% Reading Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 59% Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 70%</p> <p>West Creek Elementary 2009-2010 School Grade A- 653 points Curriculum Resource Teacher Reading 100% AYP met Reading 94% Reading Learning Gains 75% Math Learning Gains 77% Reading Lowest Quartile 71% Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains 76% Math 94% Writing 91% Science 75%</p>
---------------------	----------------	--	---	---	--

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)
ALL	Mary Suzanne Johnston	BS in Mathematics Education MS in Mathematics Education Certification: Secondary Mathematics 6-12	6	5	<p>2011-2012 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 48% Writing: 82% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math: 60% Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Math: 69%</p> <p>2010-11 School Grade: B FCAT Proficiency: Reading 39% Math 74% Science: 42% Writing: 83% Learning Gains: Reading 46% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 42% Math: 70% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2009-10 School Grade: D FCAT Proficiency: Reading 42% Math 70% Science: 32% Writing: 87% Learning Gains: Reading 48% Math: 72% Lowest 25%: Reading: 43% Math: 58% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: No 95% Tested: Yes in all categories AYP Reading Proficiency: No</p>

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

					<p>AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2008-09 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency: Reading 43% Math 71% Science: 29% Writing: 86% Learning Gains: Reading 51% Math: 76% Lowest 25%: Reading: 47% Math: 65% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: Yes Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes, except Reading Hispanic AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in Total and White...No in all other categories</p> <p>2007-08 School Grade: C FCAT Proficiency: Reading 43% Math 71% Science: 36% Writing: 79% Learning Gains: Reading 52% Math: 75% Lowest 25%: Reading: 41% Math: 68% AYP information: School-wide: No Total Writing Proficiency: N/A Total Graduation Criterion Met: N/A 95% Tested: Yes, except Reading Hispanic AYP Reading Proficiency: No AYP Math Proficiency: Yes in Total and White...No in all other categories</p>
Reading	Clinton J. Ewane	BS in Elementary Education MS in Curriculum and Reading Instruction MS in Education Administration Certifications:	1	8	<p>Bridgewater MS: 2011-2012 School Grade: A FCAT Proficiency: Reading 80% Math 81% Writing: 88% Science: 72% Learning Gains: Reading 72% Math: 81% Lowest 25%: Reading: 70% Math: 68%</p>

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

		Reading K-12 Elementary Ed K-6			Bridgewater MS: 2010-11 School Grade: A FCAT Proficiency: Reading 84% Math 85% Science: 65% Writing: 93% Learning Gains: Reading 67% Math: 80% Lowest 25%: Reading: 72% Math: 72%
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Professional Development is focused upon PLCs (Professional Learning Communities) which allow teachers time to work on common planning and assessments as well as best practices.	George Kispert	Year-long activity; June 2013
2. "Wekivizing" and ongoing Mentoring Program: Orientation of new teachers to school prior to school starting as well as bi-weekly meetings to support instructional staff new to Wekiva.	Mary Suzanne Johnston	Year-long activity; June 2013
3. Attend district and state recruiting efforts	D. Elise Gruber	Year-long activity; June 2013

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0 (0%) Out of Field 3 (2.7%) PSC teachers who were not rated highly effective according to new assessment system	3 (2.7%) Teachers will be placed on Improvement Plans under new assessment system

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
113	2% (3)	24% (27)	63% (71)	11% (12)	35% (40)	99% (112)	4% (5)	6% (7)	15% (17)

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
Milca Rivera	Bennett, Roshunda	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations

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

Andrew Beverly	Benton, Shannon	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Theo McWhite	Butts, Tommie	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Mercedes Harrington	Cvetco, Jay	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Ed Carman	Davis, Samuel	Similar duties as new hire	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Suzanne Johnston	Ewane, Clinton	Similar duties as new hire – Curriculum Resource Teacher	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Carol Duberstein	Fligor, Lene	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Jami Bartschi	Gnapp, Lisa	Experienced teacher who teaches fine arts class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Carlene Rogers	Sommerhage, Mercedes	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS – Science Department Chairperson	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations

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

Beverly, Andrew	Grenci, Michael	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Sol Varon	Grevert, Jeffrey	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Ed Carman	Groeneveld, Heather	Similar duties as new hire	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Paul Izzo	Linares, Eric	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Taryn Garland	Lubin, Gersino	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Jerrod Miller	Murray, Yolondalyn	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Nicole Meeks	Nassar, Charles	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Randall Ius	O'Connor, Dana	Department Chair of the Applied Program	Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations

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

Deb Owens	Oliva, Angel	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Ward Gros	Owens, Marie	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Suzanne Johnston	Owens, Matthew	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Camille Leachman	Pitts, Janet	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Trish Smith	Rivera, Carman	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Bryan Gary	Sanders, Jason	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Cheryl Butler	Senkel, Jennifer	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Carlene Rogers	Sommerhage, Frank	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS – Science Department Chairperson	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations

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

Randall Ius	Stephen Villiotis	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS – Applied Programs Department Chairperson	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations
Cheryl Gleason	Vince, Kortney	Experienced teacher who teaches the same class(es) as new hire to Wekiva HS	Two day orientation of School by CRT; Bi-weekly Induction Training; Peer Observations; Monthly individual meeting with CRT; Informal/Formal observations

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

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: Dr. E. Elise Gruber, Demetria Wilson, Edward Carman, Samuel Davis, Jean Ewane, Terseca Cook, Suzanne Johnston, Heather Groeneveld
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The MTSS Team meets bi-weekly to discuss specific topics as needed. Team members work with the school PLCs to gather and interpret data, and monitor tiered differentiation where needed. Team members will report findings at the weekly MTSS meetings. An area of focus this year is to progress monitor the Lowest Quartile weekly in Reading. All teachers of the Lowest Quartile report to school coaches weekly via a survey so information can be tracked to help these students stay focused and succeed. At bi-weekly RtI meetings members of the Team pose questions as they examine the data to gain further insight into what the data is suggesting. The Team works collaboratively in analyzing the data and in recommending an appropriate plan of action. Team members facilitate further discussion of the data with respective PLC Teams as well as appropriate interventions, keeping in mind the previous discussions occurring with the Leadership Team. Team members will pose questions to the PLC Teams during their review of the data to seek interventions that should instill change for improvement. The Leadership Team members will report back to the MTSS Leadership Team regarding the PLC Team's intervention plan and their progress toward improvement. Students in Intensive Reading/Math (9-12) as well as retake students not in Intensive Reading/Math participate in Mini-Assessments weekly and data is shared with teachers, administration, and the MTSS team weekly to help differentiate instruction. Each assistant principal is the liaison to specific curricular areas at our school. They are supported by the instructional coaches, CRT, staffing specialist, ELL Coordinator, and department chairpersons.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The school-based MTSS Leadership Team examines the data from the previous year and scans the environment to determine appropriate goals for the SIP. Members of the Team assist in drafting suggested activities and strategies to include in the SIP. The same process used by the MTSS Leadership Team in analyzing data during the school year and in developing an appropriate plan of action is used in developing the SIP. The MTSS Leadership Team works collaboratively with the school's teams in implementing the SIP. The MTSS Leadership Team monitors progress along the way and suggests any necessary revisions to strategies and activities of the SIP. Members of the MTSS Leadership Team also work in conjunction with our School Advisory Council in monitoring the progress of the SIP. George Kispert and Suzanne Johnston assembled the document prior to sharing with the principal.
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. Data sources for the MTSS team include, but are not limited to EDW (Enterprise Data Warehouse), Edusoft, Pearson (FCAT and EOC data), ACT, SAT, PERT, Industry Certification, PSAT, grade distributions, My Access, discipline and attendance data. The data management systems in place include the following: Tier 1: MTSS Leadership Team, Curriculum Leaders Team, PLC Teams Tier 2: Reading and Math PLC Teams, Advanced Placement PLC Team, Industry Certification PLC Team, Student Support Services Team Tier 3: ESE PLC Team, IEP Teams
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS: The staff at Wekiva participated in an overview of the MTSS process during the 2011-2012 school year. PLC Teams also participated in regular progress monitoring meetings in which they analyzed data and planned for instructional interventions. Our next steps are to explore additional instructional interventions that the PLC Teams may implement for greater student success. These will be generated through the brainstorming sessions with the various PLC Teams and compiled to share with the entire staff. The MTSS Leadership Team will continue to develop the framework we will use for Tiers 1 through 3 and present these to the staff during Professional Development sessions so that full implementation may be initiated this school year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS: Time and access to appropriate data is essential for success for the MTSS Leadership Team. Meetings are supported by appropriate personnel such as Department Chairpersons, PLC Team Leaders, and Testing Coordinator. MTSS Leadership meetings are typically held on the 2nd and 4th Mondays following the Administrative meetings.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT): Dr. D. Elise Gruber, Nykowanna Sloan, Angela Clayton, Jean Ewane, Joyce Poole, Susan Rawson, Kelli Mitchell, Heather Groeneveld, Ward Gros, Michael Kellen, Robin Dakers, James Fake, and Lene Fligor.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Assistant Principal establishes the dates of the monthly meetings and facilitates them. The Team determines the topics to be discussed at subsequent meetings. A formal agenda guides the discussion at each meeting. Individual team members who have volunteered to spear head an effort report out on progress made in each of the targeted initiatives, programs, or events. Members engage in collaborative discussions on each topic on the agenda with the Assistant Principal facilitating the discussion. Minutes from each meeting are maintained and subsequently published to the members of the team and the entire staff.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The following efforts will be in place at Wekiva during the 2012-2013 school year: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• School wide focus on three reading strands: vocabulary development, the use of non-fiction text, and reading comprehension• Follow-up survey on the Summer Reading Assignment• Monthly Book Club• Target Mini-Grant participation• Million Minute Marathon• Non-fiction resources included in weekly lesson planning school wide• Promote collaboration among building faculty (building consensus regarding instructional strategies) using rubrics• Create a literacy action plan that aligns with the academic needs of the students• Use formative assessments to establish goals and monitor progress• Spend most of the meetings on discussing school-wide data and content areas• Communicate the student achievement challenges our students face• Discuss the enriching reading activities for the year.• School-wide reading strategies – Before- During- After Reading Strategies (to be determined after soliciting and viewing teacher responses via survey) Reading Strategies responsibility of every teacher: The weekly lesson plan format that is being used by all teachers includes a specific notation of the specific non-fiction reading material that teachers shall incorporate into instruction. Social studies and several of our science teachers participated in CRISS Training during 2010-2011. They will be encouraged to continue to incorporate CRISS strategies into their instructional practices. Additional CRISS training will be offered to staff members who have not previously participated or who are not reading endorsed. All teachers are expected to include specific reading and writing activities within instruction. Teachers will incorporate a focus on specific reading strategies to help students understand the targeted content-based reading.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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

N/A

**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?

All instructional staff at Wekiva High School will participate in the three part Reading initiative. The first part focuses upon Vocabulary Development in all classes. Teachers will use multiple strategies to develop grade level appropriate vocabulary. Strategy One directs the instructional staff to create “Language Rich” classes. Specific activities may include, but are not limited to, developing walls that teach, concept circles, concept definition maps, thinking maps, and employing word games. The second strategy under Vocabulary Development suggests that teachers introduce small groupings of similar words. Expanding upon this strategy will ensure that students will be able to comprehend the vocabulary being taught using vocabulary awareness charts, compare and contrast, cause and effect, problem and solution, or keeping track charts. The final strategy under Vocabulary Development encourages all teachers to use graphic organizers to facilitate Higher Order Thinking skills and to teach technical vocabulary words. Strategies may include items such as linear arrays, word maps, Venn diagrams, and T-charts.

The second part of the Reading Initiative focuses upon Literary Analysis, specifically the use of non-fiction passages. Teachers will provide students a variety of nonfiction, informational text, and expository text to demonstrate an understanding of the information being taught. Strategy One suggests that all teachers demonstrate the Strategy of Pre-reading a selected text selection. Suggested methods of achieving this strategy include surveying the text, predicting the main idea, reviewing reading aids, and predicting the Genre. The next strategy related to Nonfiction requires teachers to model and organize information to show understanding or relationships among facts, ideas, and events. Specific methods may include charting, mapping, summarizing, comparing, contrasting, and drawing inferences. The final strategy related to working with nonfiction passages deals with marking the text. Specific ideas include numbering paragraphs, circling key terms and underlining relevant information in the text.

The final part of the school-wide Reading initiative deals with improving student Reading Comprehension. Strategy one suggests that reading comprehension will improve if students implement the process of summarizing ideas of expository texts by writing in the margins. Summarizing sections of a text enables students to state what paragraphs are about, describe what the author is doing, and identifying key terms and/or ideas. Resources to achieve this process include content based publications. Strategy two requires that all classes utilize Cornell Note-taking. Utilizing the same method of note-taking from class to class will help students understand and master material in all types of classes and ultimately improve their reading comprehension. The last strategy for reading comprehension relies on making connections with prior knowledge. Encouraging student to think about what they already know about a topic or type of reading will enhance comprehension. Teachers may model how to predict, question, activate prior knowledge, infer, monitor, adjust and reread.

**High Schools Only*

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

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

Students at Wekiva have a wide variety of Applied Program offerings that they can pursue. These include the following: Business Education courses,

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

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

Drafting, Aerospace Technology, AFJROTC, Agri-Science, TV Production, and Laser Photonics. Students in our Applied Programs work toward meeting industry standards as measured by their performance on Industry Certification Exams. Within each program are ample opportunities for career exploration and career-linked experiences. Teachers of these programs work collaboratively with teachers of other content areas to piggy-back targeted concepts so that students see the correlation of subjects and topics that they are learning. Teachers of Applied Programs also meet quarterly as members of a professional learning community to examine and plan for issues linked to industry certification, scheduling, and real-world connections of their programs. The Laser Photonics Academy, the Agri-Science, Business Technology Academy and the Health Science Academy are working diligently in establishing a cohort of teachers to promote interdisciplinary efforts and targeted instruction for students enrolled in the academies.

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?

A comprehensive school counseling program is in place based on the ASCA National Standards for Students. Our counselors cover all three strands of the ASCA National Model for School Counseling: career, personal/social, and academic. All students benefit from the guidance program as the counselors deliver guidance lessons through the classroom. Students are given an opportunity for academic advisement where credits are checked, discussions are held about career plans, and courses are selected based on student goals. The mission of the school counseling program at Wekiva High School is clearly stated and based on the 11 essential outcomes of the Orange County Public Schools. Our mission is: Counselors will provide an opportunity for all students to develop the personal, academic, and career skills needed to ensure personal success.

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](#).

Wekiva High School provides the following opportunities for students:

- After School Tutoring
- Saturday tutoring for FCAT, EOC tests, ACT/SAT, and AP
- Comprehensive counseling by grade level by Guidance
- Teacher implementation of SCHMOOP (online web-based student support system for ACT, SAT, PSAT, and Advanced Placement preparation)

Individual counseling for students by Guidance

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. Need to identify informational reading across curriculum and strategies to better support students, including ESE accommodations.	1A.1. Provide ongoing training in Guided Reading and Differentiated Instruction to improve teacher skills in meeting the needs of the targeted group.	1A.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Reading Dep. Chair	1A.1. Common Assessments, Reading Focus Calendar, Data discussions within PLC's, and Meeting agendas/minutes	1A.1. Lesson Plans, Quarterly Common Assessments, Mini-Assessments, & Benchmark Assessments
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>60% (650) of ninth and tenth grade students at Wekiva High School will score at FCAT Level 3 on the Spring 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</i>	19%(232)	60% (650)					
			1A.2. Ongoing common assessment tool does not exist to adequately monitor student performance or accurately target interventions in Reading.	1A.2. Teachers and support staff will use data/results (FCAT to search, determine, and select appropriate materials to differentiate instruction. i.e., magazines, pamphlets, fiction/nonfiction books, newspapers, articles, internet resources, school books, etc...)	1A.2. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and Reading Dep. Chair	1A.2. Data discussions with the Reading & Language Arts Depts., Reading Focus Calendar, and Formal/Informal Observations.	1A.2. Lesson Plans, Quarterly Common Assessments, Mini Assessments, & Benchmark Assessments. Increase in student engagement
			1A.3. Need to support higher order thinking, analysis, strategy development, and meaning beyond the text.	1A.3. Provide ongoing professional development training on how to develop and effectively use common and formative assessments to monitor student progress	1A.3. Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach	1A.3. Data discussions with the Reading & Language Arts Depts., Data discussions within PLC's, Meeting agendas/minutes.	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Assessment results
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. Classroom teacher not trained to utilize STARR and allowing enough classroom time for use.	1B.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	1B.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Department Chair ESE, and Teachers	1B.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	1B.1.STARR
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>50% (7) of ninth and tenth grade students participating in the FAA will score at levels 4, 5, or 6 in Spring, 2013.</i>	0% (0)	50% (7)					

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. Build a system of weekly progress monitoring	2A.1. Continue to train teachers to disaggregate data to address individual student needs.	2A.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach.	2A.1. Mini Assessments will be used weekly to monitor student progress	2A.1. Edusoft weekly Mini Assessments, FCAT Data, Common Assessments				
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>									
<i>25% (271) of ninth and tenth grade students at Wekiva High School will score at FCAT Level 4/5 on the Spring 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>	17% (210)	25% (271)									
2A.2. Instructional staff need more training on integrating Reading Across Content Areas								2A.2. All content area teachers will participate in the school-wide initiative to integrate reading strategies to build Vocabulary Development, Literary Analysis, and Reading Comprehension	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, and Reading Coach	2A.2. PLC's will collaborate using the benchmark mini assessments. Data discussions across academic departments Administrators will conduct formal/informal observations to monitor teachers' instructional practices	2A.2. Lesson Plans, Formal/Informal Observations, PLC meeting minutes, & agendas
2A.3. Students having access to additional and supplemental resources and additional non-fiction texts								2A.3. Increase student access to the media center and the technology labs. Continue to build classroom libraries	2A.3. Assistant Principal, Media and Technology Specialists, Reading Coach.	2A.3. Weekly Reading Logs, Teacher/Student Conferences, and Student Assessment Charts	2A.3. FCAT Data, FAIR Assessment data, Edusoft weekly mini assessments, Read 180, and Edge
2A.4. Student schedules are already issued and students may be reluctant to enroll in more rigorous classes Class size amendment classes may be at state mandated capacity.			2A.4. Increased by 3 to 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors and AP)	2A.4. API, Guidance Counselors, AP Coordinator	2A.4. Review enrollment of students enrolled in AP and Honors classes	2A.4. SMS					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. Teachers need to utilize portfolios for entire class.	2B.1. Teachers maintain student portfolios with samples demonstrating improvement in reading.	2B.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	2B.1. Progress Monitor data from portfolios	2B.1. Rubrics developed for specific items in portfolios				
Reading Goal #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>									
<i>70% (9) of students taking the FAA Reading will score at Level 7 or above in Spring, 2013.</i>	57.1% (4)	70% (9)									

**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
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	3A.1. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	3A.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance	3A.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest in Intensive Reading classes.	3A.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Data Walls
Reading Goal #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>65% (705) of ninth and tenth grade students at Wekiva High School will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Test.</i>	58% (709)	65% (705)					
			3A.2. All content area teachers using the School-wide reading strategies; Vocabulary Development, Literary Analysis, and Comprehension with fidelity	3A.2. Provide a series of trainings for instructional staff on how to incorporate and integrate the School-wide Reading Initiative.	3A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Teachers/ Instructional Staff	3A.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading Coach, Teachers/ Instructional Staff	3A.2. FCAT Data, FAIR Testing Data, Mini Assessments, Benchmark Testing
			3A.3. High ESOL population who struggle in the area of reading	3A.3. Differentiate Instruction based on students' ability levels and student data using high interest, age appropriate materials for the ELL population. Implement use of Achieve 3000 to support ELL learners. Schedule students for double block reading classes who have limited English abilities.	3A.3. ELL Compliance Staff, ELL teacher	3A.3. Formal/Informal Observations, Weekly Progress Monitoring, Charting Student Progress	3A.3. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, Common Assessments, Reading Focus Calendar
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. Classroom teacher are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to incorporate its use.	3B.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program as well as Access Points and specific targeted reading strategies based upon individual student's needs to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	3B.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	3B.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	3B.1. STARR
Reading Goal #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>50% (5) of ESE students taking the FAA Reading will make Learning Gains in Spring, 2013.</i>	38% (6)	50% (5)					

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. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	4A.1. Place students in Intensive Reading classes and Reading blocks. Provide Afterschool Tutoring and Saturday School Tutoring	4A.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselors	4A.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest in Intensive Reading classes.	4A.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Data Walls
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>70% (759) of the Lowest 25% in Ninth/Tenth Grade will make Learning Gains on the Spring 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.</i>	61% (746)	70% (759)					
			4A.2. Students being aware of their academic progress in the area of Reading.	4A.2. Students will be able to review their progress monthly using the classroom Data Walls and graph their progress in their student binders.	4A.2. Reading Coach, Teachers	4A.2. Weekly Progress Monitoring, Teacher/Student Conferences, Charting Student Progress	4A.2. Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders Student Data Walls
			4A.3. The need for effective researched-based programs that support the school-wide Reading Initiative	4A.3. Teachers will use Read 180, Edge programs, to support continuous improvement.	4A.3. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Teachers/ Instructional Staff	4A.3. Formal/Informal Observations, Weekly Progress Monitoring, Graphing Student Progress	4A.3. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls

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		Target AMO in Reading was 49%; actual performance was 42%	53%	58%	63%	26%	22%	
	Reading Goal #5A: <i>39% (477) ninth and tenth grade students achieved Level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading test in April, 2011. Last year 42% (514) students achieved Level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading test. A decrease of 4% is a reasonable percent to improve annually.</i>		Asian 81% Black 31% Hispanic 35% White 58% ELL 11% SWD 19% Econ. Disadvantaged 32%	Asian 73% Black 42% Hispanic 50% White 67% ELL 24% SWD 39% Econ. Disadvantaged 46%	Asian 75% Black 48% Hispanic 55% White 70% ELL 32% SWD 45% Econ. Disadvantaged 51%	Asian 78% Black 53% Hispanic 60% White 73% ELL 39% SWD 51% Econ. Disadvantaged 57%	Asian 81% Black 59% Hispanic 65% White 77% ELL 47% SWD 57% Econ. Disadvantaged 62%	Asian 84% Black 65% Hispanic 70% White 80% ELL 55% SWD 64% Econ. Disadvantaged 68%	
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.	Reading Goal #5B: <i>We will reduce the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in reading by at least 4%.</i>		5B.1. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	5B.1. Place students in Intensive Reading classes and Reading blocks. Provide Afterschool Tutoring and Saturday School Tutoring.	5B.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance	5B.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest in Intensive Reading classes.	5B.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	White: 42% (246) Black: 69% (420) Hispanic: 65% (233) Asian: 30% (19)		White: 33% (193) Black: 58% (353) Hispanic: 50% (179) Asian: 27% (17)						
				5B.2. Lack of student interest and motivation towards Reading.	5B.2. Provide students with relevant books through the media center, classroom libraries, and the local library. Support reading incentive plans through the media center and incorporate use with daily required reading logs.	5B.2. Media Center Specialist, Reading Coach, Teachers/Instructional Staff	5B.2. Student Reading Logs, Student Book Talks, Student Progress Charts.	5B.2. FCAT Data, Weekly Mini Assessments, Common Assessments.	
				5B.3. The need for effective researched-based programs that support the school-wide Reading Initiative.	5B.3. Teachers will use Read 180, Edge, Reading Plus program, and AVID Weekly Reader to support continuous improvement.	5B.3. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Teachers/Instructional Staff.	5B.3. Formal/Informal Observations, Weekly Progress Monitoring, Graphing Student Progress.	5B.3. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls.	
			5B.4. Lack of funding to purchase Kindles and appropriate books for Kindles	5B.4. Explore possibility of purchasing 25 Kindles to be available for student check-out	5B.4. Media Specialist	5B.4. Follow-up with students recommended to use Kindles for reading	5B.4. Checkout records in Destiny		

**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 subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	5C.1. Place students in Intensive Reading classes and Reading blocks. Provide Afterschool Tutoring and Saturday Tutoring	5C.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselors	5C.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest in Intensive Reading classes.	5C.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls.
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test in Spring, 2013 by 9%.</i>	83% (50)	76% (46)					
			5C.2. Teacher lack of knowledge and skill of using Literacy Circles	5C.2. ELL teacher implements Literacy Circles in classes.	5C.2. Reading Coach, ELL Reading Teachers	5C.2. Progress monitoring of reading skills/knowledge of ELL students	5C.2. Mini-assessments, Benchmark assessments, FAIR data
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. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time.	5D.1. Place students in Intensive Reading classes and Reading blocks. Provide Afterschool Tutoring and Saturday Tutoring.	5D.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselors	5D.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest in Intensive Reading classes.	5D.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls.
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of SWD not making satisfactory progress in reading by 6%.</i>	81% (238)	61% (179)					
			5D.2. Time to include focus on Text Features with targeted group.	5D.2. Teachers place extended focus on Text Features	5D.2. Reading Coach, Reading Teachers	5D.2. Progress monitoring of mini-assessments, benchmark assessments, FAIR data	5D.2. Mini-assessments, Benchmark assessments, FAIR data

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. Students need an increased amount of reading instructional time and access to reading materials may be limited.	5E.1. Place students in Intensive Reading classes and Reading blocks. Provide Afterschool Tutoring and Saturday Tutoring. Ensure that students are aware of check out procedures in the media center. Ensure book studies are available to all students.	5E.1. Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselors	5E.1. FCAT Scores will be used to properly place students and tailor instruction. Pre and Posttest In Intensive Reading classes.	5E.1. FCAT Data, Mini Assessments, FAIR Data, Student Binders, Student Data Walls.
Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 5%.</i>	68% (966)	54% (768)					
			5E.2. Time constraints, teacher lack of knowledge of program.	5E.2. Integration of SCHMOOP within Intensive Reading classes	5E.2. Reading Coach, Reading Teachers	5E.2. Progress Monitoring of FAIR data and Benchmark data	5E.2. Student sign-in data from SCHMOOP

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
Monthly professional development in CRISS strategies	9-12/Reading and all content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide Teams	Monthly- Tuesdays of each month during planning	Follow-up classroom visits and continuation/review in the following monthly PD	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Marzano- I Observation: Assist teachers with embedding targeted Design Questions into daily instruction.	9-12/All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide Teams	Monthly- Tuesdays of each month during planning/ make prearranged classrooms visits/PLCs	Follow-up classroom visits and continuation/review in the following monthly PD	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Common Core: Assist teachers with understanding CC and building rigor in their daily engagement with teachers.	9-12/All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide Teams	Monthly- Tuesdays of each month during planning/ make prearranged classrooms visits/PLCs	Follow-up classroom visits and continuation/review in the following monthly PD	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Build Literacy Council	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane/ media specialist	School-wide	August throughout year Based on staff development calendar	Facilitate monthly meetings	Jean Ewane/ Dr. Gruber
Reading Strategies in the Content Areas: Provide professional development for all teachers to review best practices and to	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide Teams	Pre-planning	Follow-up classroom visits and continuation/review in the following monthly PD	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber

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

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

learn new strategies to improve reading comprehension and reading in the content						
Provide SRI/SAM refresher training for reading teachers	9-12/Reading	Jean Ewane	Reading	Aug/September and throughout the year in targeted PLC meetings	Follow-up classroom visits and continuation/review in the following monthly PD	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
School-wide reading strategies of the month (across curriculum)	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide	August/September	Appear on school TV and send email updates/school Intranet share documents. Classroom visits	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Setting SMART GOALS (After PD, teachers will be able to assist students with setting their goals)	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide	August/ December	Appear on school TV and send email updates/school Intranet share documents. Classroom visits	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Student Data Chats (based on district assessments)	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide	After district assessments' results return	Provide training during planning/send out PowerPoint presentations detailing the procedures/ appearing on school TV	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Ensure that READ180 and EDGE resource books are ordered for intensive reading classes	9-12/Reading	Jean Ewane	Reading	Order over the summer	Classroom visits	Jean Ewane
Disaggregate 2012 FCAT 2.0 reading scores and FAIR scores to determine correct intensive reading placement	9-12/Reading	Jean Ewane	Reading	Summer/2012 And throughout the year to ensure that all level 1s/2s are placed in intensive reading save those with waivers	Classroom schedules/ EDW	Jean Ewane/ Technology Coordinator
Maintain reading resource links to school web sites or literacy coaches' website	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane/ Technology Coordinator	School-wide	September and throughout year	Review website weekly	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Monitor and chart progress of reading via District Assessments, FAIR, & READ 180's technology program.	9-12/Reading	Jean Ewane	Reading	September and throughout year	Data: Teacher data, district reports & school reports	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Teacher Surveys: Provide teachers opportunities to share their input of reading and literacy PD that they would like to have at Wekiva High School.	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane	School-wide	September and throughout year	Send electronic survey; analyze results and share with entire faculty. (Survey Monkey)	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber
Parent/Community Reading Resources: Educate parents about resources to support reading instruction (testing	9-12/ All content areas	Jean Ewane with aid from Content Area Department Chairs/Media Specialist	School-wide	Fall/Spring (before FCAT)	Send tri-folds to parents with reading, math, science, and writing resources	Jean Ewane/Nikki Sloan/Dr. Gruber

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

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

dates/literacy resources)						
---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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
Implement effective reading program (Read 180 & Edge)	Interactive Workbooks, texts, instructional resources	School Budget	\$14,000
			Subtotal:\$14,000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Have kindles available for students to check out from the Media Center to promote reading	25 kindles	Internal School Funds	\$2,000
			Subtotal:\$2,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$16,000

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Students are not proficient in speaking/listening skills	1.1. Utilization of software to improve speaking/listening skills during ESOL classes	1.1. Carol Duberstein; Lene Fligor	1.1. Students will move through the program on the computer and will be accessed at key times.	1.1. Software assessment tools; exit slips.
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
<i>70% (63) of the ELL students taking the Listening/Speaking portion of the CELLA Test in Spring 2013 will score at the Proficient Level.</i>	61% (55).	1.2. ESOL students do not speak in English regularly	1.2. Opportunities to speak during ESOL class to peers and teachers	1.2. Lene Fligor	1.2. Teacher will provide feedback individually to students to help develop proficiency in speaking	1.2. Rubric developed for individual tasks; exit slips.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Students have the inability to read in English.	2.1. ELL students will take DLA-R or DLA as part of their course load during 2012-2013 based upon their # of years in the country.	2.1. Carol Duberstein	2.1. Monitor enrollment of ELL students and their schedules	2.1. Check schedules in SMS.
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
<i>30% (28) of the ELL students taking the Reading portion of the CELLA Test in Spring 2013 will score at the Proficient Level.</i>	24% (22)	2.2. Students have the inability to read in English	2.2. Have students work with appropriate computer based reading program to help students at the level they are at.	2.2. Lene Fligor; Jean Ewane	2.2. Monitor results of their work using the computer based reading program as well as time using the program weekly.	2.2. Reading program software
		2.3. Students have the inability to read in English	2.3. ELL students participate in FAIR testing 3 times during the year	2.3. Jean Ewane	2.3. Monitor student progress from one testing period to the next; share results with teacher and ELL contact.	2.3. FAIR data

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		3.1 ELL students have weak mechanics when writing expository or persuasive essays.	3.1 Focus on English language conventions during the instruction of writing in Language Arts and ESOL classes.	3.1. CRT, 9 th Grade PLC Team Leader, 10 th Grade PLC Team Leader	3.1. Common Assessments of ninth and tenth grade Language Arts classes And My Access	3.1 My Access and teacher (PLC) created writing assessments
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
40% (34) of the ELL students taking the Writing portion of the CELLA Test in Spring 2013 will score at the Proficient Level.	31% (26)					
	3.2. Some teachers need to be creative in terms of how to integrate writing experiences within their instruction due to the nature of the content taught.	3.2. Some teachers need to be creative in terms of how to integrate writing experiences within their instruction due to the nature of the content taught.	3.2. All content area teachers are requiring writing experiences totaling at least 1000 words per marking period.	3.2. CRT, Administrative staff, Curriculum Leaders	3.2. Progress monitoring of student performance on various writing assignments completed by individual teachers and departments	3.2. Teacher grading scales
	3.3. There are times when technology glitches prevent the effective execution of software programs.	3.3. There are times when technology glitches prevent the effective execution of software programs.	3.3. Each department will utilize My Access with their students in completing writing experiences on prescribed topics throughout the year.	3.3. CRT, Administrative Staff, Core Coaches, Curriculum Leaders	3.3. Progress monitoring of My Access writing experiences	3.3. Holistic scoring of writing products through My Access

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

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

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. Classroom teachers are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to incorporate its use.	1.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	1.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	1.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	1.1. STARR
Mathematics Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>30% (3) of ESE students will score at Levels 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Spring, 2013.</i>	19% (3)	30% (3)					
			1.2 There was a limited amount of student success in math previously.	1.2 Teacher publicly displays student's work to promote student confidence	1.2 Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	1.2 Results of assessments of math	1.2 Rubrics created for assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. Classroom teachers are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to incorporate its use.	2.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	2.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	2.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	2.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program
Mathematics Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>40% (4) of ESE students will score at Level 7 or higher on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Spring, 2013.</i>	31% (5)	40% (4)					
			2.2. Classroom teachers have limited knowledge of how to provide real world math applications for enrichment.	2.2. Teachers will meet with their Math colleagues to obtain some ideas for real world applications and then they will implement these with students	2.2. ESE and Math Teachers	2.2. Student performance on targeted activities	2.2. Rubrics that teachers develop to accompany targeted activities
			2.3. Teachers lack experiences with regular level math classes	2.3. Teacher models Intensive Math program and incorporates comparable instructional activities	2.3. Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	2.3. Results of assessments of math	2.3. Rubrics created for assessments

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. Mathematics Goal #3: <i>30% (3) of ESE students will make learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Spring, 2013.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 19% (3)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 30% (3)	3.1. Classroom teachers are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to implement its use.	3.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	3.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	3.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	3.1. STARR
			3.2 Teachers need to make time for inclusion of mini-assessments and for progress monitoring	3.2 Teacher use of mini-assessment that parallel access point curriculum	3.2 Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	3.2 Progress monitoring of student success/struggles with Mini-assessments	3.2 Mini-assessments

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement														
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool										
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	1.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Algebra 1 standards and targets.	1.1 Algebra 1 PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	1.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	1.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment										
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*															
<i>60% (225) of our students will achieve the district average and will exceed the 2011-2012 school score by 2% on the Algebra I End of Course Exam by July 2013.</i>	48% (176)	60% (225)															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.</td> <td>1.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.</td> <td>1.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,</td> <td>1.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items</td> <td>1.2.A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.</td> <td>1.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for reteaching and/or enrichment.</td> <td>1.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team</td> <td>1.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities</td> <td>1.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.4 Algebra 1 PLC Team</td> <td>1.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during Review Sessions</td> <td>1.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.</td> <td>1.4 The Algebra 1 PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Algebra 1 students rotate into all Algebra 1 teachers' classrooms for instruction.</td> <td>1.4 Teachers will plan for an Algebra 1 Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.</td> </tr> </table>								1.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.	1.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	1.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	1.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	1.2.A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards	1.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	1.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for reteaching and/or enrichment.	1.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team	1.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	1.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
1.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.	1.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	1.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	1.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	1.2.A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards													
1.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	1.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for reteaching and/or enrichment.	1.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team	1.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	1.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings													
1.4 Algebra 1 PLC Team	1.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during Review Sessions	1.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.	1.4 The Algebra 1 PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Algebra 1 students rotate into all Algebra 1 teachers' classrooms for instruction.	1.4 Teachers will plan for an Algebra 1 Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.													

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

		1.5 Low level of pre-requisite skills of students entering Algebra I	1.5 Increase by 5% - Successful Completion of Algebra I Prior to 10 th Grade	1.5 Algebra I PLC Team	1.5 Progress Monitoring of the Benchmark Assessment (4 times/year) as well as differentiation Double block with Intensive Math Level 1 students in Algebra I	1.5 Data from yearly assessments; Algebra EOC data from May 2013.
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. Students do not have experience working with rigorous application problems in Algebra.	2.1. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios. They will have opportunities to integrate algebraic concepts with Laser Photonics, Health Science or Agri-science curricula as part of our co-curricular initiative.	2.1. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	2.1. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	2.1. PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
Algebra Goal #2: <i>10% of students who take the 2013 Algebra I EOC Test will score at Level 4 or 5.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 4% (16)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 10% (37)				
			2.2 Students are reluctant to transfer from regular level Algebra I to Algebra I Honors after the school year has started.	2.2 Increased by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors) 2.2 Guidance, Algebra I PLC Team	2.2 Movement notes provided to guidance by Algebra I Team with recommendations to move qualified students from Regular to Honors Algebra I	2.2 SMS, Teacher rosters

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%. Baseline data 2010-2011	Target AMO was 32%; actual performance was 48%. Black 30% Hispanic 56% White 60% ELL 27% SWD 31% Econ. Disadvantaged 40%	38% Black 35% Hispanic 34% White 46% ELL 29% SWD 34% Econ. Disadvantaged 34%	45% Black 42% Hispanic 41% White 51% ELL 36% SWD 41% Econ. Disadvantaged 41%	51% Black 48% Hispanic 47% White 57% ELL 43% SWD 47% Econ. Disadvantaged 47%	57% Black 55% Hispanic 54% White 62% ELL 50% SWD 54% Econ. Disadvantaged 54%	63% Black 61% Hispanic 61% White 68% ELL 58% SWD 61% Econ. Disadvantaged 61%								
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>The percent of students performing at Level 3 or above will increase by 5% each year beginning in 2013.</i>														
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool									
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>We will decrease the percentage of students in each subgroup not making satisfactory progress.</i>	3B.1. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th style="width: 50%;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> <tr> <td>White 40% (65)</td> <td>White:54% (74)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black 70% (143)</td> <td>Black: 65%(133)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic 44% (72)</td> <td>Hispanic:66% (108)</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White 40% (65)	White:54% (74)	Black 70% (143)	Black: 65%(133)	Hispanic 44% (72)	Hispanic:66% (108)	3B.1. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios. 3B.2. Time constraints to create and implement instructional activities	3B.1. Algebra 1 PLC Team, 3B.2. Select instructional activities will be created and implemented by teacher to target specific needs of targeted subgroups	3B.1. Algebra 1 PLC Team 3B.2. Algebra I PLC Team	3B.1. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items 3B.2. Evaluation of knowledge gained by students after utilization of specific instructional activities by subgroups	3B.1. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards 3B.2. Reassessment of skills on various assessments such as mini-assessments, Benchmark assessments
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*													
White 40% (65)	White:54% (74)													
Black 70% (143)	Black: 65%(133)													
Hispanic 44% (72)	Hispanic:66% (108)													

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. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3C.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Algebra 1 standards and targets.	3C.1 Algebra 1 PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3C.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3C.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress.</i>	73% (20)	71% (17)					
			3C.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.	3C.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3C.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	3C.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3C.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3C.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3C.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for reteaching and/or enrichment.	3C.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3C.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3C.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3C.4 The Algebra 1 PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Algebra 1 students rotate into all Algebra 1 teachers' classrooms for instruction.	3C.4 Teachers will plan for an Algebra 1 Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	3C.4 Algebra 1 PLC Team	3C.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	3C.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
			3C.5. Time constraints for creation of items in Heritage Languages; use AmeriCorps volunteer to create items for student use	3C.5. Provide key terminology pertaining to content in heritage languages for non-native speakers	3C.5. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3C.5. Examine the results of student performance on common assessments	3C.5. Common assessments used by Algebra 1 team
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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3D.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Algebra 1 standards and targets.	3D.1 Algebra 1 PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3D.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3D.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of SWD not making satisfactory progress.</i>	69% (8)	66% (7)					
			3D.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.	3D.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3D.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	3D.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3D.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3D.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3D.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for re-teaching and/or enrichment.	3D.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3D.3. Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3D.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3D.4. The Algebra 1 PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Algebra 1 students rotate into all Algebra 1 teachers' classrooms for instruction.	3D.4. Teachers will plan for an Algebra 1 Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	3D.4. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3D.4. Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	3D.4. Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
			3D.5. Varied levels of students enrolled in course.	3D.5. Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	3D.5. ESE Inclusion Coach, Guidance Counselors	3D.5. Inclusion Coach reviews teacher and student data with appropriate individuals.	3D.5. SMS, Progress Monitoring of Benchmark Tests
			3D.6. Time constraints of Inclusion Coach	3D.6. Utilize ESE Inclusion Coach to support SWD in Algebra I classes, especially double blocks	3D.6. Inclusion Coach	3D.6. Inclusion Coach reviews student data with appropriate individuals	3D.6. Progress Monitoring of Mini-assessments and Benchmark Tests.

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. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3E.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Algebra 1 standards and targets.	3E.1 Algebra 1 PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3E.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3E.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>We will reduce the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</i>	60% (188)	66% (207)					
			3E.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Algebra problems.	3E.2. Algebra 1 teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3E.2. Algebra 1 PLC Team,	3E.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3E.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3E.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3E.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for re-teaching and/or enrichment.	3E.3. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3E.3. Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3E.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3E.4. The Algebra 1 PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Algebra 1 students rotate into all Algebra 1 teachers' classrooms for instruction.	3E.4. Teachers will plan for an Algebra 1 Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	3E.4. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3E.4. Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	3E.4. Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
			3E.5. Teachers need to be equitable with grading for all students.	3E.5. Teacher consideration of students' background experience which may impede homework completion and other considerations	3E.5. Algebra 1 PLC Team	3E.5. Progress monitoring of assessments	3E.5. Mini-assessments, Common assessments, homework

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. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning, so this is our first time using benchmark data to tailor instruction in this area.	1.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Geometry standards and targets.	1.1 Geometry PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	1.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	1.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>38% (275) of the students will score Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC Test in Spring 2013.</i>	<i>*Initial benchmark 36% (179)</i>	<i>38% (275)</i>					
			1.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Geometry problems.	1.2. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	1.2. Geometry PLC Team,	1.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	1.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			1.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	1.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for re-teaching and/or enrichment.	1.3. Geometry PLC Team	1.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	1.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			1.4 The Geometry PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Geometry students rotate into all	1.4 Teachers will plan for Geometry Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	1.4 Geometry PLC Team	1.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	1.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.

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

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

		Geometry teachers' classrooms for instruction.				
		1.5 Lack of manipulatives for students to use in Geometry	1.5 Incorporate manipulatives and 3-D models in teaching targeted concepts	1.5 Geometry PLC Team	1.5 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	1.5 Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
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. Students do not have experience working with rigorous application problems in Geometry.	2.1. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	2.1. Geometry PLC Team	2.1. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	2.1. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
Geometry Goal #2: <i>22% (100) students will score at Level 4 or 5 on the Spring 2013 Geometry EOC Test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2% (8)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 22% (100)				
			2.2. Students reluctant to move from Regular Geometry to Honors Geometry after school year has started	2.2. Increased by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors)	2.2. Guidance Counselors, Geometry PLC Team	2.2. Movement notes provided to guidance by Geometry PLC Team with recommendations to move qualified students from Regular to Honors Geometry

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	51%	46%	41%	36%	31%				
	N/A									
Geometry Goal #3A: <i>The percent of students achieving Level 3 or higher on the Geometry EOC Test will decrease by 5% annually.</i>										
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	Geometry Goal #3B:	3B.1. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Geometry problems.	3B.1. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3B.1. Geometry PLC Team	3B.1. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3B.1. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards				
	<i>Based on the initial benchmark information in Geometry, we will reduce the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry by at least 5%.</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>*initial benchmark data</i> White: 44% (64) Black 71% (139) Hispanic 67% (74)</td> <td>White:39% (56) Black:66% (129) Hispanic:62% (68)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	<i>*initial benchmark data</i> White: 44% (64) Black 71% (139) Hispanic 67% (74)	White:39% (56) Black:66% (129) Hispanic:62% (68)	3B.2. Time constraints to create and implement instructional activities	3B.2. Select instructional activities will be created and implemented by teacher to target specific needs of targeted subgroups	3B.2. Geometry PLC Team	3B.2. Evaluation of knowledge gained by students after utilization of specific instructional activities by subgroups
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*									
<i>*initial benchmark data</i> White: 44% (64) Black 71% (139) Hispanic 67% (74)	White:39% (56) Black:66% (129) Hispanic:62% (68)									

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. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3C.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Geometry standards and targets.	3C.1 Geometry PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3C.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3C.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Based on the initial benchmark information in Geometry, we will reduce the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry by at least 5%.</i>	<i>*initial benchmark data</i> 89% (17)	84% (15)					
			3C.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Geometry problems.	3C.2. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3C.2. Geometry PLC Team,	3C.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3C.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3C.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3C.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for reteaching and/or enrichment.	3C.3. Geometry PLC Team	3C.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3C.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3C.4. The Geometry PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Geometry students rotate into all Geometry teachers' classrooms for instruction.	3C.4 Teachers will plan for a Geometry Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	3C.4 Geometry PLC Team	3C.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	3C.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
			3C.5. Time constraints for creation of items in Heritage Languages; use AmeriCorps volunteer to create items for student use	3C.5. Provide key terminology pertaining to content in heritage languages for non-native speakers	3C.5. Geometry PLC Team	3C.5. Examine the results of student performance on common assessments	3C.5. Common assessments used by Geometry team
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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3D.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Geometry standards and targets.	3D.1 Geometry PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3D.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3D.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Geometry Goal #3D: <i>Based on the initial benchmark information in Geometry, we will reduce the percentage of SWD not making satisfactory progress in Geometry by at least 5%.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Initial benchmark</i> 76% (29)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 71% (27)					
			3D.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Geometry problems.	3D.2. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3D.2. Geometry PLC Team,	3D.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3D.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3D.3. Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3D.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for re-teaching and/or enrichment.	3D.3. Geometry PLC Team	3D.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3D.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3D.4. The Geometry PLC Team needs time to prepare the various activities to be used during the Review Sessions. They also need to plan a schedule in which all Geometry students rotate into all Geometry teachers' classrooms for instruction.	3D.4. Teachers will plan for a Geometry Review Sessions in which students participate in real-world applications of the targeted (learned) concepts.	3D.4 Geometry PLC Team	3D.4 Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	3D.4 Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
			3D.5. Varied levels of students enrolled in course.	3D.5. Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	3D.5. ESE Inclusion Coach, Guidance Counselors	3D.5. Inclusion Coach reviews teacher and student data with appropriate individuals.	3D.5.SMS, Progress Monitoring of Benchmark Tests
			3D.6. Time constraints of Inclusion Coach	3D.6. Utilize ESE Inclusion Coach to support SWD in Geometry classes	3D.6. Inclusion Coach	3D.6. Inclusion Coach reviews student data with appropriate individuals	3D.6. Progress Monitoring of Mini-assessments and Benchmark Tests.

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. Quarterly Benchmark Assessments were not developed last school year to help serve as targets for learning.	3E.1. Utilizing the DOE and district resources teachers will develop and implement formative and summative assessments incorporating Geometry standards and targets.	3E.1 Geometry PLC Team, CRT, Dept. Chair	3E.1 Progress monitoring of the assessment results	3E.1 Data Talk Protocol sheet and comparison checklist of standards tested within each formative and summative assessment
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Based on the initial benchmark information in Geometry, we will reduce the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry by at least 5%.</i>	<i>Initial benchmark 66% (207)</i>	<i>61% (192)</i>					
			3E.2. Students do not have sufficient background knowledge to work rigorous Geometry problems.	3E.2. Geometry teachers will design and incorporate ample problems in which students apply concepts to real-world scenarios.	3E.2. Geometry PLC Team,	3E.2. Examine student performance on real-world scenarios and their connection to benchmark assessment items and mini-assessment items	3E.2. A PLC-created rubric/scale used to measure correlation of real-world scenarios to targeted standards
			3E.3 Time constraints and varied levels of students in classes.	3E.3. Teachers will utilize district-prepared mini-assessments on a bi-weekly basis to determine the need for re-teaching and/or enrichment.	3E.3. Geometry PLC Team	3E.3 Progress monitoring of test results; Subsequent collaboration among teachers regarding additional practice activities and/or enrichment opportunities	3E.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; collaboration notes from PLC Team meetings
			3E.4 Students are required to take 4 math credits to qualify for graduation. IF a student fails a class they need to be counseled to take summer school or online opportunities to stay on successful path.	3E.4 Increased by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Upper Level Mathematics (Beyond Algebra II)	3E.4 Guidance Counselors, Mathematics Teachers	3E.4 Review records of students who get "behind" in math courses. Check the number of students enrolled in higher level math classes.	3E.4 SMS
			3E.5. Teachers need to be equitable with grading for all students.	3E.5. Teacher consideration of students' background experience which may impede homework completion and other considerations	3E.5. Geometry PLC Team	3E.5. Progress monitoring of assessments	3E.5. Mini-assessments, Common assessments, homework

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Algebra 1/Geometry Thinking Maps	Algebra 1/Geometry	Garland & Jones	Algebra 1 & Geometry PLC Team Members	1 st Nine Weeks	PLC Collaboration Notes; Classroom Observations	PLC Team Leaders, Administrative Staff
Cooperative Learning	School wide	Assistant Principal over Mathematics	All Math teachers	September & October, 2012	Classroom observations	Administrative staff & Dept. Chair
Common Core Standards	All math	Garland & Jones	All Math teachers	Ongoing 2012-2013	Classroom observations, PLC Collaboration Notes	Administrative staff & Dept. Chair

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
Incorporating manipulatives and real-world scenarios	Purchase of manipulatives and other teacher resources	School budget	\$2000
			Subtotal:\$2000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incorporate the use of Interactive Response Systems (clickers)	Clickers	Grant	\$2,000
			Subtotal:\$2000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$4000

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. Classroom teachers are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to implement its use.	1.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	1.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	1.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	1.1. STARR
Science Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>80% (9) of ESE students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science will score at Levels 4, 5, or 6 in Spring 2013.</i>	73% (8)	80% (9)					
			1.2. Limited resources available	1.2 Teacher will incorporate modified lab experiences that focus upon access points curriculum	1.2 Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	1.2 Progress Monitor data from Access Points curriculum	1.2 Assessment data from math curriculum
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. Classroom teachers are not trained to utilize STARR and have limited classroom instructional time to implement its use.	2.1. Teachers will utilize the STARR Program to prepare students for the FAA Reading.	2.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and Teachers	2.1. Progress Monitor data from STARR Program	2.1. STARR
Science Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>18% (2) of ESE students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science will score at Level 7 or higher in Spring 2013.</i>	9% (1)	18% (2)					

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

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

		2.2. Limited resources available	2.2 Teacher will incorporate modified lab experiences that focus upon access points curriculum	2.2 Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	2.2 Progress Monitor data from Access Points curriculum	2.2 Assessment data from math curriculum
--	--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---	--

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. No returning Biology teachers from last year experienced with course requirements.	1.1. Implement interactive notebooks in Biology Standard during 2012-2013.	1.1. Assistant Principal over Science and Biology teachers	1.1. Data analysis of assessments throughout the year by persons responsible for implementation.	1.1. County prepared Benchmark Tests (four times per year), County prepared quarter assessments (four times per year), Labs, Teacher generated tests, Exit tickets
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>50% (100) of students taking the Biology EOC Test in Spring 2013 will score at Level 3 or higher.</i>	24% (19)	50% (100)					
			1.2. High enrollment of ESE/ELL students in Biology standard	1.2. Implement inquiry based learning and a hands-on approach	1.2.. Assistant Principal over Science and Biology teacher s	1.2. Data analysis of assessments throughout the year by persons responsible for implementation.	1.2 County prepared Benchmark Tests (four times per year), County prepared quarter assessments (four times per year), Labs, Teacher generated tests, Exit slips
			1.3 Varied levels of students enrolled in course.	1.3. Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	1.3. ESE Inclusion Coach, Guidance Counselors	1.3. Inclusion Coach reviews teacher and student data with appropriate individuals.	1.3 .SMS, Progress Monitoring of Benchmark Tests
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. No returning Biology teachers from last year experienced with course requirements.	2.1. Implement interactive notebooks in Biology Standard during 2012-2013.	2.1. Hon Biology Teacher	2.1. Data analysis of assessments throughout the year by persons responsible for implementation.	2.1. County prepared Benchmark Tests (four times per year), Labs, Teacher generated tests, AP Mock Testing, use of released free response questions, rubrics for labs, Exit slips
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>25% (50) of students taking the Biology EOC Test in Spring 2013 will score at Level 4 or 5.</i>	24% (19) scored tier 3	25% (50)					
			2.2. Students are reluctant to move from regular Biology to Honors Biology after school year has	2.2. Increased by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors)	2.2. Guidance, Biology PLC Team	2.2. Movement notes provided to guidance by Biology Team with recommendations to move	2.2. SMS, Teacher Rosters

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

		started.			qualified students from Regular to Honors Biology	
		2.3. Students are required to take 3 math credits to qualify for graduation. IF a student fails a class they need to be counseled to take summer school or online opportunities to stay on successful path.	2.3. Increased by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Upper Level Science Courses (Beyond Biology, Chemistry and Physics courses).	2.3. Guidance Counselors, Science Teachers.	2.3. Review records of students who get "behind" in science courses. Check the number of students enrolled in higher level science classes.	2.3. SMS
		2.1d. Time and limited resources	2.1d. Implement a minimum of 1 lab experience weekly	2.1d. Biology teachers	2.1d. Review lesson plans to see if weekly lab activities are scheduled; Review Progress book to see if credit is given for lab activities.	2.1d. Biology Teacher's Lesson Plans; Progress book

End of Biology I EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Questioning Techniques	9 - 12	Carlene Rogers	All Science Teachers	September, 2012 – December, 2012 during PLC meetings (monthly)	PLC meetings, model lessons, Exit Slips	Sloan
Standards Alignment	9 - 12	Carlene Rogers	All Science Teachers	September, 2012 – December, 2012 during PLC meetings (monthly)	PLC meetings, model lessons, Exit Slips	Sloan
Inquiry based Learning	9 - 12	Carlene Rogers	All Science Teachers	September, 2012 – December, 2012 during PLC meetings (monthly)	PLC meetings, model lessons, Exit Slips	Sloan
Data Analysis (how to do, how to inform instruction)	9 - 12	Carlene Rogers	All Science Teachers	September, 2012 – December, 2012 during PLC meetings (monthly)	PLC meetings, model lessons, Exit Slips	Sloan

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
Incorporate inquiry-based labs	Lab materials	School Budget	\$2000
			Subtotal:\$2000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
AP Biology Institute	College Board supported training for AP teacher	School Budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal:\$500
Other			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$2500

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Tenth grade students have weak mechanics when writing expository or persuasive essays.	1A.1. Focus on English language conventions during the instruction of writing in Ninth and Tenth grade Language Arts and ESOL classes.	1A.1. CRT, 9th Grade PLC Team Leader, 10th Grade PLC Team Leader	1A.1. Common Assessments of ninth and tenth grade Language Arts classes And My Access	1A.1. My Access and teacher (PLC) created writing assessments			
Writing Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>								
90% (495) Wekiva High School tenth graders will score at a level of 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes in Spring, 2013. 50% (272) Wekiva High School tenth graders will score at a level of 4 or higher on the FCAT Writes in Spring, 2013.	82% (449)	90% (495)								
	30% (163)	50% (272)								
	1A.2. Some teachers need to be creative in terms of how to integrate writing experiences within their instruction due to the nature of the content taught.	1A.2. All content area teachers are requiring writing experiences totaling at least 1000 words per marking period						1A.2. CRT, Administrative staff, Curriculum Leaders	1A.2. Progress monitoring of student performance on various writing assignments completed by individual teachers and departments	1A.2. Teacher grading scales
	1A.3. There are times when technology glitches prevent the effective execution of software programs.	1A.3. Each department will utilize My Access with their students in completing writing experiences on prescribed topics throughout the year.						1A.3. CRT, Administrative Staff, Core Coaches, Curriculum Leaders	1A.3. Progress monitoring of My Access writing experiences	1A.3. Holistic scoring of writing products through My Access
	1A.4. Varied levels of students participating in writing	1A.4. Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	1A.4. ESE Inclusion Coach, Guidance Counselors	1A.4. Inclusion Coach reviews teacher and student data with appropriate individuals.	1A.4. SMS, FCAT Writes scores, ACT/SAT/PERT Writing scores					
	1A.5. Students do not want to submit personal writing samples	1A.5. Submit student samples of writing to Graffiti (creative writing publication)	1A.5. All teachers who participate in writing activities at WHS	1A.5. Check list of submissions with Graffiti sponsor (Kellen)	1A.5. Check list of submissions with Graffiti sponsor (Kellen)					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. Teachers need to utilize portfolios for entire class.	1B.1. Teachers maintain student portfolios with samples demonstrating improvement in	1B.1. Assistant Principal, Inclusion Coach, Dept. Chair ESE, and	1B.1. Progress Monitor data from portfolios	1B.1. Rubrics developed for specific items in portfolios			

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

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

Writing Goal #1B: <i>80% (4) ESE tenth graders will score Level 3 or higher on the FAA Writing Test in Spring, 2013.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		reading skills.	Teachers		
	67% (4)	80% (4)					
			1B.2. Limited teacher experiences with standards tested in FAA Writing	1B.2. Teachers will provide writing experiences that parallel FAA Writing	1B.2. Inclusion Coach, ESE teachers	1B.2. Progress monitor writing samples from students throughout year	1B.2. Utilize rubric used to grade FAA Writing

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
New requirements for FCAT Writes (mechanics)	9. 10	Cheryl Gleason (9) and Nicole Meeks(10)	Grades 9, 10 Language Arts/ESOL teachers plus ESE self-contained teachers of tenth graders	August 2012 – October 2012	Review during monthly PLC meetings	Cheryl Gleason and Nicole Meeks

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incorporate My Access to develop student writing skills and implement data review conducted by PLC Teams	Software program	School Budget	\$25,200

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

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

Subtotal:\$25,200			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$25,200			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

**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.Students not familiar with style of DBQs	1.1.Utilize DBQs on a regular basis to improve student understanding	1.1.US History PLC members	1.1. DBQs assigned to US History classes at least 2 times per grading period.	1.1.Team created Rubrics for DBQs					
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*										
50% (250) of students taking the US History EOC Test in Spring 2013 will score at Level 3 or above.	n/a	50% (250)										
								1.2. Students do not have an understanding of modern day events connecting to historical event.	1.2. Create linkages of historical events to modern day events.	1.2.US History PLC members	1.2. After instructional strategy students will perform either a test or a DBQ to determine mastery of material.	1.2.Team created tests, Benchmark tests, DBQs
								1.3.Retention of key US History information or background knowledge	1.3.US History teachers will organize a Blitz to help students review key historical information prior to US History EOC Test.	1.3.US History PLC members	1.3. Examine the results of student performance on simulated activities used during the Review Sessions	1.3. Data Talk Protocol sheet; PLC-created rubric/scale to assess the specific problems used in measuring student performance during the Blitz activities.
								1.4. Students do not master concepts after first time of instructions	1.4.Implement tiered interventions throughout the PLC team	1.4.US History PLC members	1.4.Evaluation of assessment tools, review of exit slips	1.4.Team created tests, Benchmark tests, DBQs, Exit Slips
			1.5. Varied levels of students enrolled in course.	1.5. Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	1.5. ESE Inclusion Coach, Guidance Counselors	1.5. Inclusion Coach reviews teacher and student data with appropriate individuals.	1.5.SMS, Progress Monitoring of standardized Tests					
			2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.Students not familiar with style of DBQs	2.1.Utilize DBQs on a regular basis to improve student understanding	2.1.US History PLC members	2.1. DBQs assigned to US History classes at least 2 times per grading period.	2.1.Team created Rubrics for DBQs		
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*										
20% (100) of students taking the US History EOC Test in Spring 2013 will score at Level 4 or 5.	n/a	20% (100)										

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

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

		2.2. Students do not have an understanding of modern day events connecting to historical event.	2.2. Create linkages of historical events to modern day events.	2.2.US History PLC members	2.2. After instructional strategy students will perform either a test or a DBQ to determine mastery of material.	2.2.Team created tests, Benchmark tests, DBQs
		2.3. Students do not master concepts after first time of instructions	2.3.Implement tiered interventions throughout the PLC team	2.3.US History PLC members	2.3.Evaluation of assessment tools, review of exit slips	2.3.Team created tests, Benchmark tests, DBQs, Exit Slips
		2.4 Students do not want to move from regular American History to honors American History after school year has started.	2.4 Increased by 3 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors)	2.4 Guidance Counselors, US History PLC Team	2.4 Movement notes provided to guidance by US History Team with recommendations to move qualified students from Regular to Honors American History	2.4 SMS, Teacher Rosters
		2.5 Students reluctant to create DBQs and/or write to prompts provided by their peers	2.5 Teachers have students create DBQs to which peers must respond	2.5 US History PLC Team	2.5 Sample DBQs submitted by students	2.5 Progress book

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
DBQs	11	S Smith	US History PLC Team	Monthly	Discuss PM results of DBQs; creation of rubrics	S Smith, D Wilson

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

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

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

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

			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Some students have ongoing medical concerns that result in repeated absences that total in excess of ten days.	1.1. Meet with Student Services personnel to determine who are the students with ongoing medical issues and explore additional means of support for these students.	1.1. Administrative Deans, Student Services Personnel, School Nurse	1.1. Track these students and their attendance directly linked to ongoing medical conditions	1.1. Establish rosters, use Excel spreadsheet to grid, document support given
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
<i>During the 2012-2013 school year the average daily attendance will increase from 92.06% (2236) to 94% (2070)</i>	92.06% (2236)	94% (2070)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	1272	1200					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	206	175					
			1.2. Some parents have students take vacations during school time that impacts their daily attendance and grades.	1.2. Communicate with all parents the importance of attending school and keeping vacation time at times when school is not in session; special communication to parents who continue to have students miss school for vacation purposes or for child care	1.2. Administrative Deans	1.2. Compose a letter for the quarterly Newsletter and design a special message to be placed on the school's website; compose and send special letter to offending parents who continue to have their students miss school due to vacations or providing child care to younger siblings	1.2. Continued tracking of attendance rates through EDW and SMS
			1.3. Time to track attendance quarterly and gather incentives	1.3. Develop quarterly recognition program based upon perfect attendance and/or improvement in attendance	1.3. Discipline team (AP and Deans)	1.3. SMS or Progress Book attendance records are tracked at the end of each quarter to determine students who qualify	1.3. SMS and Progress Book

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

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

					for incentives	
		1.4. Some students simply stop coming to school with or without their parents' knowledge of the attendance.	1.4. Identify those students with patterns of repeated unexcused absences and communicate with parents	1.4. Administrative Deans, Student Services Personnel	1.4. Explore alternative options for students who do not wish to attend school and through communication with parents and students seek alternative placements	1.4. Continued tracking of attendance and patterns of attendance through EDW and SMS

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 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
Provide incentives to students who have perfect attendance or improve attendance quarterly	Movie tickets, cookies, etc.	SAC	\$500
			Subtotal:\$500
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Utilize the Plasco system to track tardies to class which impact student attendance	Computer-based Plasco system	Internal School Budget	\$1,200
			Subtotal:\$1,200
Professional Development			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$1700

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Certain behavioral infractions are regulated by Board policy invoking out-of school suspension	1.1. Promote positive behavior by referring to Mustang Manners and utilizing “Caught Yak Doing Something Good” Cards	1.1. Administrative Staff and teachers	1.1. Progress monitoring of discipline statistics at weekly Roti meetings	1.1. Discipline reports from EDW and SMS
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	1290	1200					
<i>During the 2012-2013 school year Wekiva High School will reduce the number of students receiving out-of-school suspensions from 316 (12.22%) to 250 (11.9%)</i>	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	551	500					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	530	500					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	325	300					
			1.2. Some students are apathetic regarding behavioral consequences.	1.2. Invoke specific behavioral consequences in a tiered fashion so that discipline is standard, firm, and fair for all students	1.2. Administrative Deans	1.2. Progress monitoring of disciplinary statistics at weekly Roti meetings	1.2. Discipline reports through EDW and SMS
			1.3 Selecting most appropriate agency to get involved with students	1.3. Utilize an interagency approach with students at risk of dropping out	1.3. Administrative Deans, SAFE Coordinator	1.3. SAFE Coordinator review suspension lists to prioritize students who need referrals	1.3. Suspension Lists(ISS/OSS)
			1.3 Selecting most appropriate agency to get involved with students	1.3. Utilize an interagency approach with students at risk of dropping out	1.3. Administrative Deans, SAFE Coordinator	1.3. SAFE Coordinator review suspension lists to prioritize students who need referrals	1.3. Suspension Lists(ISS/OSS)
			1.4. Some students do not respond to positive reinforcement of positive behaviors because of their history of misconduct.	1.4. Design and implement an incentive program to reward those repeat offenders who make improvement during a specified time frame	1.4. Administrative Deans	1.4. Progress monitoring of disciplinary statistics at weekly Roti meetings	1.4. Discipline reports through EDW and SMS and internal Excel spreadsheets

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
Interagency support for students at risk	9 - 12	SAFE Coordinator	School-wide	Nov 2012 – Jan 2013	SharePoint referrals posted	SAFE Coordinator
Principal Meetings with students by grade level	9-12	Principal	School-wide	September 2012 – March 2013	Review of Discipline Data/development of future programs	Leadership Team
Meetings with student groups by Deans	9-12	Administrative Deans	School-wide	October 2012 – May 2013	Review of Discipline Data/Development of future programs	Leadership 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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Promotion of improvement in behavior by repeat offenders	Incentives (food, movie tickets, etc.)	Donations from business partners	\$150
			Subtotal:\$150
			Total:\$150

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			1.1. Locating students who stop coming to school often is very challenging and unsuccessful.	1.1. Work closely with our Social worker with Child Study to make connections with students who stop attending school and their parents in order to explore other educational options.	1.1. Administrative Deans; Student Services personnel	1.1. Ongoing communication with Social Worker and documentation of efforts	1.1. Summary notes from meetings with Social Worker, students, and parents
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>Increase the overall graduation rate to 96% (2016) which in turn decreases the dropout rate to 4% (84).</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	15%	8%					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	85%	92%					
			1.2. Sometime students lose interest in school because they do not find value in what they are learning.	1.2. Initiate a strong Classroom Guidance program and individual student conferences with counselors	1.2. Guidance Counselors, Teachers	1.2. Counselor documentation of efforts and student logs	1.2. Continued enrollment of students and credit count information
			1.3 Some students prefer to isolate themselves and remain unconnected to school.	1.3 Promote involvement in extracurricular activities both at the beginning of the school year as well as periodically throughout the year	1.3 Administrative Staff, Student Activities Director, Athletic Director, Coaches, Club Sponsors	1.3. Periodic survey the extracurricular activity sponsors and coaches regarding membership numbers and compare to previous numbers	1.3. Extracurricular activities survey
			1.4 There may be possible difficulty in maintaining a school within a school environment.	1.4 Implement Drop Back In Program	1.4 Guidance Department Chair	1.4 Monthly Feedback from Drop Back In Coordinators	1.4 Information provided through the Drop Back In Program on a case by case basis

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
Counselor Meetings with students	9-12	Counselors	School-wide	September 2012 – May 2013	Individual/Small Group meetings based upon goals/programs	Counselors/Principal

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Sessions will be scheduled in the evenings at school and parents may not be able to attend due to work or transportation.	1.1. Educate parents about appropriate topics (cyber bullying, post-secondary education options (alternative tech schools, dual enrollment, SAT/ACT, etc.)	1.1. Asst. Principals/SAFE Coordinator, Counselors	1.1. Attendance of parents will be monitored for each evening session	1.1. Sign in sheets
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>In previous years data has not been collected regarding parent attendance at school activities. In 2012-2013 10% of our students will be represented at non-extracurricular events sponsored at the school.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	n/a	10% (220)					
			1.2. Parents may have limited knowledge of how to support their child to meet success while in high school.	1.2. Hold bi-monthly parent to parent sessions on pertinent topics that link to student success in schools	1.2. Asst. Principals/SAFE Coordinator, Counselors	1.2. Attendance of parents will be monitored for each evening session	1.2. Sign In Sheets
		1.3. Parents do not pay attention to communication methods regularly.	1.3. Communicate in a variety of manners important information (examples include Connect Orange, flyers, marques, community newspapers, quarterly newsletter)	1.3. Asst. Principals/SAFE Coordinator, Counselors	1.3. Send out Survey Monkey to determine level of utilization of communication methods	1.3. Survey Monkey; data from Connect Orange calls	

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
Post-secondary education options	11-12	Guidance	Parents of 11/12 grade students	Nov2012 evening	Contact parents who attended to see if there are any questions/concerns	Guidance
Cyber bullying	9-12	Guidance	Parents of 9-12 grade students	October 2012 evening	Articles in quarterly newsletter for continual information	Guidance
Student success series	9-12	Guidance	Parents of 9-12 grade students	Oct 2012 – Feb 2012 (monthly in evenings)	Email and Survey	Guidance

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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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: <i>Inform Wekiva HS students and feeder Middle School 8th graders of opportunities dealing with Applied programs/magnet.</i>	1.1A.9/10 grade students are unaware of Applied programs/Magnet 1.1B. It is difficult to find qualified teachers who are certified in this area.	1.1. Inform current 9/10 grade students of opportunities in the Laser Photonic Magnet and the Agri-Science Program.	1.1.George Kispert	1.1.Gather data from SMS to determine new enrollments in program(s)	1.1.Enrollment in program(s) and application(s) for Laser Photonic Magnet
	1.2.Students are unaware of the HIP program	1.2.Promote student participation in the Northrup Grumman WORTHY Program	1.2.George Kispert	1.2.Exit Slips and applications distributed after presentation to Laser Photonic students	1.2.Applications for the HIP Program

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
HIP Program	9-12	Steve Lindauer	Laser Photonic Instructors	August 2012 – January 2013	PLC meeting collaboration notes	George Kispert

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: <i>Communicate with rising Juniors and Seniors the programs available and requirements for each program</i>	1.1A.Students are not informed about possible programs both at school and area tech centers	1.1.Open house prior to registration in Spring, 2013	1.1.Terri Anderson, Applied teachers	1.1.Student sign-up to visit area tech centers in guidance	1.1.Exit Slips and applications for Tech Programs
	1.1B. Students are limited by the enhanced admission requirements to the Tech Centers.				
	1.2.9-11 Students are not aware of opportunities of Wekiva based Applied programs	1.2.Videos prior to registration in Spring, 2013	1.2.George Kispert	1.2.Track number of students who sign up for Applied programs via registration in Spring 2013	1.2.Registration for Applied Programs
	1.3 .Students are not informed about possible programs both at school and area tech centers	1.3 Work Cooperatively with Technical Centers	1.3 Terri Anderson, Applied teachers	1.3 Tech Centers hold an informational session in auditorium prior to Registration in 2013.	1.3 Registration for Tech Centers
1.4 Time for planning	1.4 Promote cross curricular connections among CAPE academies and core content area classes	1.4 CAPE and core content teachers	1.4 Review CAPE academy student portfolios	1.4 CAPE academy portfolios	

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Students are not inclined to change schedules to take AVID class after school year has started	1.1. AVID Coordinator reviews students schedules and interviews potential candidates; provides list to guidance & API	1.1. AVID Coordinator, API, Guidance Counselors	1.1. Meeting notes from AVID Coordinator	1.1. SMS, Teacher Rosters
Additional Goal #1: <i>Increased by 3% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., AP and AVID)</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	AVID: 151 Industry Certification: 19 AP: 1120	AVID: 142 Industry Certification: 30 AP: 817					
			1.2. Students are not inclined to change schedules to take AP classes after school year has started	1.2. AP Coordinator and Guidance Counselors meet with potential candidates	1.2. AP Coordinator, API, Guidance Counselors	1.2. Meeting notes from AP Coordinator and Guidance Counselors	1.2. SMS, Teacher Rosters
			1.3 Students do not take the PERT Test seriously. Students do not take rigorous AP classes to prepare for college.	1.3 Increase College and Career Readiness	1.3 AVID & AP Coordinators, Guidance Counselors, 11 th grade teachers (Math & LA)	1.3 Inform students via LA classes how the results of the PERT test will affect their future	1.3 PERT Results
			1.5 Students need to be informed to magnets and possible Dual Enrollment credits that can be earned.	1.4 Increase by 5% - Enrollment and Performance in College Dual Enrollment Programs	1.4 Guidance Counselors, Magnet coordinators	1.4 Preparation by class for Industry Certification tests	1.4 Industry Certification test results
			1.6 Students are not familiar with format and content of ACT/SAT. Not enough students take the SAT/ACT.	1.5 Increase by 3% - Student Earning at or Above 21.2 on the ACT and/or at/or Above 502 Verbal, 515 Math, and 494 Writing on the SAT	1.5 AP in charge of Data, Guidance in charge of ACT/SAT testing	1.5 Review the number of students participating in ACT/SAT testing and their average scores on subtests.	1.5 SAT/ACT Tests
			1.7 Limitations in scheduling to include elective areas	1.6 Increase enrollment in Fine Arts classes	1.6 API, Guidance counselors, Fine Arts teachers	1.6 Review enrollment in each Fine Arts class in Spring 2013	1.6 SMS

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AP Training for every subject area	All AP Subjects	College Board	AP teachers	October 2012-July 2013	Data Review on Mock Tests/AP Test Performance	AP PLC Team/Principal
AVID Training	9-12	Matthew Owens	All teachers	September 2012-May 2013	Data Review of Student Performance	AVID PLC Team/Principal

High School Objectives

Required Objectives for High Schools

Goal: Intense Focus on Student Achievement	Objective Measurement	LOCATION IN SIP
Increased by 3 to 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Advanced Programs (i.e., Honors, AP, AVID, IB)	Enrollment Reports/Performance Data	Page 83: Additional Goals
Increased by 3 to 5% - Enrollment and Performance in Upper Level Mathematics (Beyond Algebra II) and Science Courses (beyond Biology, Chemistry, and Physics)	Enrollment Reports/Performance Data	Page 46 #2.1.b Page 56 #2.1.c
Increase by 3 to 5% - Enrollment and Performance in College Dual Enrollment Programs	Enrollment Reports/Performance Data	Page 83 #1.4
Increase College and Career Readiness	School Data	Page 83 #1.3
Increase by 3 to 5% - Student Earning at or Above 21.2 on the ACT and/or at/or Above 502 Verbal, 515 Math, and 494 Writing on the SAT	ACT Data SAT Data	Page 83 #1.5
Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016	FCAT	Page 27 #5A Page 41 #3A Page 47 #3A
Increase Fine Arts Enrollment	Enrollment Reports	Page 83 #1.6
Working Cooperatively with Technical	School Data	Page 80 #1.3

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

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

Goal: Intense Focus on Student Achievement	Objective Measurement	LOCATION IN SIP
Centers		
Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	Enrollment Classifications	Page 26 #4.B.3
Increase by 3 to 5% - Successful Completion of Algebra I Prior to 10 th Grade	Enrollment Reports/Performance Data	Page 40 #1.5

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
Initiate AP Training	College Board AP Training of teachers	Internal School Budget	\$5,000
			Subtotal:\$5000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Initiate AVID Training for teachers	AVID Training	Internal School Budget	\$3,000
			Subtotal:\$3000
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$8000

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:\$16,000
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$4000
Science Budget	Total:\$2500
Writing Budget	Total:\$25,200
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:\$1700
Suspension Budget	Total:\$150
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:\$8000
	Grand Total:\$57,550

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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.
SAC meets monthly at Wekiva High School on Tuesday evenings. Agendas include presentations dealing with school specific information.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
None: SAC does not have funds available at this time.	\$0.00