

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: Trinity Elementary	District Name: Pasco County
Principal: Cortney Gantt	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Susan Nies	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	Cortney Gantt	BS, MA Elementary Education/Educational Leadership	2	10	2003-2004: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met 2004-2005: Trinity Elementary School Grade: B, AYP: 100% Criteria Met 2005-2006: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 97% Criteria Met (Provisional), 2006-2007: Gulf Highlands Elementary School, School Grade C, AYP: No 87% Criteria Met 2007-2008: Pine View Elementary, School Grade A, AYP: No 97% Criteria Met 2008-2009: Pine View Elementary, School Grade A, AYP: No 97% Criteria Met 2009-2010: Pine View Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 97% Criteria Met 2010-2011: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met 2011-2012: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met
Assistant Principal	Shannon Middleton	Degrees: Master of Education, Bachelor of Arts in Education Areas of Certification: Emotional Handicaps K12, Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, Educational Leadership K-12, ESOL, Elementary Education K-6	3	7	2005-2006: Sunray Elementary, School Grade: B, AYP: No 90% Criteria Met 2006-2007: Sunray Elementary, School Grade: B, AYP: No 92% Criteria Met 2007-2008: Sunray Elementary, School Grade: C, AYP: No 85% Criteria Met 2008-2009: Sunray Elementary, School Grade: C, AYP: No 82% Criteria Met 2009-2010: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met 2010-2011: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met 2011-2012: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met

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)
Literacy	Faye Matodobra	Elem Ed Reading	11	4	2000-2001 Hudson Elementary, Reading Specialist, Grade C 2001-2002 Trinity Elementary, Reading Specialist, Grade A 2002-2003, Trinity Elementary, Grade A 2003-2004, Trinity Elementary, Grade A, AYP met 2004-2005, Trinity Elementary, Grade B, AYP met 2005-2006, Trinity Elementary, Grade A, 97% criteria met for provisional AYP 2006-2007, Trinity Elementary, Grade A, AYP met 2007-2008, Trinity Elementary, Grade A, AYP met 2008-2009 Trinity Elementary, Grade A, AYP met 2009-2010, Trinity Elementary, Grade B, AYP met 2010-2011: Trinity Elementary School, Grade A AYP met 2011-2012: Trinity Elementary School Grade: A, AYP: 100% Criteria Met

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. Screening/Interview process	Principal	Ongoing
2. School level training	Literacy Coach	August-June

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<p>3. Each teacher new to the profession is assigned a mentor who is selected based upon demonstration of sustained effective teaching practices. The mentor teacher is trained in Clinical Education. This mentor works side by side with the beginning teacher, providing support, resources, observation and coaching sessions, and technical advise on an ongoing basis. New teacher support groups are provided monthly. Administrators routinely meet with mentors and mentees to provide coaching and support. In addition, all teachers receive support from team members, team leaders, specialists, administrators and district staff.</p>	<p>Mentors, Administration, Team Leaders</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>4.</p>		

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/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
All teachers are Highly Qualified. Ms. Paus, Ms. Filipiak and Ms. Wyrick are out-of-field for gifted.	All teachers are currently enrolled in classes to complete their gifted certifications.

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
41	9% (4)	37% (15)	43% (19)	17% (7)	41% (17)	100% (41%)	4% (2)	17% (7)	58% (24)

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
Renee Benore	Jennifer Menzer	Pairing based upon teacher needs, ease of access and skills set that the mentor brings to the partnership.	Observations, individual meetings with teachers, provide resources, coaching and conferencing

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Aimee Paus	Dana Supernault	Pairing based upon teacher needs, ease of access and skills set that the mentor brings to the partnership.	Observations, individual meetings with teachers, provide resources, coaching and conferencing.
Cathy Cellura	Cheryl Baeza	Pairing based upon teacher needs, ease of access and skills set that the mentor brings to the partnership.	Observations, individual meetings with teachers, provide resources, coaching and conferencing.
Aimee Paus	Samantha Landers	Pairing based upon teacher needs, ease of access and skills set that the mentor brings to the partnership.	Observations, individual meetings with teachers, provide resources, coaching and conferencing.

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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Cortney Gantt- Principal, Shannon Middleton- Assistant Principal, Whitney Batista- Guidance, Faye Matodobra- Literacy Coach, Donna Mobilia- RTI Teacher, Susan Schultz- Special Education Teacher, Nicole Martin- School Psychologist, Deb Fairbank- Speech Pathologist, Shannon Johnson- First Grade Teacher and Jeanne Brant- Third Grade Teacher</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The team meets weekly to review screening data, review Progress Monitoring data, and plan for interventions. Team members provide professional development/technical assistance to all staff in order to support MTSS implementation.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The MTSS Leadership Team participates in analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation. They analyze school-wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends. Assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment) are developed for all staff to use. Progress Monitoring data is reviewed and interventions are planned when deemed necessary. The team is planning for additional professional development/technical assistance to support MTSS implementation. All this information will be used to determine school improvement objectives.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Data sources and management systems include: Reading- Tier 1: Fair/PMRN and MMH Treasures Unit assessments, Tier 2: MMH Running Records, weekly assessments and Triumphs assessments, Tier 3: Supplemental Curriculum assessments (Lessons in Literacy, Soar to Success, Stevenson...to name a few programs used). Math- Tier 1: CORE K-12 math assessments and Go Math Unit tests, Tier 2: Go Math Intervention program assessments, Tier 3: Computer based intervention data. Science- Tier 1: CORE K-12 science assessments and Fusion Science Unit tests, Tier 2: Fusion Science Intervention program assessments, Tier 3: Computer based intervention data. Writing- Tier 1-3: Six Traits Rubric and State FCAT Rubric Behavior- Tier 1: Response to classroom behavior plan, as documented by student planner, Tier 2-3- Individualized behavior plan, as documented by plan.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Trinity Elementary will participate in professional development training that will focus on the following: - Description of data collection processes to assess current staff skills. - Identification of days available for MTSS professional development. - Content of professional development day(s) based on state model professional development plan.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS. - Resources to conduct professional development- Resources to provide technical assistance and follow-up/support. -Plan for data collection to evaluate MTSS implementation levels.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Cortney Gantt- Principal, Shannon Middleton- Assistant Principal, Faye Matodobra- Literacy Coach, Cathy Cellura- Kindergarten Team Leader, Shannon Johnson- 1st Grade Team Leader, Jennifer Hendrickson- 2nd Grade Team Leader, Jeanne Brant- 3rd Grade Team Leader, Karen Logan- 4th Grade Team Leader, Aimee Paus - 5th Grade Team Leader

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Lead Literacy Team meets monthly to discuss school-wide improvement goals, review data from Core K-12, FAIR, and classroom assessments. They develop and conduct classroom walkthroughs based on best practices to determine areas of improvement for professional development and coaching. Teachers chosen to be on the Literacy Team share a common vision, are committed, have a desire to inspire others, are willing to do non-judgemental walkthroughs, uplift others and are willing to share their experiences and strengths. The team members' responsibilities include, but are not limited to: Being an agent for change, completing literacy scans to help determine professional development needs in the reading block and assisting the literacy coach with professional development trainings. Selected teachers include a representative from each team, Administration, and the Literacy Coach.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Using the Literacy Walkthroughs to guide our professional development

Monitoring the differentiation of Literacy Stations

Training/Coaching teachers on the Common Core Standards

Assisting teams in analyzing assessment data to guide instruction

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.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

****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?

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?

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](#).

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		

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

<p>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p>	<p>1A.1. Possible lack of understanding of the Common Core Standards, to drive CORE instruction.</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers will participate in an introductory training of the Common Core Standards. Then hold weekly team meetings to unpack and discuss the Common Core Standards. In addition, teachers will meet by grade level to plan and coach each other to ensure consistency of CORE delivery.</p>	<p>1A.1. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration & District Personnel</p>	<p>1A.1. Teachers will create lesson plans, which demonstrate rigorous learning task that align with the common core.</p>	<p>1A.1. Lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standards. In addition, Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT</p>		
---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

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

Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 3), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading is 24%. Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 5%.							
	Based on FCAT School level Report: 59 students out of 250 tested (23.6%) scored a level 3.	Based on FCAT School level Report: 73 students out of 250 tested (29%) will score a level 3.					
		1A.2. Possible lack of understanding how new Common Core Standards translate to classroom teaching practices.	1A.2. Teachers will participate in school wide book study to understand the practical implications of the new Common Core Standards.	1A.2. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach & Administration	1A.2. Classroom teaching practices will reflect best practices from that increase rigor for students	1A.2 Lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standards. In addition, Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT.	

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

		1A.3. Students scoring a level 1 & 2 on FCAT have deficits in their reading skills and may not have had targeted intensive interventions	1A.3. Students who are struggling in reading will receive an additional 30 minutes of intensive intervention in reading	1A.3. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, support services & Administration	1A.3. Problem solving meetings to determine appropriate, and effectiveness of interventions. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use. Lesson plans will be reviewed for implementation and walkthrough data, as well as teachers participating in meeting cycles to conduct data analysis and progress monitoring of student reading levels.	1A.3. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #1B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</p>	<p>2A.1. Possible lack of understanding of the Common Core Standards, to drive CORE instruction.</p>	<p>2A.1. Teachers will participate in an introductory training of the Common Core Standards. Then hold weekly team meetings to unpack and discuss the Common Core Standards. In addition, teachers will meet by grade level to plan and coach each other to ensure consistency of CORE delivery.</p>	<p>2A.1. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration & District Personnel</p>	<p>2A.1. Teachers will create lesson plans, which demonstrate rigorous learning task that align with the common core.</p>	<p>2A.1. Lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standards. In addition, Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT</p>		

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

<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring a Level 4 and 5), in grades 3,4, & 5, in Reading is 52%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and 5 by 5%.							
	Based on FCAT School level Report: 131 students out of 250 tested (52.4%) scored a level 4 or 5.	Based on FCAT School level Report: 143 students out of 250 tested (57.4%) will score a level 4 or 5.					
		2A2. Teachers may have difficulty differentiating instruction.	2A.2. Teacher will provide differentiated assignments to meet student's individual needs.	2A.2. Classroom teacher & Literacy Coach & Administration	2A.2. Student reading levels will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of differentiated activities. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use.	2A.2. Running Records, Lexile and FAIR data	

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

		2A.3. Additional time needed to provide enrichment to level 4 and 5 students.	2A.3. Additional enrichment activities will be provided and gifted students will be served through the Cluster grouping model	2A.3. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, support services & Administration	2A.3. Quarterly meetings to review student data will occur to monitor student progress. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use.	2A.3. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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		
<p>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>3A.1. Possible lack of understanding of the Common Core Standards, to drive CORE instruction.</p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers will participate in an introductory training of the Common Core Standards. Then hold weekly team meetings to unpack and discuss the Common Core Standards. In addition, teachers will meet by grade level to plan and coach each other to ensure consistency of CORE delivery.</p>	<p>3A.1. Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, Administration & District Personnel</p>	<p>3A.1. Teachers will create lesson plans, which demonstrate rigorous learning task that align with the common core.</p>	<p>3A.1. Lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standards. In addition, Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT</p>		

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

<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of students making learning gains, in grades 3,4, & 5, in Reading is 76%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in Reading by 5%.</p>							
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 190 students out of 250 tested (76%) made a learning gain in Reading.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 203 students out of 250 tested (81%) will make a learning gain in Reading.</p>					
		<p>3A.2. Inability of teachers to identify students not making learning gains, with new format of FCAT reports.</p>	<p>3A.2. Teachers will receive training in Pasco STAR, the district data management system, and in FCAT score reporting to affect their instructional grouping.</p>	<p>3A.2. Administration & Technology Specialist</p>	<p>3A.2. Teachers will use data they retrieve from Star and FCAT reports in team data meetings to target instruction.</p>	<p>3A.2. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT</p>	

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

		3A.1 Possible lack of understanding and practice opportunities for students to engage in quality learning centers	3A.3. Teachers will provide practice opportunities and direct instruction for differentiated learning centers.	3A.3. Literacy Coach & Administration	3A.3. Teachers will use data they acquire from FAIR, Running Records and Unit tests to assess the quality and impact of their learning centers. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use.	3A.3. Fair Data, Unit Assessments	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	NA	NA					
		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

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		
<p>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4A.1. Inability of teachers to identify the lowest 25% of students not making learning gains.</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will receive training in Pasco STAR, the district data management system, and in FCAT score reporting to affect their instructional grouping.</p>	<p>4A.1. Administration & Technology Specialist</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will use data they retrieve from Star in team data meetings to focus instruction.</p>	<p>4A.1. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #4A:</u> The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains, in grades 3,4, & 5, in Reading is 77%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in Reading by 5%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	Based on FCAT School level Report: 49 of the 63 Lowest 25% students tested (77%) made a learning gain in Reading.	Based on FCAT School level Report: 52 of the 63 Lowest 25% students tested (82%) will make a learning gain in Reading.					
		4A.2 Teachers may have difficulty differentiating instruction	4A.2. Teacher will be provided direct instruction in differentiated centers to meet student needs	4A.2. Literacy Coach & Administration	4A.2. Teacher will use data gathered from Unit tests and FAIR data to monitor student gains. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use.	4A.2. FAIR and Unit test	
		4A.3. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	4A.3. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	4A.3. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	4A.3. Increased student achievement on assessments	4A.3.. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT	
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.		
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	NA	NA					
		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

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	
<p>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading is 24% (60).</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading will be decreased to 21% (53).</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading will be decreased to 18% (45).</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading will be decreased to 15% (38).</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading will be decreased to 13% (33).</p>	<p>The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading will be decreased to 12% (30).</p>

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

<p><u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading is 24% (60). Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 12%.</p>							
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>	<p>5B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> NA</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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. Lack of understanding/exposure to the instructional language.	5C.1. Students will have access to additional instructional vocabulary	5C.1. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	5C.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	5C.1. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5C:</u></p> <p>The percentage of English Language Learner students achieving below proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Reading is 100%. Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 5%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	Based on FCAT School level Report: 1 of 1 English Language Learners (100%) scored below proficiency (scoring a level 1 or 2).	Based on FCAT School level Report: 1 students out of 1 tested (100%) will score a level 3.					
		5C.2. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	5C.2. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	5C.2. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	5C.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	5C.2. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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
Common Core Standards, weekly meetings	K-5	Literacy Coach	All Instructional Personnel-Reading	Completion by June 2013	Lesson plan reviews, Data and Data will be reviewed at Team meetings and the coaching model will be used to meet individual needs	Literacy Coach & Administration
Pathway to the Common Core- Book Study	K-5	Literacy Coach	All Instructional Personnel-Reading	Completion by June 2013	Lesson plan reviews, Data and Data will be reviewed at Team meetings and the coaching model will be used to meet individual needs	Literacy Coach & Administration
Data Roundups Topics: Assessment Data Reviews, Progress Monitoring and Intervention, Planning for Instruction	K-5	Administration	All Instructional Personnel-Reading	Weekly by teams for data reviews and Once Quarterly for planning	Weekly and monthly meeting logs, lesson plans, walkthroughs	Administration

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
None needed-current adopted textbook series is still being utilized	MMH Reading Series	None needed	0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None needed- web base source being used	Common Core web document	None needed	0.00
Subtotal:\$ 0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Data Roundups Topics: Assessment Data Reviews, Progress Monitoring and Intervention, Planning for Instruction	Administration for training	District funds will provide subs	2000.00
Pathways to the common Core- Book Study	Administration		
Subtotal:\$2000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$2000.00			

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 Lack of understanding/exposure to the instructional language.	1.1. Students will have access to additional instructional vocabulary practice and listening/speaking opportunities.	1.1 Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	1.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	5C.1. Cella Exam	
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> 50% of students are scoring at proficiency on the listening/Speaking portion of the Cella Exam. Therefore will increase proficiency by 25%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	50% (2 out of 4 students)					
		1.2. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	1.2. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	1.2. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	1.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	1.2. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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 Lack of understanding/exposure to the instructional language.	2.1. Students will have access to additional instructional vocabulary practice and listening/speaking opportunities.	2.1 Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	2.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.1. Cella Exam	
<u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> 50% of students are scoring at proficiency on the Reading portion of the Cella Exam. Therefore will increase proficiency by 25%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	50% (2 out of 4 students)					
		2.2. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	2.2. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	2.2. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	2.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.2. Cella Exam
		2.3. Lack of exposure to English based texts	2.3. Increased exposure and practice opportunities for Reading.	2.3. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	2.3. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.3. Cella Exam

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1 Lack of direct writing instruction and practice.	2.1. Students will have access to additional direct instruction and writing practice opportunities.	2.1 Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	2.1. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.1. Cella Exam	
CELLA Goal #3: 25% of students are scoring at proficiency on the Reading portion of the Cella Exam. Therefore will increase proficiency by 25%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	25% (1 out of 4 students)					
		2.2. Teacher not aware of writing as deficit area for ESOL students.	2.2. Increased discussions in professional development session that focus on writing needs.	2.2. Literacy Coach and Administration	2.2. Increased student achievement on assessments	2.2. Cella Exam
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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
Professional development with instructional staff that focus on the writing needs of ESOL students.	Literacy Coach	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$0.00			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Possible lack of Understanding Math Standards	1A.1. Trainings on how to unpack the standards will occur with K & 1 teachers to help them understand and plan for instruction. Teachers will also utilize updated teaching materials that include the Common Core Standards.	1A.1. Administration and District Personnel	1A.1. Teacher lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standard experiences for students.	1A.1. Math unit tests and benchmark results		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of students achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 3), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics is 36%. Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 5%.</p>							
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 90 students out of 250 tested (36%) scored a level 3.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 103 students out of 250 tested (41%) will score a level 3.</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Core instruction may not include the use of manipulatives, graphing calculators, and/or hands-on activities.</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives, graphing, calculators, and/or hands-on activities for standard or within each unit of study.</p>	<p>1A.2. Administration</p>	<p>1A.2. Teacher lesson plans will be reviewed and walkthrough data.</p>	<p>1A.2 Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results.</p>	

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

		1A.3. Evidence-based interventions used during supplemental instruction may not be intensive interventions matched to individual student needs (levels 1 & 2 students).	1A.3. Math plans targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem solving process. Teachers will match evidence-based interventions to individual student needs and provide them	1A.3. Administration	1A.3. Grade-level meetings will review results of common assessment data to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment).	1A.3. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u> N/A.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

	1A.2. Core instruction may not include the use of manipulatives, graphing calculators, and/or hands-on activities.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3..	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2A.1. Possible lack of Understanding Math Standards</p>	<p>2A.1. Trainings on how to unpack the standards will occur with K & 1 teachers to help them understand and plan for instruction. Teachers will also utilize updated teaching materials that include the Common Core Standards.</p>	<p>2A.1. Administration and District Personnel</p>	<p>2A.1. Teacher lesson plans will reflect Common Core Standard experiences for students.</p>	<p>2A.1. Math unit tests and benchmark results</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring a Level 4 and 5), in grades 3,4, & 5, in Mathematics is 38%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and 5 by 5%.</p>							
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 95 students out of 250 tested (38%) scored a level 4 or 5.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 108 students out of 250 tested (43%) will score a level 4 or 5.</p>					

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

	<p>1B.2. Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives, graphing calculators, and/or hands-on activities for standard or within each unit of study.</p> <p>1B.3. Teachers may not be proficient in providing enrichment activities to proficient students.</p>	<p>2A.2. Core instruction may not include the use of manipulatives, graphing calculators, and/or hands-on activities.</p>	<p>2A.2. Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives, graphing calculators, and/or hands-on activities for standard or within each unit of study.</p>	<p>2A.2. Administration</p>	<p>2A.2. Teacher lesson plans will be reviewed and walkthrough data.</p>	<p>2A.2. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results</p>	
		<p>2A.3. Teachers may not be proficient in providing enrichment activities to proficient students.</p>	<p>2A.3. Students who are proficient in math will receive an additional enrichment interventions in math.</p>	<p>2A.3. Administrator and gifted teachers</p>	<p>2A.3. Quarterly meetings to review student data will occur to monitor student progress and walkthrough data</p>	<p>2A.3. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results</p>	
<p>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Lack of proficiency in understanding learning gains and how to monitor student growth.	3A.1. Provide direction instruction to teachers in reading and understanding FCAT reports and training in using benchmark assessments to drive instruction.	3A.1. Administration	3A.1. Quarterly meetings to reflect on benchmark data and lesson plans.	3A.1. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students making learning gains, in grades 3,4, & 5, in Mathematics is 85%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics by 5%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	Based on FCAT School level Report: 213 students out of 250 tested (85%) made a learning gain in Mathematics.	Based on FCAT School level Report: 225 students out of 250 tested (90%) will make a learning gain in Mathematics.					
		3A.2. Evidence-based interventions used during supplemental instruction may not be intensive interventions matched to individual student needs (levels 1 & 2 students).	3A.2. Math plans targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem solving process. Teachers will match evidence-based interventions to individual student needs and provide them	3A.2. Administration	3A.2. Grade-level meetings will review results of common assessment data to determine progress toward benchmark (80% on common assessment).	3A.2. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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		
<p>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4A.1. Inability of teachers to define/identify the lowest 25% of students not making learning gains.</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will continue to receive training in Pasco STAR, the district data management system, and in FCAT score reporting to affect their instructional grouping.</p>	<p>4A.1. Administration</p>	<p>4A.1. Teachers will use data they retrieve from Star in team data meetings to group and regroup their guided math and math centers</p>	<p>4A.1. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains, in grades 3,4, & 5, in Mathematics is 70%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of Lowest 25% students making learning gains in Mathematics by 5%.							
	Based on FCAT School level Report: 44 of the 63 Lowest 25% students tested (70%) made a learning gain in Mathematics	Based on FCAT School level Report: 48 of the 63 Lowest 25% students tested (75%) will make a learning gain in Mathematics					
		4A.2. Teachers may have difficulty differentiating instruction	4A.2. Teacher will provide differentiated activities to meet student's individual needs.	4A.2. Administration	4A.2. Student math assessments will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of differentiated activities	4A.2. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results	

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

		4A.3. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	4A.3. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	4A.3. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	4A.3. Increased student achievement on assessments	4A.3. Math unit tests, CORE K-12 data and benchmark results	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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

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	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics is 26% (65).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics will be decreased to 23% (58).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics will be decreased to 20% (50).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics will be decreased to 17% (43).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics will be decreased to 15% (38).	The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics will be decreased to 13% (33).
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> The percentage of students not achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 1 or 2), in grades 3, 4, & 5, in Mathematics is 26% (65). Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 13%.							

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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement 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		

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

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

for the following subgroup:							
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: 100% of all English Language Learners tested were proficient in Math. Therefore this section is not applicable.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics	Problem-Solving Process to						

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

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

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

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
NA							
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School	Mathematics	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		

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

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: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

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: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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		

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

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.		
	Mathematics Goal #4: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance.*				
		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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						

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

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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						
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> NA							
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		

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 1.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		

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

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

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

		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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						

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

	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.		
<u>Geometry Goal #1:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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.		

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

<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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), 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						
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> NA							

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 subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Geometry Goal #3B: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas	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

in need of improvement for the following subgroup:							
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3E:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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
Data Roundups Topics: Assessment Data Reviews, Progress Monitoring and Intervention, Planning for Instruction	K-5	Administration	All Instructional Personnel-Math	Weekly by teams for data reviews and Once Quarterly for planning	Weekly and monthly meeting logs, lesson plans, walkthroughs	Administration
Common Core Training	K-1	District Personnel	K-1 Instructional Personnel-Math	Completion by June 2013	Weekly and monthly meeting logs, lesson plans, walkthroughs	Administration
Standards for Mathematical Practice: Developing Processes and Proficiencies in Mathematics Learners by Juli Dixon- Article Review	K-5	Administration	All Instructional Personnel-Math	Once a semester by teams for Quarterly planning	Semester lesson plans, walkthroughs	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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Standards for Mathematical Practice: Developing Processes and Proficiencies in Mathematics Learners by Juli Dixon- Article Review	Web based source	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Data Roundups Topics: Assessment Data Reviews, Progress Monitoring and Intervention, Planning for Instruction	Administration	None needed-subs covered under Reading budget	\$0.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$0.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Teachers not using all resources provided with new textbook adoption.	1A.1. Professional development to orient teachers to new materials	1A.1. Administration, District Personnel, Team Leaders	1A.1. Walkthrough data and Unit test	1A.1. CORE K-12 Results and benchmark tests		

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

<u>Science Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of students achieving proficiency (scoring a Level 3), in grade 5, in Science is 43%. Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 5%.</p>							
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 40 students out of 94 tested (43%) scored a level 3.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 45 students out of 94 tested (48%) will score a level 3.</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Core instruction may not include the use of interactive Notebook moodle.</p>	<p>1A.2. Professional development to orient teachers to new materials</p>	<p>1A.2. Administration, Team Leaders</p>	<p>1A.2. Lesson plans and Walkthrough data</p>	<p>1A.2. CORE K-12 Results and benchmark tests</p>	

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

		1A.3. Pacing of new content may be not allow processing time.	1A.3. Previewing content prior to instruction within the classroom.	1A.3. Classroom teacher and ESOL teacher	1A.3. Increased student achievement on assessments	1A.3.. Unit Test, Running Records, Lexile, FAIR & FCAT	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
---	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

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

<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p>	<p>2B.1. Teachers not using all resources provided with new textbook adoption.</p>	<p>2B.1. Professional development to orient teachers to new materials</p>	<p>2B.1. Administration, District Personnel, Team Leaders</p>	<p>2B.1. Walkthrough data and Unit test</p>	<p>2B.1. CORE K-12 Results and benchmark tests</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2A:</u> The percentage of students above proficiency (scoring a Level 4 and 5), in grade 5, in Science is 25%. Therefore, we will increase the percentage of students scoring level 4 and 5 by 5%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 24 students out of 94 tested (25%) scored a level 4 or 5.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 28 students out of 94 tested (30%) will score a level 4 or 5.</p>					

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

	1B.2. Core instruction may not include the use of interactive Notebook moodle. 1B.3. Teachers may have difficulty differentiating instruction.	2B.2. Professional development to orient teachers to new materials	2B.2. Administration, Team Leaders	2B.2. Lesson plans and Walkthrough data	2B.2. CORE K-12 Results and benchmark tests	2A.2.	
		1B.3. Teacher will provide differentiated assignments to meet student's individual needs.	1B.3. Classroom teachers, Gifted teachers & Administration	1B.3. Student assignments/ rubrics will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of differentiated activities. In addition, walkthroughs will be conducted for consistent and pervasive use.	1B.3. CORE K-12 Results and benchmark tests	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2B:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

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

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
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: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Science Goal #2:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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]).

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #2: NA	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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

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

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

Interactive Notebook Moodle	K-5	Science Rep. & Administration	K-5 All Instructional Staff	By December 2012	Lesson plans, walk-throughs	Administration
Fusion Math Resources	K-5	Science Rep. & Administration	K-5 All Instructional Staff	By December 2012	Lesson plans, walk-throughs	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Interactive Notebook Moodle	Online resources	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Fusion Math Resources	Textbook series	None needed (already purchased)	\$0.00
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:\$0.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (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. Teacher not familiar with the writing components of the Common Core Standards	1A.1. Teachers will be provided direct instruction in Common Core Standards	1A.1. Administration	1A.1. Writing samples, rubrics and walkthrough data	1A.1. Six traits rubric and FCAT rubric		

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

<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> The percentage of students achieving a score of 3, 4, 5, or 6, in grade 4, in Writing is 99%. Therefore, we will decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 or 2 by 1%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 73 students out of 74 tested (99%) scored a level 3 or above.</p>	<p>Based on FCAT School level Report: 74 students out of 74 tested (100%) will score a level 3 or above.</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Teachers not familiar with Writer's Workshop</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will be provided direct instruction in Writer's workshop</p>	<p>1A.2. Literacy Coach, Administration</p>	<p>1A.2. Writing samples, rubrics and walkthrough data</p>	<p>1A.2. Six traits rubric and FCAT rubric</p>	
		<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	<p>1A.3.</p>	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>		

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

Writing Goal #1B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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
Common Core Standards	K-5	Literacy Coach	All Instructional Personnel- K-5	Weekly team meetings, completed by June 2013	Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs	Administration
Writer Workshop	K-5	Literacy Coach	All Instructional Personnel- K-5	Weekly team meetings, completed by June 2013	Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs	Administration

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

June 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
Common Core Standards	Literacy Coach	None Needed	\$0.00
Writer Workshop	Literacy Coach	None Needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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 Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Parents are not aware of how many days their students have been absent.	1.1 Parents will be notified in writing when their child has missed more than 5 days per quarter.	1.1 School Social Worker	1.1 Review of quarterly attendance data	1.1 End of year ADA report		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> To maintain the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of 96%.	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					

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

	96% (480 students) on an enrollment of 500 students.	96% (506 Students) on an enrollment of 528 students.					
	<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>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of absences in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.</i>					
	<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>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students tardy in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
How to review attendance and tardy procedures with parents	K-5	Administration	All Instructional Staff	By September 13th (Open House)	Attendance data review	Administration

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
Parents will be notified in writing when their child has missed more than 5 days per quarter.	Social Worker will report	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Technology			

June 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:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
How to review attendance and tardy procedures with parents	None Needed- training will occur during pre-planning week	None Needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

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 Students are not provided with direct instruction in behavioral expectations and/or positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior.	1.1 School will implement school-wide Positive Behavior Support classroom systems, which include direct instruction in expected behavior, and a system of reinforcement for appropriate behavior.	1.1 Administration & Guidance Counselor	1.1 Discipline committee will review discipline data monthly and determine the total number of discipline days assigned, the number of suspension incidences and days, and the percent of students receiving one or more suspension days. This data will be compared to data from the same month of the 2010-2011 school year to determine progress toward goal.	1.1 Monthly Office Discipline Referral and Suspension Data		

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

Suspension Goal #1: By June 2013, number of suspensions, total suspension days assigned, to repeat offenders will be decreased by 50%.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	0 Students	0 Students					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	None	None					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of- School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out-of-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out-of-school</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out-of-school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out-of-school</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School will implement school-wide Positive Behavior Support classroom systems, which include direct instruction in expected behavior, and a system of reinforcement for appropriate behavior.	K-5	Administration	All staff members	Completed by August 24, 2011	Discipline data	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

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

School will implement school-wide Positive Behavior Support classroom systems, which include direct instruction in expected behavior, and a system of reinforcement for appropriate behavior.	Classroom and school-wide posters	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School will implement school-wide Positive Behavior Support classroom systems, which include direct instruction in expected behavior, and a system of reinforcement for appropriate behavior.	Administration	None needed	\$0.00
Subtotal:\$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$0.00			

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> NA	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1 Possible lack of communication regarding the event.	1.1 Flyer and phone call will be sent home with the event information and the information will be shared with parents on Meet the Teacher Day	1.1 Administration	1.1 Conduct a comparison of the sign-in sheets from last year’s event to the current year. Sign-in sheets	1.1 Open House sign in sheets		

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1: We will maintain the number of families that attend Open House (80%), which is our main vehicle through which we share the curriculum, expectations and organizational structure of our school.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	400 parents out of 500 students (80%)	422 parents out of 528 students (80%)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

Topic: Communicating with parents	K-5	Administration	All Instructional Personnel	Completed by August 10,2012	Open House sign-in sheets	Administration

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
Automated phone messages and newsletters will be created to advertise our Open House with parents	Paper	District funds	\$100.00
Subtotal:			
Total:\$100.00			

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

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

CTE Professional Development

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

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
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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Additional 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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:\$2000.00
CELLA Budget	Total:\$0.00
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$0.00
Science Budget	Total:\$0.00
Writing Budget	Total:\$0.00
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:\$0.00
Suspension Budget	Total:\$0.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:\$100.00
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:\$2100.00

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

Grand Total:

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

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

Review of School Improvement Plan
Introduction to the new Team configurations
Introduction to the new Social Studies series
Data reviews
Guidance Services

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Roller over funds from previous year-no new funds granted this year. Fund will be used for curriculum planning and substitutes.	\$3527.00