

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: Cedar Key High School	District Name: Levy
Principal: Daniel Faircloth	Superintendent: Robert Hastings
SAC Chair: B.J. Arrington and Lenita Cato	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.

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Daniel Faircloth	BS Agriculture MS Ed Leadership MS Religious Educations	1	24	1998-99 School Grade B 1999-00 Elem A; Middle A; HS D 2000-01 School Grade B 2001-02 School Grade B 2002-03 School Grade A 2003-04 School Grade A 2004-05 School Grade B 2005-06 School Grade A
Assistant Principal	N/A				

DRAFT

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	Linda Campbell	Elementary Education K-6 and ESOL Certifications BA, MA Degrees in Elementary Education Specialist Degree in Education	39	Title/3	2012 FCAT --Lowest quartile Reading Gains of 73% 2011 FCAT-- Lowest quartile Reading Gains of 50% 2010 FCAT—Lowest quartile Reading Gains of 59%

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. Partnering new teachers with mentors	Principal	August 2012
2. Screening applications and references	Principal	Summer 2012
3. Create professional development plans	Principal	September 2012
4. Professional development based on professional data	Faculty	October 2012
5. PLC's and book studies	Faculty	September 2012 – May 2013

DRAFT

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
0	

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
19	0	21% (4)	26% (5)	52% (10)	21% (4)	Data unavailable	26% (5)	11% (2)	42% (8)

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
B.J. Arrington	Dr. Susan Wood	Shared reading curriculum	Observations, modeling and conferencing
Janeice Smith	Jo McCall	Elementary backgrounds	Observations, modeling and conferencing
Raymond Powers	Steven ray	Cross Curriculum support	Observations, modeling and conferencing

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A - Services are provided for students requiring additional interventions through pull out and push in programs.
Title I, Part C- Migrant - Migrant Services are administered by a Migrant Aide and Migrant Tutor provided by Alachua County. Students receive services during and after school.
Title I, Part D
Title II – District funds are used to purchase technology equipment to support classroom instruction, funds are also used to support ongoing professional development for principal and teachers.
Title III – Services are provided by the district and ESOL teachers to support English Language Learners in the classroom setting.
Title X- Homeless - School Homeless Liaison reports to the District Liaison. Appropriate assistance is provided.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs – Anti-bullying and Cyber Stalking Programs are provided annually by the State Attorney’s Office and the local police department.
Nutrition Programs – Elementary students are provided nutritional instruction by the physical education and classroom teachers with the support IFAS through University of Florida. Middle School students receive instruction in nutrition in Exploratory Wheel Class.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education – Agricultural and business industry certification, including ready to work certification are offered.
Job Training - The Business Cooperative Education program allows student to earn credits while being employed at a local business.
Other – SES Tutoring is provided for students scoring level 1 or 2 on FCAT. Additional after-school tutoring is provided for at risk 2nd and 3rd Graders.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

--

DRAFT

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.
Dan Faircloth – Principal, Linda Campbell – RtI Teacher, Jennie-Lynn Hudson Lane – Guidance Counselor, and Sherry Banda – ESE Teacher and Dr. Susan Wood, Reading Interventionist
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?
The emphasis of MTSS is to closely monitor student learning and to provide support to students who do not demonstrate mastery of skills. The classroom, or subject area teachers, monitor skills through CIM checks and provide interventions for mastery before repeating the CIM check. Teachers track student mastery throughout the year. Interim exams are given three times a year. If a gap in performance is shown between student and his peers the teacher brings this to the attention of the MTSS Leadership Team. Data is reviewed and interventions are planned with scheduled progress monitoring. The team meets again after 6 weeks of interventions and interventions are changed, intensified or suspended as needed.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
The MTSS Leadership Team reviews data and helps set goals in Reading, Writing, Math and Science. The Team looks closely at data to determine why students are not meeting past goals and examines the CORE program to determine its effectiveness and if changes need to be made. The team helps design specific strategies to be included in the SIP for interventions to improve the performance of students who scored Levels 1 and 2 on FCAT, or who are not showing learning growth.
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. Classroom teachers monitor student performance in the CORE. Tier 1 data meetings are held every two weeks to discuss student learning needs. Performance Matters data are reviewed. These include CIM checks, FAIR, and Interim Assessments, Write Scores and classroom performance grades. Data summaries are sent to the principal after data meetings. Those in the RtI Tiers 1 and 2 are monitored every 10 days for Tier 2 and every 5 days for Tier 3. Progress charts, interim assessments behavior plans, and classroom performance grades are recorded and graphed. . The MTSS Leadership Team meets every other week to monitor the RtI process.
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
MTSS/RtI in-service will be provided in September to train new teachers in the RtI process and to review the process for established teachers. The RtI teacher will attend district meetings and update school faculty on RtI information throughout the year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.
The MTSS Leadership Team will continue to monitor student performance, assessing core curriculum effectiveness and providing interventions as needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Dan Fairecloth – Principal, Linda Campbell – RtI Teacher, Lauren Adams – HS English, Brad Penney – HS Social Studies/Administrative Assistant, Kim Bishop – MS Math/Civics, Cheryl Allen – 4th grade, Raymond Powers – MS/HS Sciences, and Dr. Susan Wood – MS/HS Reading Intervention.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The Team meets monthly to discuss school literacy issues. School wide data is reviewed and decisions are made concerning professional development.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
The Team's major initiative will be the implementation of Common Core Content Literacy Standards.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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

The Pre-K teacher and the Kindergarten teacher work together to prepare students for transition to kindergarten. The Pre-K curriculum provides necessary skills for success in kindergarten. Pre-K students visit the kindergarten classroom in the spring and are provided staggered entrance for effective screening.

**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?

Common Core Content Literacy Standards are beginning to be fully implemented and will include the use of informational text and text complexity across the curriculum.

**High Schools Only*

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

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

Business and agricultural courses may lead students to industry certification. Marine Biology classes are linked to local aquaculture industry.

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?

Eighth graders participate in a career planning course. High school students participate in Talent Search, sponsored by a local college. The school offers a Personal, Career, and School Development Skills course

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](#).

In 2010, Cedar Key High School increased enrollment in post secondary institutions to 58.3%. High School English classes are using the Springboard Curriculum which promotes college readiness. AP Courses, Levy Virtual and Florida Virtual School courses are available for students seeking higher level course work.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1 Students lack strategies for understanding informational text.	1A.1.a As a priority, all teachers will embed strategies for content area literacy. Specific areas addressed will include vocabulary, text complexity, close text reading, and key comprehension strategies. In addition, interventions will be provided by English language arts teachers for at-risk students.	1A.1.a All faculty involved	1A.1.a Principal walk through, lesson plans, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings. The most essential part of this process monitoring is that all classroom teachers make systematic recommendations for intensive intervention.	1A.1.a FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
Reading Goal #1A: Increase the percent of students achieving reading proficiency in reading to 70%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		1A.1.b K-5 th grade at risk students will receive intensive interventions using Fast ForWord, Frontloading, intensive phonics and phonemic awareness, as well as key comprehension strategies.	1A.1.b RtI Teacher, ESE Teacher, and Title Paraprofessional	1A.1.b Tier Two Level students will be monitored every ten days and tier three students every five days.	1A.1.b FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
	62% (79)	70% (89)		1A.1.c Sixth through 12 th grade at risk students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading Classes with specific focus on increased skill in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.	1A.1.c Intensive Reading Teacher	1A.1.c In addition to progress reports from Fast ForWord or Read 180, supplemental interventions will be assessed, i.e. daily vocabulary assessments, timed fluency tests, and Visual Thinking Strategies.	1A.1.c FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
				1A.1.d Helping our parents understand the cognitive challenges of the new Common Core standards is a primary goal for our faculty. Specifically, parents need to know about the shift in focus from literacy texts to informational. CKS will invite parents to weekly literacy nights, to open houses, to parent conferences, and to literacy workshops. In addition, newsletters, Skyward, and teacher	1A.1.d Classroom teachers; Title I, RtI, and literacy coach; principal; guidance counselor; and ESE teacher.	1A.1.d Parent surveys, conferences, and other feedback mechanisms.	1A.1.d FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores

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

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

			communications will keep parents involved in student progress.			
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.						1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1 Students lack strategies for understanding complex texts.	2A.1.a As a priority, all teachers will employ content area literacy strategies with emphasis on complex texts and how to analyze them. Specific areas addressed will include vocabulary, close text reading, and key comprehension strategies.	2A.1.a All faculty involved	2A.1.a Principal walk through, lesson plans, school wide mentoring program, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings	2A.1.a FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
Reading Goal #2A: 35% of students will score a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		2A.1.b K-5 grade students will receive differentiated instruction with the use of share inquiry and increasingly complex texts.	2A.1.b Elementary teachers	2A.1.b Principal walk through, lesson plans, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings	2A.1.b FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
	31%(39)	35% (45)		2A.1.c In addition, to the core curriculum and Springboard, enrichment activities will be provided to sixth through twelfth grade students (i.e. High Q, reading challenges, evaluation of the Sunshine State Readers, and close monitoring of personal goals).	2A.1.c English language arts teachers,	2A.1.c Principal walk through, lesson plans, school wide mentoring program, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings	2A.1.c FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
				2A.1.d Helping our parents understand the cognitive challenges of the new Common Core standards is a primary goal for our faculty. Specifically, they need to know about the shift in focus from literary texts to informational. CKS will provide parent workshops in the areas of Springboard, shared inquiry and complex texts.	2A.1.d Classroom teachers; Title I, RtI, and literacy coach; principal; guidance counselor; and ESE teacher.	2A.1.d Parent surveys, conferences, and other feedback mechanisms.	2A.1.d FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

<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>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1 Students lack access to data in order to monitor and motivate their academic growth.	3A.1.a As a priority, classroom teachers will post learning targets in student-friendly language and provide meaningful formative and summative assessment experiences. In addition to sharing learning outcomes with students, teachers will also create opportunities for meaningful self and peer evaluation.	3A.1.a All of the faculty will be involved in assisting students with systematic, personal data checks.	3A.1.a Collaboration via cluster and school meetings, continual realignment of school schedules, will ensure that faculty are using the data to adjust to student needs Through the differentiation process, teachers as well as students will evaluate the effectiveness of the data management system.	3A.1.a Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA, Classroom Management Progress Monitoring Tools
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
75% of students will show learning gains	74% (94)	75% (95)					
				3A.1.b K-5 grade at risk students who receive intensive interventions will be guided to monitor their daily progress.	3A.1.b RtI Teacher, ESE Teacher and Title Paraprofessional	3A.1.b Students in Fast ForWord will demonstrate 2-5% gains a day. Data checks will be provided weekly in all other programs (i.e. Frontloading, intensive phonics and phonemic awareness, as well as key comprehension strategies).	3A.1.b Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA and other progress monitoring tools.
				3A.1.c Sixth through 12 th grade at risk students enrolled in Intensive Reading classes will monitor their own progress daily.	3A.1.c Intensive Reading Teacher	3A.1.c Students in FastForWord will demonstrate 2-5% gains a day, and students in Read 180 will use the Read 180 Student Dashboard to track their individual gains and receive immediate feedback.	3A.1.c Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA and other progress monitoring tools.
				3A.1.d By shifting the emphasis from mere grades as an indicator of learning, conversations will occur between teachers, students and parents to articulate academic growth on specific learning targets.	3A.1.d Classroom teachers; Title I, RtI, and literacy coach; principal; guidance counselor; and ESE teacher.	3A.1.d Parent Conferences, Workshops Surveys, and Student Data Chars	3A.1.d Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA and other progress monitoring tools.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

<i>Enter 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.	

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1 Students do not have the skills to read and comprehend content-based text. Content area teachers need to be skilled in content-based strategies.	4A.1.a K-2 teachers will incorporate the teaching of comprehension skills across the curriculum. These skills will include text features, concept mapping, graphic organizers and academic vocabulary development.	4A.1.a Guidance Counselor, Reading Coach, RtI Teacher, Intensive Reading Teacher	4A.1.a Lesson plans will incorporate comprehension strategies, principal walk-through with feedback and faculty collaboration to ensure differentiation for lower quartile.	4A.1.a K-5 grade at risk students who receive intensive interventions will be guided to monitor their daily progress.
<u>Reading Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
65% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.	64% (81)	65% (82)					
				4A.1.b Students who lack phonological and word attack skills will receive intervention through small group pull-out.	4A.1.b Reading Coach, RtI Teacher, Title Paraprofessional, classroom teachers	4A.1.b Tier Two Level students are monitored every ten days and Tier 3 students every 5 days	4A.1.b CIM checks, Interim Assessment, FAIR data and FCAT scores
			4A.3.	4A.1.c Lower quartile students will be provided intensive reading classes in grades 6-12. Emphasis will be on fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in discipline specific text.	4A.1.c Intensive Reading Teacher	4A.1.c Next Generation Read 180 monitors student gains and academic literacy4	4A.1.c CIM checks, Interim Assessment, FAIR data and FCAT scores
				4A.1.d Parents will be informed of student progress and goals through scheduled conferences.	G4A.1.d Guidance Counselor, and Teachers,	4A.1.d Parent attendance at conferences, Problem Solving Team meetings, Educational Planning Meetings	4A.1.d CIM checks, Interim Assessment, FAIR data and FCAT scores
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #4B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.

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

		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2010-2011			38% (48)	31%(40)	28%(36)	24%(30)	21%(27)	19%(24)
	Reading Goal #5A: <i>Cedar Key School will reduce the achievement gap to 31%.</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	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1 White students lack strategies for understanding informational text.	5B.1.a As a priority, all teachers will embed strategies for content area literacy. Specific areas addressed vocabulary, text complexity, close text reading, and key comprehension strategies. In addition, interventions will be provided by English language arts teachers for at-risk students.	5B.1.a All faculty involved	5B.1.a Principal walk through, lesson plans, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings	5B.1.a FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores	
Reading Goal #5B: 70% of white students will achieve proficiency in Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	White:63 % (80) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: 70% (89) Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						
				5B.1.b K-5 th grade at risk students will receive intensive interventions using Fast ForWord, Frontloading, intensive phonics and phonemic awareness, as well as key comprehension strategies.	5B.1.b RtI Teacher, ESE Teacher, and Title Paraprofessional	5B.1.b Tier Two Level students will be monitored every ten days and tier three students every five days.	5B.1.b FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores	
			5B.1.c Sixth through 12 th grade at risk students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading Classes with specific focus on increased skill in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.	5B.1.c Intensive Reading Teacher	5B.1.c In addition to progress reports from Fast ForWord or Read 180, supplemental interventions will be assessed, i.e. daily vocabulary assessments, timed fluency tests, and Visual Thinking Strategies.	5B.1.c FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores		

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

			5B.1.d By shifting the emphasis from mere grades as an indicator of learning, conversations will occur between teachers, students and parents to articulate academic growth on specific learning targets.	5B.1.d Classroom teachers; Title I, Rtl, and literacy coach; principal; guidance counselor; and ESE teacher.	5B.1.d Parent Conferences, Workshops Surveys, and Student Data Chars	5B.1.d Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA and other progress monitoring tools.
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

DRAFT

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1 Economically disadvantaged students lack background knowledge and strategies for understanding informational text.	5E.1.a As a priority, all teachers will embed strategies for content area literacy, including: previewing lessons to build content area knowledge. Specific areas addressed will include: vocabulary, text complexity, close text reading, and key comprehension strategies. In addition, interventions will be provided by English language arts teachers for at-risk students.	5E.1.a All faculty involved	5E.1.a Principal walk through, lesson plans, twice-a-month data checks, cluster meetings	5E.1.a FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores	
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>						
65% of economically disadvantaged students will achieve proficiency.	57% (72)	65% (83)						
				5E.2.	5E.1.b K-5 th grade at risk students will receive intensive interventions using Fast ForWord, Frontloading, intensive phonics and phonemic awareness, as well as key comprehension strategies.	5E.1.b RtI Teacher, ESE Teacher, and Title Paraprofessional	5E.1.b Tier Two Level students will be monitored every ten days and tier three students every five days.	5E.1.b FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores
			5E.3.	5E.1.c Sixth through 12 th grade at risk students will be enrolled in Intensive Reading Classes with specific focus on increased skill in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.	5E.1.c Intensive Reading Teacher	5E.1.c In addition to progress reports from Fast ForWord or Read 180, supplemental interventions will be assessed, i.e. daily vocabulary assessments, timed fluency tests, and Visual Thinking Strategies.	5E.1.c FAIR, CIM checks, LIA, and FCAT Scores	
				5E.1.d By shifting the emphasis from mere grades as an indicator of learning, conversations will occur between teachers, students and parents to articulate academic growth on specific learning targets.	5E.1.d Classroom teachers; Title I, RtI, and literacy coach; principal; guidance counselor; and ESE teacher.	5E.1.d Parent Conferences, Workshops Surveys, and Student Data Chars	5E.1.d Progress Monitoring using: CIM checks, FAIR, LIA and other progress monitoring tools.	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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

Lesson Study	K – 12	Literacy Leadership Team	At least 25% of teachers	One lesson completed each semester	Lesson Discussions and Lesson Plans	Principal
CIM	K – 12	Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Wednesdays, twice monthly	Student academic improvement	Principal
Team Read	K – 12	Literacy Leadership Team	School-wide	Early release days	Lesson Discussions and Lesson Plans	Principal

DRAFT

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
Intensive Reading/Interventions/Differentiated Instruction	Exemplar, Complex and Informational Text (Scholastic and Benchmark Press)	Title	\$1,300.17
			Subtotal: \$1,300.17
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Differentiated Instruction	Upgrade Star Reading to Renaissance Platform	Title	\$600
Differentiated Instruction	Interactive white board technology	Title	\$3,000
			Subtotal: \$3,600
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide interventions using high impact strategies	Max Thompson Strategies In-service after school hours	Title	\$4,000.00
Differentiated instruction	Teachers observe others teachers within our school or at other schools.	Title	\$500
Provide reading interventions	RTI Workshops	Title	\$500
			Subtotal: \$ 5,000
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide interventions for Level 1 and 2 students.	Non SES after school tutoring	Title	\$10,690.64
Provide interventions for Level 1 and 2 students.	Purchase make work manipulative	Title	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$10,990.64
			Total: \$20,890.81

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: <i>Enter numerical data for current 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.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: <i>Enter numerical data for current 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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : <i>Enter numerical data for current 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.

DRAFT

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1.A.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.A.1. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.A.1. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	1.A.1. Department Meeting Minutes	1.A.1. LIAs, CIM checks, Core curriculum tests, Ten Marks, IXL Math, Timed Facts Tests
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
60 % of students will achieve a level 3 or above on FCAT 2013 in mathematics.	51 % (24)	60 % (28)					
			1.A.2 Student absences, behavioral problems, and lack of student engagement are possible barriers to achievement.	1.A.2. Increase the use of manipulatives and technology (Smart Response System, promethean board, laptops, and Ipad) to increase engagement and differentiation.	1.A.2. Math teachers, school administrators.	1.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	1.A.2. Attendance Records, Skyward Behavior Records, LIA Benchmark testing, CIM check results, FCAT results.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<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>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2.A.1 Access to additional curriculum based resources and strategies for providing differentiated instructional support and challenge to students.	2A.1. Locate and incorporate curriculum-based challenging instructional materials for high achieving students.	2A.1. Principals, Mathematics Teachers	2A.1. Monthly Cluster meetings.	2A.1. Benchmark Assessments.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
30 % of students will achieve a level 4 or above on FCAT 3013 mathematics.	15 % (7)	30 % (14)					
			2.A.2. Curriculum assumes background knowledge and problem solving skills that may not have been mastered.	2.A.2. Make lesson objectives explicit to students and ask students to communicate the problem solving process needed to do higher order math problems.	2.A.2. Math teachers and administrators.	2.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, benchmark tests results, and FCAT test.	2.A.2. Lesson plans, CWT Florida data collection tool, benchmark and FCAT test results.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</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>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	3A.1. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	3A.1. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	3A.1. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	3A.1. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
60 % of students will achieve learning gains on FCAT 2013 in mathematics.	64 % (30)	60 % (28)					
			3A.2. Timeliness of administration and analysis of assessment information to inform instructional planning	3A.2. Direct Data Chats with students to progress monitor achievement in order to inform instructional planning.	3A.2. Principals, Teachers, and Staff	3A.2. Analysis of progress monitoring quarterly.	3A.2. Data spreadsheets and Performance Matters Reports
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.A.1. Students who have not been successful in math are often not engaged in the lessons.	4.A.1. Increase the use of instructional technology and manipulatives to improve engagement. Positive reinforcement when actively participating. Communicate successes to parents.	4.A.1. Administrators, teacher.	4.A.1. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT, formal and informal teacher observation, monitor Skyward for increased performance.	4.A.1. Lesson plans including technology used, CWT, increased performance on assessments.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
60% of our lowest quartile students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	57 % (27)	60 % (7)					
			4.A.2. Students in the bottom quartile are frequently not exposed to HOT questions and activities as often as they are represented on the FCAT.	4.A.2. Increase the use of planned HOT questions and activities.	4.A.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, Math teacher.	Lesson plan monitoring, CWT, formal and informal teacher observation.	Lesson Plans, CWT, FCAT results.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>	<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>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Students performing a level I and II will be reduced by 50% over the next 6 years, using comparative testing.	Baseline data 2010-2011			49% (23)	40% (19)	35%(17)	30%(14)	25%(12)
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. <u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> 50% of our students in the white subgroup will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.			5B.1. White: Students who lack educational support from home. Black: Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	5B.1. Provide opportunities for after school tutoring through SES.	5B.1. Principal, teachers, and tutors.	Progress monitoring of SES students	SES tutoring progress reports	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 50% (23) Safe Harbor	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 60% (28)						

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

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

DRAFT

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. White: Students who lack educational support from home. Black: Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	5B.1. Provide opportunities for after school tutoring through SES.	5B.1. Principal, teachers, and tutors.	Progress monitoring of SES students	SES tutoring progress reports
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E: 65% of our economically disadvantage students will be proficient on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematic Test..	82 % (27) Safe Harbor	65% (21)					
			5.E.2. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	5.E.2. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	5.E.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	5.E.2. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	5.E.2. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
			5.E.3. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	5.E.3. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	5.E.3. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	5.E.3. Department Meeting Minutes	5.E.3. Formative Assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1.A.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.A.1. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.A.1. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	1.A.1. Department Meeting Minutes	1.A.1. Formative Assessments and Study Island
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
60 % of students will achieve a level 3 or above on FCAT 2013 in mathematics.	53% (26)	60% (30)					
			1.A.2 Student absences, behavioral problems, and lack of student engagement are possible barriers to achievement.	1.A.2. Increase the use of manipulatives and technology (Smart Response System, promethean board, laptops) to increase engagement and differentiation.	1.A.2. Math teachers, school administrators.	1.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	1.A.2. Attendance Records, Skyward Behavior Records, LIA Benchmark testing, CIM check results, FCAT results.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<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>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2.A.1 Access to additional curriculum based resources and strategies for providing differentiated instructional support and challenge to students.	2A.1. Locate and incorporate curriculum-based challenging instructional materials for high achieving students.	2A.1. Principals, Mathematics Teachers	2A.1. Monthly Cluster meetings.	2A.1. Benchmark Assessments.
Mathematics Goal #2A: 30% of students will achieve a level 4 or above on FCAT 2013 in mathematics.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 24% (11)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 30 % (15)	2.A.2. Curriculum assumes background knowledge and problem solving skills that may not have been mastered.	2.A.2. Math teachers and administrators.	2.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, benchmark tests results, and FCAT test.	2.A.2. Lesson plans, CWT Florida data collection tool, benchmark and FCAT test results.	
			2.A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	3A.1. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	3A.1. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	3A.1. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	3A.1. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
60% of students will achieve learning gains on FCAT 2013 in mathematics.	64 % (31)	60 % (30)					
			3A.2. Timeliness of administration and analysis of assessment information to inform instructional planning	3A.2. Direct Data Chats with students to progress monitor achievement in order to inform instructional planning through use of student Roadmaps to Success.	3A.2. Principals, Teachers, and Staff	3A.2. Analysis of progress monitoring quarterly.	3A.2. Data spreadsheets (Road Maps)
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.A.1. Students who have not been successful in math are often not engaged in the lessons.	4.A.1. Increase the use of instructional technology and manipulatives to improve engagement. Positive reinforcement when actively participating. Communicate success to parents.	4.A.1. Administrators, teacher.	4.A.1. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT, formal and informal teacher observation, monitor Skyward for increased performance.	4.A.1. Lesson plans including technology used, CWT, Study Island student participation Log, increased performance on assessments.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
65% of our lowest quartile students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test	73% (36)	65% (32)					
			4.A.2. Students in the bottom quartile are frequently not exposed to HOT questions and activities as often as they are represented on the FCAT.	4.A.2. Increase the use of planned HOT questions and activities.	4.A.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, Math teacher.	Lesson plan monitoring, CWT, formal and informal teacher observation.	Lesson Plans, CWT, FCAT results.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u>	<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>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: Students performing a level I and II will be reduced by 50% over the next 6 years, using comparative testing.	Baseline data 2010-2011			51% (25)	45% (22)	40% (20)	30% (15)	24% (12)
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: 50% of our students in the white subgroup will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.			5B.1. White: Students who lack educational support from home. Black: Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	5B.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	5B.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	5B.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	5B.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	50% (24) Safe Harbor	50% (24)						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	

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

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack educational support from home.	5E.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	5E.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	5E.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	5E.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E: 65% of our economically disadvantage students will be proficient on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematic Test..	82% (32) Safe Harbor	65% (26)					
			5E.2. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	5E.2. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	5E.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	5E.2. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	5E.2. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
			5.E.3. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	5.E.3. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	5.E.3. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	5.E.3. Department Meeting Minutes	5.E.3. Formative Assessments and Study Island

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.A.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.A.1. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.A.1. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	1.A.1. Department Meeting Minutes	1.A.1. Formative Assessments
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
65% of students will achieve a level 3 or above on EOC 2013 in mathematics.	64% (9)	65% (12)					
			1.A.2 Student absences and lack of student engagement are possible barriers to achievement.	1.A.2. Increase the use of technology (graphing calculators, Smartboard Interactive System, and laptops) to increase engagement and differentiation.	1.A.2. Math teachers, school administrators.	1.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	1.A.2. Attendance Records, Skyward Behavior Records, LIA Benchmark testing, CIM check results, FCAT results.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.A.1 Access to additional curriculum based resources and strategies for providing differentiated instructional support and challenge to students.	2.A.1. Locate and incorporate curriculum-based challenging instructional materials for high achieving students.	2.A.1. Principals, Mathematics Teachers	2.A.1. Monthly Cluster meetings.	2.A.1. Benchmark Assessments.
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
25% of students will achieve a level 4 or above on EOC 2013 in mathematics.	21% (3)	25% (5)					
			2.A.2. Curriculum assumes background knowledge and problem solving skills that	2.A.2. Make lesson objectives explicit to students and ask students to	2.A.2. Math teachers and administrators.	2.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, benchmark tests results,	2.A.2. Lesson plans, CWT Florida data collection tool,

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

		may not have been mastered.	communicate the problem solving process needed to do higher order math problems.		and FCAT test.	benchmark and FCAT test results.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017				
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011		36% (5)	30% (4)	25% (3.5)	20% (3)	15% (2)				
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> Students achieving level I and II on Algebra I EOC will be reduced by 50% within 6 years.											
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.		3B.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack educational support from home.	3B.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	3B.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	3B.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	3B.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.					
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</u> 50% of our students in the white subgroup will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>64% (9) Safe Harbor</td> <td>65% (12)</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	64% (9) Safe Harbor	65% (12)						
	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>									
64% (9) Safe Harbor	65% (12)										
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.					
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.					

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack educational support from home.	3E.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	3E.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	3E.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	3E.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
65% of our economically disadvantaged students will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test	82% (9)	65% (10).					
			3E.2. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	3E.2. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	3E.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	3E.2. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	3E.2. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
			3E.3. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	3E.3. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	3E.3. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	3E.3. Department Meeting Minutes	3E.3. Formative Assessments

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.A.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.A.1. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.A.1. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	1.A.1. Department Meeting Minutes	1.A.1. Formative Assessments and Study Island
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
60% of students will achieve a level 3 or above on EOC 2013 in mathematics.	No Data Available	60% (12)					
			1.A.2 Student absences and lack of student engagement are possible barriers to achievement.	1.A.2. Increase the use of technology (graphing calculators, Smartboard Interactive System, and laptops) to increase engagement and differentiation.	1.A.2. Math teachers, school administrators.	1.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	1.A.2. Attendance Records, Skyward Behavior Records, LIA Benchmark testing, CIM check results, FCAT results.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.A.1 Access to additional curriculum based resources and strategies for providing differentiated instructional support and challenge to students.	2.A.1. Locate and incorporate curriculum-based challenging instructional materials for high achieving students.	2.A.1. Principals, Mathematics Teachers	2.A.1. Monthly Cluster meetings.	2.A.1. Benchmark Assessments.
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
30% of students will achieve a level 4 or above on EOC 2013 in mathematics.	No Data Available	30% (6)					
			2.A.2. Curriculum assumes background knowledge and problem solving skills that	2.A.2. Make lesson objectives explicit to students and ask students to	2.A.2. Math teachers and administrators.	2.A.2. Monitor lesson plans, CWT data, benchmark tests results,	2.A.2. Lesson plans, CWT Florida data collection tool,

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

		may not have been mastered.	communicate the problem solving process needed to do higher order math problems.		and FCAT test.	benchmark and FCAT test results.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: Students achieving level I and II on Geometry EOC will be reduced by 50% within 6 years.	Baseline data 2011-2012		No Data Available				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: 50% of our students in the white subgroup will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* No Data Available	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 50% (9)	3B.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack educational support from home.	3B.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	3B.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	3B.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	3B.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack educational support from home.	3E.1. Increased utilization of CKS mentoring program for MS students and STEM tutoring.	3E.1. Principal, teachers, and staff	3E.1. Student participation in mentoring program and student log in for STEM tutoring (determined by Assessments and teacher evaluations).	3E.1. Increased performance in student data reflected on the Benchmark assessments and FCAT.
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
65% of our economically disadvantaged students will be proficient on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test	No Data Available	65% (11)					
			3E.2. Students are not exposed to enough higher order questions and activities in class necessary to achieve the depth of knowledge required for mastery.	3E.2. Increase the use of planned HOT Questions and interactive use of Essential Question in daily lessons.	3E.2. Administrators, Literacy Coach, and Math teacher.	3E.2. Lesson plan monitoring, LIA and FCAT testing results, and CWT.	3E.2. Lesson plans including HOT Qs, increased performance on Benchmark and FCAT.
			3E.3. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	3E.3. Math teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	3E.3. Math Teachers and Cluster meetings	3E.3. Department Meeting Minutes	3E.3. Formative Assessments

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

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

DRAFT

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
Differentiated instruction using technology	Study-Island Program Grades 2-8	Title	\$3759
			Subtotal: \$3759
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Differentiated instruction using technology	Upgrade Star Math, Accelerated Math and Math Facts to Renaissance Platform and renew V math license and IXL Math.	Title	\$1650
			Subtotal: \$1650
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$5409

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Economically disadvantaged students who lack adequate educational support and resources at home.	1A.1. Support students at school through STEM classroom activities, STEM tutoring sessions, and organizational skills. Use of interactive notebooks to assist in organizational skills and information management.	1A.1. All Faculty. STEM tutors: Raymond Powers and Kim Bishop	1A.1. Use tutoring sign-in logs to track the success level of students who receive STEM tutoring resources.	1A.1. Assessment scores from FCAT, LIA's, and CIM's.
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
50% of student will achieve level 3 on science FCAT	31% (11)	50% (16)					
			1A.2. Lack of student motivation and engagement in learning.	1A.2. Increase mentoring meetings to include more frequent systematic data chats so students receive mentoring advice as well as an update on their progress.	1A.2. All faculty.	1A.2. Assessment results: Increase in FCAT, LIA, and CIM scores.	1A.2. FCAT, LIA, CIM, and Student Honor increase.
			1A.3. Lack of technology resources available to the students	1A.3. Make more efficient use of school technology resources by teachers networking to share resources when possible. Seek out funding to update and increase computer technology at CKS.	1A.3. All faculty	1A.3. Principal classroom observational evidence and lesson plans. Technology inventory changes. Lesson plans include use of technology by both teacher and students.	1A.3. Grants received for technology purchases. Scores from FCAT, LIA, CIM, Teacher tests, and teacher observational evidence.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. Students are not in the habit of using higher order thinking skills.	1B.1. Utilize Problem Based Learning (PBL), an inquiry-based approach to instruction. In this method, students learn science through solving real world problems and they have to utilize higher order thinking. The role of the teacher is to coach the student into making the discoveries	1B.1. Science teacher and school administrators.	1B.1. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT, formal and informal classroom assessment, Benchmark and FCAT test results.	1B.1. On-Course Lesson planner, CWT data collection tool, District appraisal instruments, Benchmark and FCAT tests.
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
10% of students will achieve level 4, 5 or 6 on Science FCAT.	9% ()	10% ()					

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

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1 Technical reading and writing is an area that students struggle with. Students are unfamiliar with science content vocabulary.	2A.1. Increase the use of literacy strategies with the science textbook and ancillary materials	2A.1. Principal and faculty.	2A.1. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT. formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	2A.1. Lesson Plans, CWT data collection tool, District Appraisal instruments, Benchmark and FCAT test results.
Science Goal #2A: 10% of students will achieve proficiency in Science	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9% (3)	10% (3)					
			2A.2. Students are not skilled in note taking and study skills.	2A.2. Use of interactive notebooks, graphic organizers and cloze notes to increase lesson acquisition and mastery	2A.2. Science teachers and school administrators.	2A.2. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT. formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	2A.2. Lesson Plans, CWT data collection tool, District Appraisal instruments, Benchmark and FCAT test results.
		2A.3. Student engagement in science can be low	2A.3. Increase the use of hands-on activities with web-quests and other instructional technology. This will help visual learners and make lessons more interactive.	2A.3. Science teachers, school administrators	2A.3. Lesson plan monitoring, CWT. formal and informal classroom observations, assessment results.	2A.3. Lesson Plans, CWT data collection tool, District Appraisal instruments, Benchmark and FCAT test results.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. 1.1. Gaps in knowledge due to NGSSS and Common Core Standards. Reading skills and a testing schedule that tests the students one month BEFORE the end of the course.	1.1. Curriculum aligned to Common Core Standards. Teachers upack and use the Biology EOC Item Specs for specific SSS instruction.	1.1. Principals, Science Teachers	1.1. Focused walkthroughs by Principal and District personnel will be used to ensure our science teachers are using curriculum maps and item specs.	1.1. Analysis of student data, EOC.
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
80% of students in Biology I will achieve Level 3 on EOC exam.	100% (27)	80% (5)					
	1.2. Limited technology available in classroom may affect student performance on the EOC since it is a computer based testing platform. 1.3. Students need help in information organization skills to maintain EOC related information throughout the year.						
		1.2. Increased technology use in the classrooms in conjunction with curriculum. Participate in online student science webinars when possible.	1.2. Principals, Science Teachers, RTI Teacher	1.2. Classroom observations and lesson plans show students using technology for both research and products.	1.2. EOC data analysis / lesson plans/ CWT data.		
		1.3. Students need help in informational or organization skills to maintain EOC related information throughout the year.	1.3. Biology students will use INTERACTIVE NOTEBOOKS to formally organize classroom information.	1.3. Principals and Science Teachers	1.3. CWT's and lesson plans will show evidence of the Interactive Notebook requirement.	1.3. Teacher evaluation of student notebook use. Also, analysis of EOC success.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. Reading skills required for EOC test questions. Test dates falling a month before the end of the course.	2.1. Schedule Environmental Science as a Pre-biology offering for all freshmen. Use FRI and Common Core Strategies such as "Close Reading" to build test reading endurance.	2.1. Principals, Science Teachers	2.1. Principal and District personnel will ensure scheduling our courses and implementation.	2.1. Lesson plans and CWT's will document use of Common Core strategies.
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
20% of students in Biology I will achieve level 4 04 % on EOC exam.	77% (21)	20% (5)					
	2.2. Limited technology available in classroom						
		2.2. Increased technology use in the classrooms in conjunction with new curriculum.	2.2. Principals, Science Teachers, RTI Teacher	2.2. Review student data frequently and ensure students are grouped to achieve success based on	2.2. EOC data analysis / lesson plans/ CWT data.		

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

					need.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

DRAFT

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

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

DRAFT

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. An anticipated barrier is student understanding of the state scoring rubric that includes expectations for greater detail to the basic conventions of standard English, which was previously applied with leniency.	1A.1. Explicit scaffolded instruction targeting the application and scoring of basic conventions including marks for editing will be provided in mini-lessons within the instructional components of writing aloud, shared writing, guided writing, and independent writing. Student use of a rubric written in student-friendly language that clearly identifies writing expectations	1A.1. ESE teacher, Title I teacher, RtI teacher, classroom teacher	1A.1. Progress monitoring of student products with specific focus on conventions, teacher and student review of Write Score essay scoring, use of WriteScore lesson recommendations based on scores, students will use the rubric to self-assess	1A.1. Periodic writing assessments, WriteScore, student self-assessment results
Writing Goal #1A: <i>86% of students in grades 4, 8 and 10 will score a level 4 or above.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 70% (40).	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 86% (36)					
<p>1A.2. Student stamina in writing through the allotted time and persevering in the technique of editing and revision is an anticipated barrier.</p> <p>1A.3. In-depth individual writing analysis is an anticipated barrier.</p>							
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.

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

Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<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>					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

DRAFT

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Aligning writing curriculum	K-5	Instructional Coach	K-5, ESE and RtI teachers	October Early Release	Writing Samples	Principal

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.1. Teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs. Utilize Test Item Specs and Miami-Dade Question bank.	1.1. Civics Teacher and Principal	1.1. Practice Tests and EOC results.	1.1. 2013 EOC Results
Civics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
30% of students will achieve a level 3 on the Civics EOC	No Data First EOC 2013	30% (5)					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			1.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students.	1.1. Teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs. Utilize Test Item Specs and Miami-Dade Question bank.	1.1. Civics Teacher and Principal	1.1. Practice Tests and EOC results.	1.1. 2013 EOC Results.
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
30% of students will achieve a level 4 and 5 on the Civics EOC	No Data First EOC 2013	30% (5) <i>this box.</i>					

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

DRAFT

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students..	1.1. Teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.1. US History Teacher and Principal	1.1. Practice Tests, LIAs 1-3, and EOC results.	1.1. 2013 EOC Results
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
30% of students will achieve a level 3 on the US History EOC	No Data First EOC 2013	30% (4)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			1.1. Determining the specific needs of individual students..	1.1. Teacher will utilize Florida NGSSS and Common Core to formatively assess the students and to determine curriculum needs, track growth, and direct instruction to meet student needs.	1.1. US History Teacher and Principal	1.1. Practice Tests, LIAs 1-3, and EOC results.	1.1. 2013 EOC Results
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
30% of students will achieve a level 4 and 5 on the US History EOC	No Data First EOC 2013	30% (4)					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

DRAFT

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

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Learning Maps and Focus Calendars	9 – 12	Carol Jones	Levy County US History Teachers	June 2012	Create LIA's	Carol Jones
LIA Creations	9 - 12	Gina Tovine	Levy County US History Teachers	July 2012	LIA's Testing 2012 – 2013	Brad Penney

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

DRAFT

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1 Parental attitudes toward school attendance does not support school policy	1.1. Parents will be informed of policy at Open House and parents will receive letter when student has 5 absences. Tardy Consequences 9 per 9 weeks) will include: 3rd tardy-warning 4th Tardy-2 Detentions 5th tardy-3 Detentions 6th Tardy ISS	1.1. Guidance Counselor/Administrative Assistant	1.1. Monitor for decrease in absences and tardies.	1.1. Skyward
<u>Attendance Goal #1</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
18% decrease in students with excessive absences and a 2% decrease in number of students with excessive tardies.	94% (237)	95% (231)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	114(61%)	99(43%)					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	11 (5%)	7 (3%)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Students lack of “buy in” to code of conduct.	1.1. Explanation of Code of Conduct during opening day assembly and each nine weeks; classroom management plans established in line with code	1.1.Principal, Classroom teachers and Guidance Counselor	1.1.Comparison of data	1.1.Skyward
Suspension Goal #1: Reduce the number of school suspensions by 25%.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	145 total suspensions In-school	109					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	69 students suspended In-school						
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	57 total suspensions Out-of-school	43					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	34 students suspended Out-of-school						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

DRAFT

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Parents inability to attend school activities because of conflicts of scheduling and need for child care.	1.1 Workshops will be scheduled with flexible times and child care will be offered. Literacy newsletters and summaries of workshops will be back-packed to parents not in attendance.	1.1 Principal and Title Teacher.	1.1 Parent Survey	1.1. Workshop attendance sheets
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Increase percent of parents being offered assistance with home literacy to 75%	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 43% (95)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 75% (170)					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parental Involvement	K-12	Title Teacher	K-12 Teachers	November 8 3:30 – 4:30	Take home activities	Principal/Title Teacher

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
Provide Literacy Newsletter monthly.	Resources for Educators Parental Involvement Newsletter	Title	\$1,000
Workshop for Parents “Helping Your Child Be a Better Reader”.	Workshop for K- 5 teachers provided by Title Teacher	Title	\$500
			Subtotal: \$1500
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Involving Parents with Literacy	Workshop for K- 12 teachers provided by Title Teacher	Title	\$800 for additional hours
			Subtotal: \$800
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide workshop to involve parents with Literacy	Title and classroom teachers	Title	\$500
			Subtotal: \$500
			Total: \$2800

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: Students showing proficiency in both Math and Science in grades 5 and 8 will increase by 10%. High school students showing proficiency in both Math and Science will increase by 10%. 2012 28% (11) 2013 38% (15)	1.1. Higher level course expectations	1.1. Provide STEM tutoring	1.1. Guidance, Math and Science teachers	1.1. LIAs Math and Science teachers	1.1. FCAT Math and Science, EOC Exams
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: 5% (2) of the eligible agricultural and business students will earn Industry Certification in Agriculture or Business management.	1.1. Academic ability of level 1 and 2 students enrolled in the classes	1.1. Increase the amount of practice test items and time spent practicing.	1.1. Ag Teacher Business Teacher	1.1 Review scores on Practice Tests.1	1.1 Industry Certification Exam.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Microsoft Office Certification	HS Business	CTE Coordinator	Business Teacher	December 2012	Coordinator will progress monitor	CTE Coordinator

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:

Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<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.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: 20890.81
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total: 5409.00
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: 2800.00
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Grand Total: 29099.81

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" 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.
The School Advisory Council has scheduled five meetings for the 2012-13 school year. The council will review the School Improvement Plan and participate in workshops on the budget and promote opportunities for parental involvement.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

DRAFT