

# 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: Mittye P. Locke Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Adam Wolin	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Richard Bracker	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	Adam Wolin	BA- Exceptional Student Education MS- Exceptional Student Education MS- Educational Leadership	2	7	2011-212- A (Rd. Prof.-61%, Math Prof.-66%, Writing Prof.-82%, Science Prof.-56%, Rd. Gains-66%, Math Gains-79%, Rd. Gains Lowest 25%-53%, Math Gains Lowest 25%-85%) 2010-2011- A/AYP not Met in Reading for Total, White, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged and not met in Math for Total, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010- B/AYP not met 2008-2009- B/Yes made AYP 2007-2008-C/AYP not met 2006-2007-A/AYP not met
Assistant Assistant Principal	Debra Mattheus	BS-Elementary Ed. MA-Educational Leadership Certified- Educational Leadership	3	7	2011-212- A (Rd. Prof.-61%, Math Prof.-66%, Writing Prof.-82%, Science Prof.-56%, Rd. Gains-66%, Math Gains-79%, Rd. Gains Lowest 25%-53%, Math Gains Lowest 25%-85%) 2010-2011- A/AYP not Met in Reading for Total, White, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged and not met in Math for Total, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010- B/AYP not met 2008-2009- A/AYP not 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)
Reading	Vita Gilchrist	BA- Elementary Education MS- Reading Certified: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) Reading (Grades K-12) Subject Area: Reading/ Literacy	24	3	2011-212- A (Rd. Prof.-61%, Math Prof.-66%, Writing Prof.-82%, Science Prof.-56%, Rd. Gains-66%, Math Gains-79%, Rd. Gains Lowest 25%-53%, Math Gains Lowest 25%-85%) 2010-2011- A/AYP not Met in Reading for Total, White, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged and not met in Math for Total, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010- B/AYP not met
Math	Amy Hlebak	BA- Early Childhood MS- Reading Certified: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) Middle School Math (5-9) ESOL Endorsement	8	3	2011-212- A (Rd. Prof.-61%, Math Prof.-66%, Writing Prof.-82%, Science Prof.-56%, Rd. Gains-66%, Math Gains-79%, Rd. Gains Lowest 25%-53%, Math Gains Lowest 25%-85%) 2010-2011- A/AYP not Met in Reading for Total, White, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged and not met in Math for Total, Hispanic, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010- B/AYP not 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. Recruit: Applicants go through an extensive screening process to ensure that they are the most highly qualified teacher for the position.	Administration/District	June 2013

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

2. Retain: Continue providing support to faculty members through job embedded training and learning communities. In addition, provide support through the coaching cycle. In addition, if first year teachers are hired there are regularly scheduled "Eaglet" meetings (New Teacher Meetings) for new teachers and mentors are assigned.	Administration/Coaches/Staff Development	June 2013
3.		
4.		

**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

***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
48	0%	19% (10)	38% (18)	43% (20)	31% (15)	100% (48)	14% (7)	0 (0)	63% (30)

***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
Vita Gilchrist	K-5 Teachers/Currently No Assigned Mentee	Improve Reading and Writing Instruction	Staff Development, Coaching and Conferencing
Amy Hlebak	K-5 Teachers/Currently No Assigned Mentee	Improve Math Instruction	Staff Development, Coaching and Conferencing
Samantha Downey	K-5 Teachers (emphasis on ESE staff)	Improve ESE instructional practices and assist with ESE procedures	Staff Development, Coaching and Conferencing

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

### 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 In an effort to provide a comprehensible framework of services to better meet the needs of economically disadvantaged children and to give all children a greater chance for academic success, while reducing duplication of services, Mitty P. Locke E.S. coordinates the utilization of federal, state, and local funds and integrates several programs in compliance with state requirements.
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs- At MPLES, Second Step Violence Prevention materials will be used with students.
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start- At MPLES we have two Head Start Prekindergarten classes and two Prekindergarten Varying Exceptionalities classes. Assessments such as Galileo and Esi-P are conducted along with other diagnostic assessments in order to provide data needed to prepare these students for an easy transition into kindergarten. Our Prekindergarten Program also provides home visits and parent programs throughout the year to assist our families.
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Our RtI team includes the following staff: School Administrators, General and Special Education Teachers, Math Coach, Intervention Teacher, Literacy Coach, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, Guidance Counselor and Student Success Coach.

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?

Our school-based RtI team meets on a regular basis with each grade level team. During the meetings, the team reviews universal screening data, progress monitoring data, and plans for interventions. The team also considers the fidelity of the RtI implementation and any additional training needs of the staff.

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

- Identification of critical RtI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity.
- Analysis of school wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends.
- Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention.
- Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment).
- Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars.
- Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity
- Assessment of school staff's practices and skill development (RtI Skills and RtI Perception of Practices Surveys).
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation.

Involvement may include:

- Analysis of relevant demographic/school profile data for the purpose of problem analysis and hypothesis generation.
- Identification of critical RtI infrastructure already established and/or in need of development and provide plan for building capacity.
- Analysis of school wide and grade-level data in order to identify student achievement trends.
- Analysis of disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention.
- Development of assessment strategies and calendars (i.e., Universal Screening, Progress Monitoring, Diagnostic Assessment).
- Development of data review plans, supports, and calendars.
- Development of processes to ensure intervention fidelity
- Review of Progress Monitoring data.
- Planning for Interventions.
- Assessment of RtI implementation progress (Self- Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)).
- Assessment of school staff's skill development (RtI Skills Survey).
- Development of professional development/technical assistance plan to support RtI implementation.

### MTSS Implementation

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

Pasco STAR v2 (Student Testing and Assessment Reports) is the tool that houses our data for the district and this tool allows teachers and other staff members to analyze student data. This is important at the start of the year for student placement. However, the PMRN will be used to analyze the FAIR assessments on our students thereafter. We will use CORE K-12 assessments and the management system for CORE K-12 assessments for math and science in grades 2-5. Pre (baseline data), Midyear, and Post assessments will be used in math and science to drive instruction. Writing prompts and common scoring spreadsheets have been developed for the school. Reading Unit Assessments are analyzed and grade-level action plans are developed. A school-based electronic database has been developed in order to house data in regards to students who are being discussed at specific TBIT or SBIT meetings.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Our school will continue implementation of RtI to include all grade level of teachers and students. The Student Services team, led by our school psychologist and RTI Coach, will be guiding the teachers through the process with the assistance of district personnel. Additional support will be provided through ongoing trainings and coaching by the school-based vision team. Summer training and intermittent trainings for team leaders have been established to support the teachers through the problem-solving process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Weekly grade-level problem solving meetings have been established. During each of these meetings, instructional support and coaches will be in attendance to assist in the process of identifying the problem, developing interventions, progress monitoring, and decision making. Additionally, a school assigned RtI Coach will be available to assist with teams who are in need of further support.

### *Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Administration, K-5 Teachers, Guidance, ESE Teachers, Literacy Coach, Intervention Teacher, Media Specialist, Technology Specialist, and Math Coach

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

Meetings are held once a month to monitor the goals of the school and problem solve the current issues at hand. A sub group of this group make up the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), this team is the leadership team for PS/RtI . This team meets every week within their grade level group for Teacher Based Intervention Team (TBIT) meetings. This group is also charged with the rollout of literacy data and literacy initiatives that are new to the school.

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

Common-Core State Standards, Text-Complexity, Text Dependent Questioning, and Writing to Learn in all curricular areas

### *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.

At Mitty P. Locke Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instructional and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Screening data will be collected and aggregated by the middle of September 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Specific screening tools our school will use include: FLKRS and Running Records

### ***\*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](#).

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**

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

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

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>	1A.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	1A.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	1A.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	1A.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	1A.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		



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

<p><b>Reading Goal #1A:</b> <i>The percentage of students achieving level 3 in Reading will increase from 22% to 30% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i></p>	<p><b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b></p>	<p><b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b></p>					
	<p>22% (60)</p>	<p>30% (81)</p>					
		<p>1A.2. Students have limited instruction that is matched to analyzed assessment data.</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will plan instruction based on the needs analyzed in the common assessments.</p>	<p>1A.2. All classroom teachers and coaches</p>	<p>1A.2. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR and RR.</p>	<p>1A.2. CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR, RR</p>	
		<p>1A.3. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.</p>	<p>1A.3. Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and academic scales/rubrics of expectations.</p>	<p>1A.3. All classroom teachers</p>	<p>1A.3. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences</p>	<p>1A.3. Observation results</p>	
<p><b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b></p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>	<p>1B.1.</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #1B:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b></p>	<p><b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>	2A.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	2A.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	2A.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	2A.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	2A.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u> <i>The percentage of students achieving level at or above 4 in Reading will increase from 37% to 40% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>37% (100)</i>	<i>40% (108)</i>					
		2A.2. Students have limited instruction that is matched to analyzed assessment data.	2A.2. Teachers will plan instruction based on the needs analyzed in the common assessments.	2A.2. All classroom teachers and coaches	2A.2. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR and RR.	2A.2. CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR, RR	

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

		2A.3. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.	2A.3. Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and academic scales/rubrics of expectations.	2A.3. All classroom teachers	2A.3. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences	2A.3. Observation results	
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
		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		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3A.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	3A.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	3A.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	3A.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	3A.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in Reading will increase from 51% to 60% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	51% (137)	56% (151))					
		3A.2. Students have limited instruction that is matched to analyzed assessment data.	3A.2. Teachers will plan instruction based on the needs analyzed in the common assessments.	3A.2. All classroom teachers and coaches	3A.2. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR and RR.	3A.2. CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR, RR	

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

		3A.3. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.	3A.3. Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and academic scales/rubrics of expectations.	3A.3. All classroom teachers	3A.3. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences	3A.3. Observation results	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
		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		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>	4A.1. Students have limited knowledge or inadequate opportunities for application of skills.	4A.1. Teachers will provide small, flexible group instruction based on student needs.	4A.1. All teachers and coaches	4A.1. Teachers will discuss implementation, concerns, and student progress during grade level meetings.	4A.1. FAIR, CCRP Weekly & Unit Assessments		
<u>Reading Goal #4A:</u> <i>The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading will increase from 53% to 60% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	53%	60%					
		4A.2. Students have limited instruction that is matched to analyzed assessment data.	4A.2. Teachers will plan instruction based on the needs analyzed in the common assessments.	4A.2. All classroom teachers and coaches	4A.2. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR and RR.	4A.2. CCRP Unit Assessments, FAIR, RR	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

<p><b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
<p><u>Reading Goal #4B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		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	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> School Wide- 69%  Hispanic- 60% FRL- 66% SWD- 26%	Hispanic-64% FRL- 69% SWD- 43%	Hispanic-68% FRL- 72% SWD- 47%	Hispanic-71% FRL- 75% SWD- 52%	Hispanic-74% FRL- 78% SWD- 57%	Hispanic-77% FRL- 80% SWD- 62%	Hispanic- 80% FRL- 82% SWD- 65%
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The non-proficient students in each subgroup will decrease by 50% by 2017.							
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		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	5B.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	5B.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	5B.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	5B.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		

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

<p><b>Reading Goal #5B:</b></p> <p><i>The percentage of students from designated subgroups will increase their proficiency in reading (White: 61% to 65%/ Hispanic: 35% to 40%) based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>                  White: 61% (146)                  Black:                  Hispanic: 35% (29)                  Asian:                  American Indian:</p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>                  White: 65% (156)                  Black:                  Hispanic: 40% (34)                  Asian:                  American Indian:</p>					
		<p>5B.2. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.</p>	<p>5B.2. Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and academic scales/rubrics of expectations.</p>	<p>5B.2. . All classroom teachers</p>	<p>5B.2. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences</p>	<p>5B.2. Observation results</p>	
		<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	<p>5B.3.</p>	

**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		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5C.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	5C.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	5C.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	5C.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	5C.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<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		

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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.</p>	<p>5D.1. All classroom teachers and coaches</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.</p>	<p>5D.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples</p>		
<p><b>Reading Goal #5D:</b>  The percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency in reading will increase from 11% to 25% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>11% (5)</p>	<p>25% (11)</p>					
		<p>5D.2. Students have limited knowledge and inadequate opportunities for application of phonics skills</p>	<p>5D.1. Daily targeted strategies include mnemonics, visual images, vowel patterns, and word categories in the scope and sequence presented in state approved reading intervention programs.</p>	<p>5D.1. ESE Teachers, Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will discuss implementation and concerns during grade level meetings.</p>	<p>5D.1. Informal assessments included from reading intervention programs</p>	
		<p>5D.3 Students have limited knowledge or inadequate opportunities for application of skills.</p>	<p>5D.3. Teachers will provide small, flexible group instruction based on student needs.</p>	<p>5D.3. All teachers and coaches</p>	<p>5D.3. Teachers will discuss implementation, concerns, and student progress during grade level meetings.</p>	<p>5D.3. FAIR, CCRP Weekly &amp; Unit Assessments</p>	



**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		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5E.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	5E.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	5E.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	5E.1. Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	5E.1. CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples		
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b> <i>The percentage of students identified as economically disadvantaged demonstrating proficiency in reading will increase from 44% to 50% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	44% (88)	50% (101)					
		5E.2. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.	5E.2. Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and academic scales/rubrics of expectations.	5E.2. All classroom teachers	5E.2. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences	5E.2. Observation results	

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

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.							
	PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	CCSS/ Grade level application	K-5	Vita Gilchrist, Grade Level Facilitators	School-Wide	Bi-Weekly- PD, Bi-Weekly-PLC	School Developed CCSS document	Administration/Literacy Coach
	Writing to Learn- Core Connections	K-5	Jane Hobgood, Consultant	School-Wide	August 2012	Walkthrough Data, writing response samples	Administration/Literacy Coach
	Independent Reading	K-5	District Facilitator	School-Wide	January 2013	Conference forms	Administration/Literacy Coach

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Vocabulary and Reading Strategies	Reading/Vocabulary A-Z	Title I	\$500
Preview and Review Skills	Brain-Pop	Title I	\$2100
Phonemic Awareness	Earobics	Title I	\$3000
<b>Subtotal: \$5600</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing to Learn	Core Connections Consultant	Title-I	See Writing PD
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$5600</b>			

*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]).

<b>CELLA Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>	1.1 Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	1.1 Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	1.1 All classroom teachers and coaches	1.1 Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	1.1 CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples	
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>The percentage of students proficiency in listening/speaking will increase from 27% (2012) to 35% (2013).</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b>					
	27% (6 students)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>	2.1 Students have limited knowledge or inadequate opportunities for application of skills.	2.1 Teachers will provide small, flexible group instruction based on student needs.	2.1 All teachers and coaches	2.1 Teachers will discuss implementation, concerns, and student progress during grade level meetings.	2.1 FAIR, CCRP Weekly & Unit Assessments	
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b>  <i>The percentage of students proficiency in reading will increase from 23% (2012) to 30% (2013).</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u>					
	23% (5 students)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>	2.1 Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written and oral formats.	2.1 Teachers will provide students with opportunities to respond to teacher and student selected reading (i.e. independent, read aloud, partner reading) in written and oral formats.	2.1 All classroom teachers and coaches	2.1 Teachers will analyze results from the CCRP Unit short response assessments and classroom written response samples.	2.1 CCRP Unit Assessments, classroom written response samples	
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b>  <i>The percentage of students proficiency in listening/ speaking will increase from 32% (2012) to 40% (2013).</i>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>  					
	32% (7 students)					
		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**



**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing to Learn- Core Connections	Writing throughout all content areas/ Consultant	Title I	See Writing PD
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Elementary Mathematics Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>	1A.1. Teachers have limited access to scales and rubrics for math.	1A.1. Teachers will develop academic scales/rubrics of expectations and share them on the school Moodle site.	1A.1 All classroom teachers	1A.1 Teachers will upload and download rubrics to school Moodle site.	1A.1 Moodle usage report		
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <b>#1A:</b>  <i>The percentage of students scoring at achievement level 3 in math will increase from 27% to 35% based on the FCAT 2032 results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	27% (73)	35% (94)					

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

		1A.2. Current Math instruction does not meet individual student needs.	1A.2 Teachers will provide fluid small group instruction or activities to enrich or scaffold based on assessment and observation data.	1A.2 Classroom teachers, Math Coach	1A.2. Teachers will analyze pretest graphic organizers, and observation data.	1A.2 Pre test data, walkthrough tool	
		1A.3. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	1A.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the math lesson in written format.	1A.3. All classroom teachers and coaches	1A.3. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	1A.3. Classroom written response samples	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>	1B.1.						
<b>Mathematics Goal #1B:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>	2A.1. Teachers have limited access to scales and rubrics for math.	2A.1. Teachers will develop academic scales/rubrics of expectations and share them on the school Moodle site.	2A.1 All classroom teachers	2A.1 Teachers will upload and download rubrics to school Moodle site.	2A.1 Moodle usage report		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>  <i>The percentage of students achieving level at or above 4 in Math will increase from 37% to 42% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	37% (99)	42% (113)					
		2A.2. Current Math instruction does not meet individual student needs.	2A.2 Teachers will provide fluid small group instruction or activities to enrich or scaffold based on assessment and observation data.	2A.2 Classroom teachers, Math Coach	2A.2. Teachers will analyze pretest graphic organizers, and observation data.	2A.2 Pre test data, walkthrough tool	
		2A.3. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	2A.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the math lesson in written format.	2A.3. All classroom teachers and coaches	2A.3. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	2A.3. Classroom written response samples	

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

<p><b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</p>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		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		
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3A.1. Current Math instruction does not meet all student needs.	3A.1. Math Coach will assist teachers in planning a math unit instruction if the grade level pretest score is below 40%.	3A.1. Classroom teachers, Math Coach	3A.1. Post test data	3A.1. Post Test graphic organizer		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> <i>The percentage of students making learning gains in Math will increase from 57% to 64% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	57% (115)	64% (129)					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
	<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		
<b>4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>	4A.1. Students do not have adequate problem solving skills.	4A.1. Teachers will provide students with common strategies across the grade levels for problem solving.	4A.1. Classroom teachers, Math Coach	4A.1. Problem solving bookmarks used in each classrooms.	4A.1. Walk through data		
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> <i>The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math will increase from 85% to 88% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	85%	88%					
		4A.2. Students do not have ample opportunities to practice, preview and review skills.	4A.2. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to practice, preview and review skills collaboratively through the use of centers/activities/ structures/ projects/etc.	4A.2. Classroom teachers, Math Coach	4A.2. Teachers will analyze pre/posttest data.	4A.2.Pre/post test data	
		4A.3.	4A.3.				

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

<p><b>4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.				
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u></p>					
	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					
		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	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>	<b>School Wide- 70%</b> <b>Hispanic- 65%</b> <b>FRL- 66%</b> <b>SWD- 26%</b>	<b>Hispanic- 71%</b> <b>FRL- 71%</b> <b>SWD- 37%</b>	<b>Hispanic-74%</b> <b>FRL- 74%</b> <b>SWD- 43%</b>	<b>Hispanic- 77%</b> <b>FRL- 77%</b> <b>SWD- 49%</b>	<b>Hispanic- 80%</b> <b>FRL- 80%</b> <b>SWD- 55%</b>	<b>Hispanic- 82%</b> <b>FRL- 82%</b> <b>SWD- 60%</b>
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5B.1. Teachers have limited access to scales and rubrics for math.	5B.1. Teachers will develop academic scales/rubrics of expectations and share them on the school Moodle site.	5B.1 All classroom teachers	5B.1 Teachers will upload and download rubrics to school Moodle site.	5B.1 Moodle usage report		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
<i>The percentage of students from designated subgroups will increase their proficiency in math (White: 66% to 70 %/ Hispanic: 35% to 40%) based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>						
	White: 66% (158) Black: Hispanic: 35% (29) Asian: American Indian:	White: 70% (168) Black: Hispanic: 40% (33) Asian: American Indian:				
		5B.2. Current Math instruction does not meet individual student needs.	5B.2 Teachers will provide fluid small group instruction or activities to enrich or scaffold based on assessment and observation data.	5B.2 Classroom teachers, Math Coach	5B.2. Teachers will analyze pretest/posttest graphic organizers, and observation data.	5B.2 Pre/ Post test data, walkthrough tool
		5B.3. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	5B.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the math lesson in written format.	5B.3. All classroom teachers and coaches	5B.3. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	5B.3. Classroom written response samples

**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		
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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		



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

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. Current Math instruction does not meet individual student needs.</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will use various materials/resources to provide scaffolded instruction.</p>	<p>5D.1 Classroom teachers, Math Coach</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers will analyze pretest/posttest graphic organizers, and observation data.</p>	<p>5D.1. Pre/Post test data, walkthrough tool</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>  The percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency in math will increase from 18% to 30% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>18% (8)</p>	<p>30% (13)</p>					
		<p>5D.2. Students have limited understanding of the learning goals and the expectations for their learning.</p>	<p>5D.2 Teachers will develop and provide a clear learning goal and scale/rubric of expectations for each lesson presented.</p>	<p>5D.2. All classroom teachers</p>	<p>5D.2. Administrative formal/informal observations and conferences</p>	<p>5D.2 Scales/Rubrics results</p>	
		<p>5D.3. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.</p>	<p>5D.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the math lesson in written format.</p>	<p>5D.3. All classroom teachers and coaches</p>	<p>5D.3. Teachers will analyze student written samples.</p>	<p>5D.3. Classroom written response samples</p>	

**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		
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5E.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	5E.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the math lesson in written format.	5E.1 All classroom teachers and coaches	5E.1. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	5E.1 Classroom written response samples		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> <i>The percentage of students identified as economically disadvantaged demonstrating proficiency in reading will increase from 62% to 68% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	62% (124)	68% (137)					
		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*

### **Mathematics Professional Development**

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Standards for Mathematical Practices	K-5	Math Coach	School-Wide	2012-2013 school year	Walkthrough Data	Administration/ Math Coach
Pre/Post Test Graphic Organizers	K-5	Math Coach	School-Wide	August 2012	Walkthrough Data	Administration/ Math Coach

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Preview and Review Math Skills	Brain-Pop/Brain Pop Jr	Title I	See Reading Tech.
Math Skills	iPod/iPad Applications	Internal Funds	\$200
<b>Subtotal: \$200</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$200</b>			

*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]).

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>	1A.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	1A.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the science lesson in written format.	1A.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	1A.1. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	1A.1. Classroom written response samples		
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b> <i>The percentage of students achieving level 3 will increase from 32% to 40% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	32% (34)	40% (42)					

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

		1A.2. Students have limited science content knowledge.	1A.2. Teachers will deliver instruction through the use of activities/ structures/ technology/ labs, etc.	1A.2. All classroom teachers	1A.2. Teachers will analyze test data.	1A.2. Chapter tests, CORE, and/or Body of Knowledge pre/post tests	
		1A.3. Students have limited opportunities to define and defend evidence in text.	1A.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to answer text dependent questions and cite evidence in written and oral formats.	1A.3. All classroom teachers	1A.3. Teachers will analyze student responses and CORE results.	1A.3. Classroom response samples, CORE results	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>	2A.1. Students have limited opportunities to express understanding in written formats.	2A.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to demonstrate understanding during the science lesson in written format.	2A.1. All classroom teachers and coaches	2A.1. Teachers will analyze student written samples.	2A.1. Classroom written response samples		
<b>Science Goal #2A: The percentage of students achieving level at or above 4 in Reading will increase from 21% to 25% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	21% (22)	25% (26)					
		2A.2. Students have limited science content knowledge.	2A.2. Teachers will deliver instruction through the use of activities/ structures/ technology/ labs, etc.	2A.2. All classroom teachers	2A.2. Teachers will analyze test data.	2A.2. Chapter tests, CORE, and/or Body of Knowledge pre/post tests	
		2A.3. Students have limited opportunities to define and defend evidence in text.	2A.3. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to answer text dependent questions and cite evidence in written and oral formats.	2A.3. All classroom teachers	2A.3. Teachers will analyze student responses and CORE results.	2A.3. Classroom response samples, CORE results	



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

<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> <b>Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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>					
		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*

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Writing to Learn- Core Connections	K-5	Jane Hobgood, Consultant	School-Wide	August 2012	Walkthrough Data, writing response samples	Administration/Literacy Coach

**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
Lab Materials	Consumable Experiment Materials	Consumables	\$500
<b>Subtotal: \$500</b>			
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**

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing to Learn	Core Connections Consultant	Title I	See Writing PD
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$500</b>			

*End of Science Goals*

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

**Writing Goals**

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

<b>Writing Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>	1A.1. Opportunities for writing were limited to a specific block during the day or writing to a prompt.	1A.1. Teachers will imbed writing across all curricular areas.	1A.1. All classroom teachers, Literacy Coach	1A.1. Teachers will share student writing samples during grade level meetings.	1A.1. Student work samples		
<p><b>Writing Goal #1A:</b></p> <p><i>The percentage of students achieving level at or above 3.0 in Writing will increase from 82% to 88% based on the 2013 FCAT results.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	82% (65)	88% (70)					

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

		1A.2. Teachers have limited support for FCAT writing preparation.	1A.2. Teachers and students at grade 4 will be provided with regularly scheduled support through the use of modeling and co-teaching.	1A.2. Literacy Coach	1A.2. Fourth grade teachers will meet to analyze student writing samples.	1A.2 MMH writing rubric	
		1.2. Teachers need common tools for analyzing scores using MMH writing rubric.	1.2. Grade level teams will analyze student writing scores using a spreadsheet and graphs.	1.2. Literacy Coach and all teachers	1.2. Teachers will meet in grade level teams to discuss writing scores.	1.2. Spreadsheet graphs	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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.	

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Writing to Learn- Core Connections	K-5	Jane Hobgood, Consultant	School-Wide	August 2012	Walkthrough Data, writing response samples	Administration/Literacy Coach

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

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing to Learn	Core Connections Consultant	Title I	\$2500
<b>Subtotal: \$2500</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$2500</b>			

*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]).

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.							
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

*End of 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]).

<b>U.S. History EOC Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<b>U.S. History Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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		
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<b>U.S. History Goal #2:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b></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>
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<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**

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

*End of 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]).

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Attendance</b>	1.1. Students do not recognize the importance of regular attendance and lack motivation to attend school. Students do not advocate to come to school.	1.1. Implement a plan to positively reward students that consistently attend school.	1.1. Administration, classroom teachers, social worker, business partnerships, data entry	1.1. The data will be compared quarterly to the previous year to determine progress.	1.1. TERMS monthly attendance data, esempler weekly report		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> <i>School wide, we will improve student's daily attendance.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>94% average daily attendance (550 students)</i>	<i>96% average daily attendance (550 students)</i>					



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

	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Absences</u> <u>(10 or more)</u>					
	7% (39 students)	5% (28 students)					
	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Students with</u> <u>Excessive</u> <u>Tardies (10 or</u> <u>more)</u>					
	5% (28 students)	3% (17 students)					
		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**

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Improve Attendance	Incentive Resources	Business Partnerships	\$1000
<b>Subtotal: \$1000</b>			
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**

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$1000</b>			

*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)).

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
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		
<b>1. Suspension</b>	1.1. Limited student knowledge and inadequate opportunities for application of appropriate social skills.	1.1. Implement a variety of Tier II and Tier III (BIP/FBA) strategies to meet the needs of students.	1.1. RTI behavior committee, Administration, classroom teachers, guidance	1.1. The data will be compared quarterly to the previous year to determine progress.	1.1. TERMS monthly suspension data		
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b> <i>By July 2013 the percent of students receiving suspension (both In-School and Out-of-School) will decrease.</i>	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	13	10					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	11	8					

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

	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of- School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<i>26</i>	<i>13</i>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u>					
	<i>12</i>	<i>8</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**

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

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School PBS program-Caught Ya' Club	Incentives for Students, Caught-Ya Tickets	Internal	\$1000
<b>Subtotal: \$1000</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*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)).

<b>Dropout Prevention Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention</b>						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<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>					



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

	<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**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.							
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of 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)).

<b>Parent Involvement Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement</b>						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>	I.1. Communication of events	I.1. School Connect phone messages, fliers, marquee announcements, class and teacher incentives	I.1. Administration, Teachers	I.1. Increased Attendance	I.1. Sign in Sheets		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>By June of 2013, parent participation in curriculum based information sessions and/or workshops will increase by 10%.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	75%	85%					

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

		1.2. Parents of ELL students have limited understanding of home/school communications due to language acquisition.	1.2. Home/school documents will be offered in parent's home language.	1.2. Administration, ESOL teacher, ESOL instructional assistant	1.2. Increased Attendance	1.2. Sign in Sheets	
		1.3. Time of Day	1.3. Offer morning and afternoon workshops	1.3. Administration, Teachers	1.3. Increased Attendance	1.3. Sign in Sheets	
		1.4 Daycare	1.4 Offer babysitting services to families for toddlers through 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	1.4 Administration	1.4 Increased Attendance	1.4 Sign in Sheets	

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
Strategies to build positive relationships with parents and increase parent involvement	All	Administration Leadership Team	School-wide	September staff meeting	Increased parent contact and/or parent participation in school events	Leadership team, Teachers

**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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentives for Parent Trainings	Snacks, Refreshments, Incentives	Title I	\$500
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: \$500</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1. Teachers have limited technology tools to use in the classroom.	1.1. Teachers will integrate technology using ipads, ipods, laptops, and smartboards.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Walkthroughs	1.1. Observational notes
	1.2. Teachers have limited support in using technology with students.	1.2. Teachers and students at grades 4 & 5 will be provided with regularly scheduled technology support.	1.2. Media/Tech Assistant, Administration	1.2. Teachers will analyze student comfort with technology use.	1.2. Lesson plans, observational notes
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC)</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

<b>or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of STEM Goal(s)*



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

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

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> <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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of 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)).

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

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total:</b>			

*End of 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.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$5600</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$200</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$500</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$2500</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1000</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$1000</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$500</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>

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

**Grand Total: \$11300**



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

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

**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.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
<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.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
--	--------

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