Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Sunlake High School	District Name: District School Board of Pasco County
Principal: Garry Walthall	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Tyson Krutsinger	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

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

Principal	Garry Walthall	B.A. Business Management M.A. Elementary Education M.Ed. Education Leadership / School Principal (all levels) Education Leadership (all levels)	5	12	SLHS - 2011 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 83, Science 44 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 77 % lowest 25 making gains - reading 52%, math 63% AYP – NO SLHS - 2010 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 80, Writing 88, Science 41 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 74 % lowest 25 making gains in reading 44, math 47 AYP – NO SLHS - 2009 - B High Stds Rdg 48, Math 77, Writing 83, Science 42 Learning Gains - Rdg 51, Math 76 % of lowest 25 making gains - Rdg 53, math 60 AYP – NO SLHS - 2008 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 87, Science 45 Learning Gains - Rdg 59, Math 79 % lowest 25 making gains - Rdg 51, Math 68 AYP – NO
Assistant Principal	Shawn Hohenthaner	BSW M.Ed. Ed Leadership / School Principal (K-12) Education Leadership (K-12) Social Work (K- 12) Special Education (K-12)	2	8	SLHS - 2011 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 83, Science 44 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 77 % lowest 25 making gains - reading 52%, math 63% AYP – NO SLHS - 2010 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 80, Writing 88, Science 41 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 74 % lowest 25 making gains in reading 44, math 47 AYP – NO SLHS - 2009 - B High Stds Rdg 48, Math 77, Writing 83, Science 42 Learning Gains - Rdg 51, Math 76 % of lowest 25 making gains - Rdg 53, math 60 AYP – NO

Assistant Principal	Dr. Deborah Lepley	B.A.M.A Ph.D. Education Leadership (all levels) Art (all levels)	2	9	SLHS - 2011 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 83, Science 44 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 77 % lowest 25 making gains - reading 52%, math 63% AYP – NO SLHS - 2010 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 80, Writing 88, Science 41 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 74 % lowest 25 making gains in reading 44, math 47 AYP – NO SLHS - 2009 - B High Stds Rdg 48, Math 77, Writing 83, Science 42 Learning Gains - Rdg 51, Math 76 % of lowest 25 making gains - Rdg 53, math 60 AYP – NO
Assistant Principal	Ryan Brady	B.S. Special Ed M.Ed. Ed Leadership Education Leadership (all levels) Special Education (K-12) Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (5-9) ESOL Endorsement	2	2	SLHS - 2011 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 83, Science 44 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 77 % lowest 25 making gains - reading 52%, math 63% AYP – NO SLHS - 2010 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 80, Writing 88, Science 41 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 74 % lowest 25 making gains in reading 44, math 47 AYP – NO SLHS - 2009 - B High Stds Rdg 48, Math 77, Writing 83, Science 42 Learning Gains - Rdg 51, Math 76 % of lowest 25 making gains - Rdg 53, math 60 AYP – NO

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

Assistant Principal	Heather Ochs	B.S. Special Education M.Ed. Education Leadership/ Special Education (K-12) Math (5-12) P.E. (K-12) Education Leadership (K-12)	1	1	SLHS - 2011 - B - High Stds Rdg 54, Math 79, Writing 83, Science 44 Learning Gains - reading 55, math 77 % lowest 25 making gains - reading 52%, math 63% AYP – NO

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)
	We did not have any instructional coaches for the 2011-2012 school year.				

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Focus on teacher satisfaction and school climate	Admin Team	Ongoing
2. Specifically designed interview that helps pick teachers who are correctly equipped to be successful at our school.	Admin Team	Ongoing

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
2	As of 6/19/12 the teachers had become Highly Qualified

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
92	7.5%	57%	24%	12%	38%	98%	15%	3%	18%

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Karen Leon	James Kretchmar	Socially comparable and geographically close	Planned and impromptu discussions, New Teacher Committee Meetings.
Chuck Moehle	Judy Scavino, Edwin Guasp	Socially comparable and geographically close	Planned and impromptu discussions, New Teacher Committee Meetings.
Amity Gallaher	Tracee Fisher, Michelle Spratlin	Similar curriculum area	Planned and impromptu discussions, New Teacher Committee Meetings.

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Principal, Student Achievement Coach for ESE School Social Worker, School Psychologist, Behavior Specialist, SSAP Teacher, ESOL Resource Teacher, ESE Teacher, basic education teachers.
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 leadership team will meet monthly to develop a plan for full implementation of PS/RtI. They will also assist with the plan for training all staff in the PS/RtI process. In addition, the PS/RTI team will work with the Discipline Committee and the Lead Literacy Team to identify and implement both academic and behavioral interventions.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? This team will assist with the implementation of the school improvement plan through an analysis of school-wide and grade- level data in order to identify student achievement trends, analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention, and assist in the development of assessment strategies and calendars.
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. The Pasco County RTI database, SLHS developed RTI Database.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Staff training during Lunch & Learn sessions will be conducted by staff that received two day readiness School Based Leadership Team training. In addition, staff members may attend School Based Leadership Team meetings at their discretion
Describe plan to support MTSS. The Principal and the Behavior Specialist will ensure there will be time during faculty meetings and other professional development times to provide training needed in implement PS/RTI.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). School Leadership Team: Administration Department Heads
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team meets during the leadership committee time to discuss reading needs and how to accommodate those needs.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Common Core Curriculum will be a vast majority of this year's focus.

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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?

Under the implementation timeline of the Common Core Standards, the teachers will begin understanding and implementation of the standards. The standards include the use of reading across the curriculum.

*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?

The school uses professional learning communities coupled with academies that incorporate skills focused in specific areas that help students see the relevance of their coursework in their future.

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

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

Students are able to select courses that are specific to their future needs. During this process, the students have access to guidance councilors whom they can ask questions. The students also have access to electives that help determine areas of interest for their future.

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.

Based on the High School Feedback Report, 48.1% percent of students attend Florida public post secondary school, 4.05% attend an independent Florida post secondary school, and an undetermined amount of students attend private institutions both in Florida and abroad. To help increase this number, the school will implement college readiness classes for both Math and English as well as continue to increase the offerings of Advanced Placement classes and Dual Enrollment classes to help offer higher level curriculum.

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. Loss of key reading personnel.	1a.1. Using trained personnel, the people in charge of hiring the teacher will understand what is needed, and apply that knowledge into finding the right candidate.	1a.1. K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration.	1a.1. Comparative data will used to decide effectiveness of all reading personnel.	1a.1. FAIR FCAT		
Reading Goal #1a: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of students who achieve a level 3 in reading will grow by five percent.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	52.4% (479) of students scored a level 3 in Reading.	*57.4% (526) of students will score a level 3 in reading.*					
		1a.2. Lack of teacher focus on reading across the curriculum.	1a.2. The school will focus on the new Common Core State Standards which will help focus all teachers on reading.	1a.2. K-12 Literacy Coach, Administration.	1a.2. Formal and informal walkthroughs, FAIR and FCAT Data	1a.2. FAIR FCAT	
		1a.3. Varied student achievement levels.	1a.3. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	1a.3. Department Heads and administration.	1a.3. Student data & CFG discussions.	1a.3. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students s **2a. FCAT 2.0: Students s coring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
Reading Goal #1b: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.	2a.1. Teacher's lack of knowledge on advancement or enrichment activities.	2a.1. Teachers will participate in Curriculum Focus Groups to examine student data and explore best practices to address individual student needs and student motivation to achieve.	2a.1. Assistant Principal and Department Heads.	2a.1. Meeting logs, lesson plan review, student assessment data, FAIR data	2a.1. FCAT FAIR		
Reading Goal #2a: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of students who are at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in in reading will grow by five percent.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	24.7% (225) of students scored at or above level 4 and 5 in Reading.	*30% (272) of students will score at or above levels 4 and 5 in reading.*				
		2a.2. Varied student achievement levels.	2a.2. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	2a.2. Department Heads and administration.	2a.2. Student data & CFG discussions.	2a.2. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
		2a.3. High Achieving students lack recognition and celebration.	2a.3. Mid year and year end celebrations to recognize honor roll kids and promotion kids at semester time.	2a.3. Administration	2a.3. Student morale.	2a.3. Parent and student feedback	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	
Reading Goal #2b: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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

		2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3a.1. Lack of higher level reading material and higher level questions that is used with students in all curriculum areas.	3a.1. The school will focus on strategies on the Core Curriculum State Standards, which will help drive higher-level reading and high-level questions.	3a.1. K-12 Literacy Coaches, department heads, administration	3a.1. Results from FCAT and FAIR testing	3a.1. FCAT FAIR		
Reading Goal #3a:

During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of students making learning gains in reading will increase by five percent. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

	32.7% (254) of students made learning gains in reading	*38% (345) of the students will make learning gains in reading.*				
		3a.2. Varied student achievement levels.	3a.2. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	3a.2. Department Heads and administration.	3a.2. Student data & CFG discussions.	3a.2. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
		3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a..3.	3a.3.	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.**	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	
Reading Goal #3b: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4a.1. The students that fall in this category historically have very little motivation in this area and need to be engaged constantly.	4a.1. The teachers will have to collaborate with their K-12 Literacy Specialist and work with their Curriculum Focus Groups on Marzano strategies to help engage students in the reading curriculum.	4a.1. K-12 Literacy Specialist, administration, reading teachers.	4a.1. Results of the FCAT and FAIR testing.	4a.1. FCAT FAIR		
Reading Goal #4a: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase by five percent.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *35.6% (72) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *41% (83) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains.*					

		4a.2. The faculty has not had a Literacy Specialist to help out at the school this last year.	4a.2. The district has provided a Literacy Specialist to the school for the upcoming school year.	4a.2. Administration, reading teachers, basic/ESE teachers.	4a.2. Results of the FCAT and FAIR testing.	4a.2. FCAT FAIR	
		4a.3. Varied student achievement levels.	4a.3. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	4a.3. Department Heads and administration.	4a.3. Student data & CFG discussions.	4a.3. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
Reading Goal #4b: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** Currently, 47% of all students at Sunlake High School have scored a 1 or a 2 on the FCAT Reading.	43% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in Reading.	39% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in Reading.	35% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in Reading.	31% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in Reading.	27% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in Reading.	23% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level in Reading.
Reading Goal #5A: *By 2017, the number of students who score a level 1 or 2 on the FCAT Reading will be reduced to 23%.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5B. 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. Varied student achievement levels.	5B.1. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	5B.1. Department Heads and administration.	5B.1. Student data & CFG discussions.	5B.1. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.		
Reading Goal #5B: By the end of the 2013, the students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 5%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 44.8% (300) Hispanic: 53.6% (114)	White: 40% (285) Hispanic: 49% (109)					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Language barriers	5C.1. Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff	5C.1. Administration and department heads.	5C.1. CELLA testing and FCAT Results	5C.1. CELLA and FCAT results		
Reading Goal #5C: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of ELL not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by five percent.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	77.3% (17) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	*72% (16) of ELL students will not be making satisfactory progress in reading*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Lack of Co-Teach classroom support.	5D.1. Teachers will be trained in ESE strategies to prepare them in the reduction in force of ESE teachers.	5D.1. ESE Department head Administration	5D.1. FCAT Results	5D.1. FCAT Results		
Reading Goal #5D: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of SWD not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by five percent*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	69.5% (100) of SWD are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	*65% (93) of SWD will not be making satisfactory progress in reading.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Teachers have not identified students requiring differentiated Instruction and/or assessment.	5E.1. PS/RTI Team will work with the Lead Literacy Team to identify these students and develop interventions.	5E.1. K12 Literacy Coach and Student Achievement Coaches	5E.1. Review of student data and implementation of interventions.	5E.1. Review of student data and implementation of interventions		
Reading Goal #5E: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by five percent*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	68.3% (171) of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress in reading.	*63% (158) of economically disadvantaged students will not be making satisfactory progress in reading.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Focus/LLT Focus	All	PLC Leader/ Administrator	School Wide	2-4th Tuesday of every month.		

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Consumable reading materials	Consumable books	Internal	$3000.00
Materials to help student engagement	Transparencies, consumables	District	$600.00
Subtotal: $3600.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Helping focus for students on the Read 180 program.	Headsets	Internal	$600.00
Subtotal: $600.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $4200.00			
Total:			

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Language	1.1. Placement in Developmental Language Arts.	1.1. ESOL Resource teacher Administration	1.1. FCAT, CELLA data	1.1. FCAT CELLA results
CELLA Goal #1: *By 2013, 71% of students will score proficient in CELLA listening/speaking.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:				
	66% [22]				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	1.1. Language	1.1. Placement in Developmental Language Arts.	1.1. ESOL Resource teacher Administration	1.1. FCAT, CELLA data	1.1. FCAT CELLA results	
CELLA Goal #2: *By 2013, 37% of students will score proficient in CELLA reading.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	32% [10].					
		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

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.	1.1. Language	1.1. Placement in Developmental Language Arts.	1.1. ESOL Resource teacher Administration	1.1. FCAT, CELLA data	1.1. FCAT CELLA results	
CELLA Goal #3: *By 2013, 63% of students will score proficient in CELLA writing.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	58% [18]					
		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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

<u>Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals</u>

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

gh School Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: We no longer have Alternate Assessments at Sunlake High School.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: **We no longer have Alternate Assessments at Sunlake High School.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: **We no longer have Alternate Assessments at Sunlake High School.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		

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

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

Mathematics Goal #4: **We no longer have Alternate Assessments at Sunlake High School.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

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 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. Due to the EOC testing date, the last chapter in the book did not get the attention that was needed and the student scored poorly in that section as a result.	1.1. The Algebra teachers will formulate an instructional focus calendar to ensure that the final chapter in the book	1.1. Administration	1.1. Comparative results from standardized testing	1.1. EOC results		
Algebra Goal #1: *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring at an achievement level of 3 in the EOC Algebra test will increase from 59% to 64%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59.1% (201)	*64% (218)*					

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

		2.2. Varied student achievement levels.	2.2. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	2.2. Department Heads and administration.	2.2. Student data & CFG discussions.	2.2. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.	1.1. Due to the EOC testing date, the last chapter in the book did not get the attention that was needed and the student scored poorly in that section as a result.	1.1. The Algebra teachers will formulate an instructional focus calendar to ensure that the final chapter in the book	1.1. Administration	1.1. Comparative results from standardized testing	1.1. EOC results		
Algebra Goal #2: *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring at or above a achievement level of 4 in the EOC Algebra test will increase from 9% to 14%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9.1% (31)	14% (48)					

		2.2. Varied student achievement levels.	2.2. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	2.2. Department Heads and administration.	2.2. Student data & CFG discussions.	2.2. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.	
		2.3. High Achieving students lack recognition and celebration.	2.3. Mid year and year end celebrations to recognize honor roll kids and promotion kids at semester time.	2.3. Administration	2.3. Student morale.	2.3. Parent and student feedback	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** In the 2012 school year, 35% of students at Sunlake High School scored a level 1 or level 2 on the EOC Algebra test.	32% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in the Algebra EOC.	29% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in the Algebra EOC.	26% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in the Algebra EOC.	23% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in the Algebra EOC.	20% of students at Sunlake High School will score a level 1 or a level 2 in the Algebra EOC.	17% of students at Sunla High School will score a 1 or a level 2 in the Alge EOC.
Algebra Goal #3A: *By 2017, the number of students who score a level 1 or 2 on the EOC Algebra will be lowered to 17%.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**	3B.1. Varied student achievement levels.	3B.1. Teachers across the curriculum will utilize Pasco STAR to review curriculum strands to determine areas of student need and will adjust lesson plans and instruction as needed.	3B.1. Department Heads and administration.	3B.1. Student data & CFG discussions.	3B.1. CFG, Baseline and Mid-Year assessment data.		
Algebra Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 29% (65)	White: 24% (62)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	5C.1. Language barriers	5C.1. Coaching by the ESOL Resource Teacher for faculty and staff	5C.1. Administration and department heads.	5C.1. CELLA testing and FCAT Results	5C.1. CELLA and FCAT results		
Algebra Goal #3C: *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of ELL students scoring at or above an achievement level of 2 or lower will decrease by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	75% (9)	*70% (8)*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	5D.1. Lack of Co-Teach classroom support.	5D.1. Teachers will be trained in ESE strategies to prepare them in the reduction in force of ESE teachers.	5D.1. ESE Department head Administration	5D.1. FCAT Results	5D.1. FCAT Results		
Algebra Goal #3D: *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of SWD students scoring at or above an achievement level of 2 or lower will decrease by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59% (18)	*54% (23)*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	5E.1. Teachers have not identified students requiring differentiated Instruction and/or assessment.	5E.1. PS/RTI Team will work with the Lead Literacy Team to identify these students and develop interventions.	5E.1. K12 Literacy Coach and Student Achievement Coaches	5E.1. Review of student data and implementation of interventions.	5E.1. Review of student data and implementation of interventions		
Algebra Goal #3E: *During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of ED students scoring at or above an achievement level of 2 or lower will decrease by 5%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	51%	*46%*					
		3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Geometry Goal #3A: PER R&E, awaiting new results							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Geometry Goal #3B: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White:	White:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	
Geometry Goal #3C: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	
Geometry Goal #3D: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through						

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

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
PLC Focus	9-12	PLC Leader	Math Teachers only	2-4th Tuesdays of every month	Administratively developed monitoring tools	Administration

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
Continuity with high stakes testing and student engagement.	Scantrons, consumable books	Internal Fee Money	$1000.00
Materials for student engagement	Consumable resources, supplies	District Funds	$500.00
Subtotal: $1500.00			
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: $1500.00			
Total: $1500.00			

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Science Goal #1: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 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					

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

	Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: PER R&E, awaiting new results	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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
Increase student involvement/interest	Lab Materials	District	$3500.00
Subtotal: $3500.00			
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: $3500.00			
Total: $3500.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

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. Lack of writing assignments given in day-to-day classes.	1a.1. The school will continue a focus on writing across the curriculum and the introduction of the common core standards.	1a.1. K-12 Literacy Specialist, Administration.	1a.1. Growth in number and percent of students scoring a 3.0 or higher.	1a.1. FCAT results.		
Writing Goal #1a: *During the 2011-2013 School Year, the number of students who score a 3.0 and higher in writing will increase by five percent.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	87.9% (349) of the students scored a 3.0 or higher in writing.	*93% (370) of students will score a 3.0 or higher in writing.*					
		1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	

		1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
Writing Goal #1b: **We no longer have students taking the alternative assessment.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

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

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
PLC Focus	9-12/All	All PLC Leaders	School Wide	Three times monthly	Written reports by PLC Leader	Administrators.

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
Book building for student interest	Printing materials	Internal	$300.00
Subtotal: $300.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $300.00			
Total: $300.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

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

U.S. History Goal #1: We do not yet have this assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
U.S. History Goal #2: We do not yet have this assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Focus	10-12/US History Teachers	PLC Leader	PLC Subject area	2-4th Tuesdays of each month	Administrator developed response sheets.	Administration.

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			

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

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

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. Family support system	1.1. Maintain open lines of communication.	1.1. Teachers, Administration	1.1. Parent questionnaire	1.1. Parent questionnaire		
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	99.96	*99.98*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	403 (25%)	*320 (20%)*					

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

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
		1.2. Student Apathy	1.2. Tardy Table	1.2. Teachers, Administrators	1.2. Review of Data	1.2. TERMS Printout
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD Content	All Teachers	Administration/ SAT Team	School Wide	Faculty meeting in the Fall	Student/parent follow up	Administrators

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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. Teacher classroom management strategies and lack of skill in deescalating and diffusing classroom situations.	1.1. District training on de- escalation and diffusing.	1.1. Administration	1.1. TERMS data review	1.1. TERMS data		
Suspension Goal #1: *During the 2012-2013 school, we will have a five percent drop in the number of students who are suspended both in school and out of school.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	19% (310)	*18% 295*					

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

	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	11% (172)	*10% (163)*				
		1.2. Alternatives to suspension.	1.2. Lunch detention, after school detention.	1.2. Administration	1.2. Review Data	1.2. TERMS Data
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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:			

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. Lack of viable credit recovery options for underclassmen.	1.1. The APEX program will not just focus on Juniors and Seniors, but sophomores as well.	1.1. APEX lab teacher, Administration	1.1. "In house" data comparison from year to year on student grade levels in APEX	1.1. "In house" comparison.		

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

Dropout Prevention Goal #1:	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	8% (13)	4% (7)				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	86%	90%				
		1.2. Student frustration in transition from 8th to 9th grades.	1.2. Develop a 9th grade team and discuss commonalities to help with this transition.	1.2. Administration, 9th grade teachers.	1.2. Review of grades, attendance, and discipline.	1.2. TERMS and eSembler Data.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Focus	All	SAT PLC Leader	SAT PLC members	2-4th Tuesdays every month	Comparative data from previous years.	Administration.

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:			

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Lack of communication with parents about opportunities to volunteer at the school.	1.1. The school will use ConnectEd messages and existing community nights to market parent involvement.	1.1. Volunteer coordinator	1.1. Data from volunteer coordinator	1.1. Data from volunteer coordinator		
By June 2012 the level of Parent Involvement will increase by five percent.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	29.2% (467) of parents participated in school related activities.	*34% (544) of parents will participate in school related activities.*					

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

		1.2. Parents lack of understanding of the advanced curriculum at Sunlake High School.	1.2. During the spring Curriculum Fair, the school will invite members of the SAC committee to host a breakout session that describes what it is like to have a student in advanced classes.	1.2. SAC committee, Administration	1.2. Data from volunteer coordinator	1.2. Data from volunteer coordinator	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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
Budgeting money to teaches for classroom materials from the PTA.	Multiple grants	Internal	$ 4000.00
Subtotal: $4000.00			
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: $4000.00			
Total: $4000.00			

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: In the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase STEM awareness throughout all grades by providing information and activities to staff and students on a weekly basis.	1.1. Lack of knowledge about STEM.	1.1. Explore current and future STEM career needs in technology classes.	1.1. Administration, teachers in STEM areas.	1.1. Yearly review of the number of students/ groups that participate in STEM and other science competitions.	1.1. Roster of STEM/Science Competition participants
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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
Engineering software for student engagement.	Engineering software	District funds	$ 2800.00
Subtotal: $ 2800.00			
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: During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students who participate in our Engineering Academy and our Finance Academy will increase by five percent.	1.1. Student lack of knowledge about the benefits of the academies.	1.1. During the school year, the academy teachers will market the academy to middle schools and to current Sunlake High School Students.	1.1. Academy teachers, administration	1.1. Comparison of number of students in the academies from this year to next year.	1.1. Administrative review of the data.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

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
Materials to help push student engagement	Medical supplies, financial materials, drafting materials	District funds	$4000.00
Subtotal: $4000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student engagement through software	Software for financial applications and software for engineering.	District funds	$3000.00
Subtotal: $3000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $7000.00			
Total: $7000.00			

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total: $4200.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $1500.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $3500.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: $300.00
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: $4000.00
STEM Budget	
	Total: $2800.00
CTE Budget	
	Total: $7000.00
Additional Goals	
	Total:

	Grand Total: $ 23,500.00

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	▢Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

▢ Yes   ▢ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The SAC committee will meet to discuss needs of the students and staff to help promote the schools mission of providing a safe, challenging environment that promotes personal responsibility and students to excel.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Text Books	$5000.00

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

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

Student Recognition	$5000.00