

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: Bowling Green Elementary	District Name: Hardee
Principal: Kathy Clark	Superintendent: David Durastanti
SAC Chair: Linda Valdez	Date of School Board Approval: 11/9/12

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
----------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

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

Principal	Kathy Clark	B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Early Childhood Education School Principal ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsement	8	8	<p>2012 School Grade B, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 56%, Science Mastery 41%. Reading Gains for Lowest 25%- 74%, Math Gains for Lowest 25%- 78%.</p> <p>2011 School Grade A AYP/No Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 73%, Science 39%. ED, White and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading.</p> <p>2010 School Grade C AYP/No Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 70%, Science 32%. ED and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading.</p> <p>2009 School Grade A AYP/Yes Reading Mastery 60%/Growth Model 68%, Math Mastery 64%/Growth Model 72%, Science Mastery 42%, AYP achieved through the Growth Model.</p>
Assistant Principal	Stuart Durastanti	B.S. History M.S. Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsement	4	4	<p>2012 School Grade B, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 56%, Science Mastery 41%. Reading Gains for Lowest 25%- 74%, Math Gains for Lowest 25%- 78%.</p> <p>2011 School Grade A AYP/No Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 73%, Science 39%. ED, White and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading.</p> <p>2010 School Grade C AYP/No Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 70%, Science 32%. SWD and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading.</p> <p>2009-Developmental Scale Score math averages were 78% for all levels.</p>

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

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading, Math, Science, Writing	Amy Woods	B.S. Elementary Education Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	21	5	2012 School Grade B, Reading Mastery 47%, Math Mastery 56%, Science Mastery 41%. Reading Gains for Lowest 25%- 74%, Math Gains for Lowest 25%- 78%. 2011 School Grade A AYP/No Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 73%, Science 39%. ED, White and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading. 2010 School Grade C AYP/No Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 70%, Science 32%. SWD and Hispanic did not make AYP in math or reading. 2009 School Grade A AYP/Yes Reading Mastery 60%/Growth Model 68%, Math Mastery 64%/Growth Model 72%, Science Mastery 42%, AYP achieved through the Growth Model.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Principal and Assistant Principal will screen potential applicants through the District Office application file and follow district procedures.	Principal Assistant Principal	June 2012
2. Attending or utilizing the online services of Teach in Florida.	Principal Assistant Principal	June 2012

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

3. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and the Literacy Coach will facilitate monthly, after school meeting for new teachers to discuss challenges and concerns.	Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	Ongoing
4. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and the Literacy Coach will provide Relevant Staff Development to retain high quality, highly qualified teachers	Principal Assistant Principal Literacy Coach	June 2013

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
100% (37)	5% (2)	22% (8)	22% (8)	51% (19)	16% (6)	100% (37)	11% (4)	0% (0)	92% (34)

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
Amy Woods	Brandy DeBoom Courtney Durham	Since Mrs. Woods has been Literacy Coach, Bowling Green Elementary has achieved a grade A for three of the past five years and achieved AYP in 2009.	ACT/Great Beginnings Program, School based mentoring. Mentor-Mentee pairs will meet once a week during planning time to plan lessons incorporating evidence-based Reading strategies.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

--	--	--	--

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

<p>Title I, Part A Supplementary academic services are provided through after-school or summer school programs, a Literacy Coach, reading resource teacher and technology resources. Title I Part A, Title II, and the district collaborate in providing staff development and in funding Literacy Coaches. The district data coach and the Director of Student Services and Assessment will also assist the school in coordinating efforts to best serve the students of Bowling Green Elementary.</p>
<p>Title I, Part C- Migrant The migrant coordinator and the migrant advocates collaborate with school staff to ensure that the needs of migrant students are met. Academic and support services enable migrant students to participate fully in the educational experience.</p>
<p>Title I, Part D</p>
<p>Title II These funds provide professional development for teachers, substitutes for release time for teachers, consultant travel, professional development stipends, extra duty for the literacy coach, supplies and professional development for the literacy coach, and mentoring bonuses. Additionally, incentive bonuses for high performing administrators are funded by Title II. The District Director of Curriculum will also assist in providing guidance and support with the staff development process.</p>
<p>Title III The District Data Coach and school site Literacy Coaches will present professional development that addresses the unique needs of ELL/immigrant students.</p>
<p>Title X- Homeless</p>
<p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI (Supplemental Academic Instruction) pays for at least one teacher at each school to teach a remedial course (could be a pull out situation) and also provides extra duty for teachers to teach summer school.</p>
<p>Violence Prevention Programs The district provides funds for programs that support prevention of violence in and around the school. The guidance department presents character and anti-bullying lessons. Red Ribbon Week is done school wide in October to promote safe and healthy habits.</p>
<p>Nutrition Programs The School Breakfast Program provides nutritious breakfasts for paying students as well as students on the free or reduced meal program. Such meals play an important part in supporting student achievement and teaching students the elements of good nutrition.</p> <p>National School Lunch Program funds nutritious lunches for paying students as well as students on the free or reduced meal program. Healthy food supports achievement by providing nutrition to help students learn.</p> <p>Summer Food Service Program provides no-cost nutritious breakfast and lunch to community children age 18 and younger in the school cafeteria including students attending summer school.</p> <p>The school nurses present a variety of nutrition, health, and well being classes to students. Other nutritional or health related programs may be arranged by the teacher and the nurses.</p>

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Housing Programs N/A
Head Start Bowling Green Elementary provides assistance to the local federally funded daycares by providing transition days. Kindergarten Round Up is done in the spring to provide information to parents of new students that will begin school the upcoming school year. Kindergarten teachers visit daycares to inform parents of the expectations of Bowling Green Elementary. These activities are done to ease the transition to school.
Adult Education The Hardee district's Adult and Community Education Program provides instruction not only to those adults seeking a GED but for those wanting to learn English as well. This is a vital service for our rural district and community which has a high migrant population. Some parents of students attending Bowling Green Elementary attend the ELL classes in an effort to learn English so that they can help their children with homework and improve communication with teachers.
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other Title IV- Safe and Drug Free Schools pays for two prevention programs in the district: elementary schools use the violence prevention curriculum "Get Real About Violence" and secondary uses "Keeping it Real", a web based ATOD (Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drugs program).

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal/Assistant Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate):

Provides information about core instruction, state standards, assists with student data collection, delivers Tier II instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 and 3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers:

Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Literacy Coach Reading/Math/Science:

Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence based intervention strategies; assists with school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk", assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring, provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan, supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Counselor:

Gathers data from teachers, schedules the RtI meetings, guides and monitors the RtI process, supports data collection, investigates other factors such as behavior and attendance, assists with staff development, assists with data interpretation, provides additional testing information, suggests strategies and modifications in present instruction delivery.

School Psychologist:

Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist:

Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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 RtI Leadership Team will have one basic function: the improvement of student achievement by differentiating instruction, using research based materials and strategies, and bringing out the maximum potential of each student.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The RtI Literacy Leadership Team, the School Advisory Council (SAC), and the School Leadership Team are all vital contributors to the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). These teams and councils met with the principal to develop the school improvement plan. The RtI team provided data on Tier 1, 2, 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectation for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Benchmark Assessments, mini assessments</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Benchmark Assessments, mini assessments</p> <p>Midyear: FAIR, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), PMRN, Benchmark Assessments, mini assessments, FCAT simulation</p> <p>End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, PMRN</p> <p>Frequency of data days: twice a month for data analysis</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>Professional Development training began during the 2008-2009 school year conducted in part by the Literacy Coach and the school counselor. Professional development will be continued throughout the school year during the teacher's common planning time and after school in small best practice sessions.</p> <p>The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.</p>
<p>Describe plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>Scheduled monthly meetings to discuss and analyze grade level specific MTSS issues/plans.</p>

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</p> <p>The school based Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of the school based administrators, the Literacy Coach, the guidance counselor, and the grade group chairperson of each grade level.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).</p> <p>The school based LLT meets monthly to discuss issues such as curriculum, policies, procedures, data, and other related topics for school based school improvement. This team makes decisions to review and revise policies and procedures, plan staff development according to data, review teaching materials, review and give input on the SIP.</p>
<p>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?</p> <p>The major initiatives of the LLT are: to constantly monitor the lower 25% of each grade level, to oversee and monitor the literacy block to assure that differentiated instruction is implemented.</p>

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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.

Students from the Bowling Green Elementary service area that participate in pre-k programs are provided opportunities to participate in and attend school-wide orientation. Pre-k students are also invited to Bowling Green Elementary to tour the facility, participate in an actual kindergarten class and eat in the school cafeteria to orient those children to the lunch procedures of our k-5 school. Kindergarten teachers make visits to area pre-k programs to in-service parents and students on transition to regular kindergarten classes. The principal and the early childhood directors meet at least twice per school year to discuss transition. The principal also makes scheduled visits to the early childhood program to give feedback to the directors. The school sends letters home to parents about the VPK (Voluntary Pre-K) that is offered in the summer. The FLRKS test is administered to entering kindergarten students to assess readiness to begin school.

Kindergarten Round-Up is traditionally scheduled in the spring of each school year. Kindergarten teachers are in attendance for the purpose of meeting students and conducting activities with the incoming students. Kindergarten Parent Orientation is also held early in the school year to assist parents with questions and answers about the school day, policies and procedures, and to set conferences with teachers.

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

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

****High Schools Only***

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

--

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1a.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies.	1a.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies. Teachers will analyze migrant student data at Data Chats.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	1a.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.	1a.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.		

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

Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>The percentage of students scoring Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 30% to 37%.</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p>							
	30% (69)	37% (86)					
		1a.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	1a.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1a.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding.	1a.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	
		1a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	1a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	1a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	1a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	1a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>	1B.1. Students do not possess the necessary comprehension skills.	1B.1. Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build comprehension skills.	1B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	1B.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of comprehension skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	1B.1. Mini-Assessments, Checklists		

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

Reading Goal #1B: The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading will increase from 50% to 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (2)	55% (2)					
		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 in reading.	2a.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading.	2a.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies. Teachers will analyze migrant student data at Data Chats.	2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	2a.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.	2a.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.		
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 20% to 28%. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	20% (47)	28% (65)					

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

		2a.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	2a.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	2a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	2a.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding.	2a.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	
		2a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	2a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	2a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	2a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	2a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1. Students do not possess the necessary comprehension skills.	2B.1. Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build comprehension skills.	2B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	2B.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of comprehension skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	2B.1. Mini-Assessments, Checklists		
Reading Goal #2B: The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading will increase from 50% to 55%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	50% (2)	55% (2)					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3a.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading.	3a.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies.	3a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	3a.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.	3a.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.		
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> Sixty seven percent of students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	63%(142)	67% (151)					
		3a.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	3a.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	3a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	3a.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding	3a.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	

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

		3a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	3a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	3a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	3a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	3a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1. Students do not possess the necessary comprehension skills.	3B.1. Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build comprehension skills.	3B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	3B.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of comprehension skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	3B.1. Mini-Assessments, Checklists		
Reading Goal #3B: One hundred percent of students will make learning gains in Reading on FAA.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	100% (4)	100% (4)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4a.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading.	4a.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies.	4a.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	4a.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.	4a.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.		
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> Seventy seven percent of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	74% (30)	77% (31)					
		4a.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	4a.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	4a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	4a.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding.	4a.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	

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

		4a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	4a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	4a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	4a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy coach.	4a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
--	--	--	---	---	--	---	--

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 42 percent Reading Satisfactory	47 percent Reading Satisfactory	Target AMO Reading: 52 percent Reading Satisfactory	Target AMO Reading: 57 percent Reading Satisfactory	Target AMO Reading: 61 percent Reading Satisfactory	Target AMO Reading: 66 percent Reading Satisfactory	Target AMO Reading: 71 percent Reading Satisfactory
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> In order to reduce the achievement gap by 50%, Bowling Green Elementary has extended the 90 minute uninterrupted Reading block to 105 minutes. The bottom 25% in Reading receives 30 minutes of Reading Resource a day. Bowling Green Elementary conducts ongoing Data Chats to monitor the interventions being provided to RtI students through “Remediation Roundup”. Teachers use research-based interventions. After school is provided to targeted students.							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. White/Hispanic: Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading.</p>	<p>5B.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies.</p>	<p>5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.</p>	<p>5B.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.</p>		

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

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<p>The percentage of White students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55% to 60%</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 45% to 51%</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p>							
	White: 55% (23) Hispanic: 45% (79)	White: 60% (25) Hispanic: 51% (90)					
		5B.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	5B.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	5B.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	5B.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding.	5B.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	

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

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

		5B.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	5B.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	5B.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	5B.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy coach.	5B.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.
--	--	--	---	---	--	---

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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.		

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

Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested	5E.1. Tier 1: Teachers implement strategies. Provide explicit instruction on identified, evidence-based reading strategies.	5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	5E.1. Teachers assess students on the use of specific reading strategies weekly to determine if students know when and how to apply the strategies.	5E.1. FAIR in comprehension focusing on specific cluster areas.		
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u> The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring a Level 3 or higher will increase from 48% to 53%. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	48% (104)	53% (115)					
		5E.2. Reading in the content area rarely includes explicit instruction in word decoding.	5E.2. Teachers will provide direct, explicit instruction in word decoding.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	5E.2. Reading Leadership Team will review FAIR diagnostic data after each assessment period to determine students' progress in word decoding.	5E.2. FAIR Ongoing Monitoring	

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

		5E.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	5E3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	5E.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	5E.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	5E.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities <small>Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
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
Instructional Strategies	K-5 Reading	Woods	School Wide	During planning and after school. Quarterly meetings.	Sign In Sheet. Lesson implementation documented in plans.	Principal
Common Core State Standards/Text Complexity	K-5	Woods	School Wide	During planning and after school, scheduled in-service days	Sign In Sheet	A. Woods
Reading Leadership Community	K-5	Principal	School Wide	During planning and after school	Sign In Sheet	Principal
Book Study	K-5	Principal	School Wide	After school	Sign In Sheet	Administration

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

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

Gradual Release Model	K-5	Woods	School Wide	During planning and after school.	Sign In Sheet	A. Woods
-----------------------	-----	-------	-------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	----------

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
McRel	Vocabulary	Text-book related	\$1,250.00
Saxon	Phonics/Vocabulary	Title I	\$6,758.90
Coach	Comprehension	Title I	\$1438.40
McMillan	Reading Series	Text book related	\$1,700.00
Subtotal:\$11,147.30			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Study Island	Software application	Title I	\$1,000.00
Renaissance Reading	Accelerated Reader	Title I	\$2,000.00
Discovery	Online Resources	Title I	\$800.00
Subtotal:\$3,800			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Development of Instructional Focus Calendar-Stipends for Summer Development-Reading	Committee/PLC-Reading Leadership Team	Title I	\$2,500.00
Subtotal:\$2,500			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$17,447.30			

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

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

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Students do not possess necessary vocabulary skills.	1.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build vocabulary skills.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	1.1. Teachers assess students on the use of vocabulary skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	1.1. FAIR, Mini-Assessments, English in a Flash.	
CELLA Goal #1: Forty eight percent of students will score proficient in Listening/Speaking.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	42% (15)					
		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. Students do not possess necessary word decoding skills.	2.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build word decoding skills.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	2.1. Teachers assess students on the use of word decoding skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	2.1. FAIR, Mini-Assessments, English in a Flash.	

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

<p><u>CELLA Goal #2:</u> Thirty three percent of students will score proficient in Reading.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<p>25% (9)</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>	<p>2.3.</p>

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. Students do not possess necessary grammar skills.	2.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build grammar skills.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach.	2.1. Teachers assess students on the use of word grammar to determine if students are making adequate progress.	2.1. Writing Assessments	
CELLA Goal #3: Thirty three percent of students will score proficient in Writing.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	25% (9)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Manipulatives	Wording Building Skills	Text-book related	\$250
Subtotal:\$250			
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:\$250			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1a.1. Core instruction rarely included the use of manipulatives.	1a.1. Tier 1: Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students whom achieved proficiency. Teachers incorporate the use of manipulatives for each unit of study.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1a.1. Grade-level teams review results of common assessment data to determine academic progress.	1a.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
Thirty one percent of students will achieve a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. Data from School Grade Report.							
	31% (72)	38% (88)					
		Ia.2. Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions is not matched to individual student needs.	Ia.2. Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.	Ia.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	Ia.2. Grade-level teams review results of common assessment data to determine academic progress.	Ia.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS	
		Ia.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	Ia.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	Ia.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	Ia.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	Ia.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	IB.1. Students do not possess the necessary number sense skills.	IB.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build number sense skills.	IB.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	IB.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of number sense to determine if students are making adequate progress.	IB.1. Mini-Assessments, Chapter test, Checklist.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
Thirty three percent of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Math.							
	25% (1)	33% (1)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2a.1. Core instruction rarely includes the use of hands-on activities.	2a.1. Tier 1-Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark data for all students whom achieved a Level 4 or 5. Teachers incorporate the use of hands-on activities for each unit of study.	2a.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	2a.1. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	2a.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u> Twenty two percent of students will achieve a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	22% (51)	30% (70)					

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

		2a.2. Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions is not matched to individual student needs.	2a.2. Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.	2a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	2a.2. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	2a.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS	
		2a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	2a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	2a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	1a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	1a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1. Students do not possess the necessary number sense skills.	2B.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build number sense skills.	2B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	2B.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of number sense to determine if students are making adequate progress.	2B.1. Mini-Assessments, Chapter test, Checklist.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u> Fifty five percent of students will score at or above Level 7 in Math.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	50% (2)	55% (2)					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3a.1. Core instruction rarely included the use of manipulatives.	3a.1. Tier 1: Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark data for all students whom made Learning Gains in Mathematics. Teachers incorporate the use of manipulatives for each unit of study.	3a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	3a.1. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	3a.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> Eighty percent of students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	77% (174)	80% (181)					

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

		3a.2.: Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions is not matched to individual student needs.	3a.2.: Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.	3a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	3a.2. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	3a.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS	
		3a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	3a3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	3a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	3a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	3a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1. Students do not possess the necessary number sense skills.	3B.1. Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build number sense skills.	3B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	3B.1. Teacher assesses students on the use of number sense to determine if students are making adequate progress.	3B.1. Mini-Assessments, Chapter test, Checklist.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u> Seventy Eight percent of students will make learning gains on FAA in Math.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	75% (3)	78% (3)					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4a.1. Core instruction rarely included the use of manipulatives.</p>	<p>4a.1. Tier 1: Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark data for all students whom made Learning Gains in Mathematics. Teachers incorporate the use of manipulatives for each unit of study.</p>	<p>4a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>4a.1. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress</p>	<p>4a.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.</p>		
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u> Eighty percent of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. Data from School Grade Report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>78% (30)</p>	<p>80% (31)</p>					

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

		4a.2 Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions is not matched to individual student needs.	4a.2. Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.	4a.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	4a.2. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress	4a.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS	
		4a.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	4a.3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	4a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	4a.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	4a.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 46 percent Math Satisfactory	56 percent Math Satisfactory	Target AMO Math: 55 percent Math Satisfactory	Target AMO Math: 60 percent Math Satisfactory	Target AMO Math: 64 percent Math Satisfactory	Target AMO Math: 69 percent Math Satisfactory	Target AMO Math: 73 percent Math Satisfactory
<p><u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5A: In order to reduce the achievement gap by 50%, Bowling Green Elementary has implemented a 60 minute Math block. The bottom 25% in Math receives extra interventions. Bowling Green Elementary conducts ongoing Data Chats to monitor the interventions being provided to RtI students through “Remediation Roundup”. Teachers use research-based interventions. After school is provided to targeted students.</p>							

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p>	<p>5B.1. White/Hispanic: Core instruction rarely included the use of manipulatives.</p>	<p>5B.1. Tier 1: Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark data for all students whom made Learning Gains in Mathematics. Teachers incorporate the use of manipulatives for each unit of</p>	<p>5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.1. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.</p>	<p>5B.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.</p>		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<p>The percentage of White students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 58% to 62%</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p> <p>The percentage of Hispanic students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 54% to 59%</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p>							
	<p>White: 58% (25) Hispanic: 54% (95)</p>	<p>White: 62% (27) Hispanic: 59% (104)</p>					
		<p>5B.2 Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions is not matched to individual student needs.</p>	<p>5B.2. Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.</p>	<p>5B.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>5B.2. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.</p>	<p>5B.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS</p>	

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

		5B.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	5B3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	5B.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	5B.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	5B.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.
--	--	--	--	---	--	---

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

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

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

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

<u>Mathematics Goal</u> <u>#5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Core instruction rarely included the use of manipulatives.	5E.1. Tier 1: Grade levels determine core instructional needs by reviewing benchmark data for all students whom made Learning Gains in Mathematics. Teachers incorporate the use of manipulatives for each unit of study.	5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principal , Literacy Coach	5E.1. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	5E.1. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS.		
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u> The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring a Level 3 or higher will increase from 57% to 61%. Data from School Grade Report.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	57% (120)	63% (131)					

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

		5E.2 Evidence-based intervention used during supplemental instructions are not matched to individual student needs.	5E.2: Teachers match evidence-based intervention to individual student needs.	5E.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	5E.2. Grade-level teams review results of benchmark data to determine academic progress.	5E.2. Weekly assessment tied to Mathematic NGSSS	
		5E.3. The training and monitoring of teachers implementing higher order questions and text complexity.	5E3. Teachers include higher-order questions and use Webb's Depth of Knowledge in lesson planning.	5E.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Coach.	5E.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during CWT and will be checked periodically by the principal, assistant principal, and Literacy Coach.	5E.3. CWT logs and classroom observations to determine frequency of higher order questioning and text complexity.	

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: <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>					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		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.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<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

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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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		

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2011-2012						
<u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
<u>Geometry Goal #3D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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
Best Practices	K-5	A. Woods	School Wide	Monthly	CWT	Principal/Assistant Principal

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
Everglades	Fl. Math Standards Test Prep	Title I	\$250
Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt	Math series	Text book related	\$1,700.00
Subtotal:\$1,950.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Renaissance Math (STAR/Math Facts in a Flash)	Supplemental math software	Title I	\$4,026.00
IXL	Online resource	Title I	\$2,250.00
Subtotal:\$6,276.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Development of Instructional Focus Calendar-Stipends for Summer Development-Math	Committee-PLC Math Team	Title I	\$2,500.00
Subtotal:\$2,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$10,726			

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

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

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. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.	1a.1. Utilize the FCIM process to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment.	1a.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1a.1.Frequently view assessments and student groupings to target the needs of students based on assessments.	1a.1.Student progress on various assessments		

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

Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percent of students scoring a Level 3 on the 2013 Science FCAT will increase from 28% to 35%. Data from School Grade Report.							
	28% (23)	35% (29)					
		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 science.	1B.1. Students do not possess the necessary comprehension skills.	1B.1. Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build comprehension skills.	1B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1B.1. Teacher assesses students on comprehension skills to determine if students are making adequate progress.	1B.1. Mini-Assessments, Checklist		

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

<u>Science Goal #1B:</u> One hundred percent of students will score at Level 4, 5, and 6 in Science.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100% (1)	100% (1)					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</p>	<p>2a.1. Core instruction does not consistently provide explicit instruction in reading strategies aligned with tested benchmarks at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.</p>	<p>2a.1. Utilize the FCIM process to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment.</p>	<p>2a.1.Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach</p>	<p>2a.1.Frequently view assessments and student groupings to target the needs of students based on assessments.</p>	<p>2a.1.Student progress on various assessments</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2A:</u> The percent of students scoring a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 Science FCAT will increase from 12% to 21%.</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

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

	12% (10)	21% (17)					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
		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>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. 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>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem						

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

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

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

Biology 1 Goal #2:	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>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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
Best Practices	K-5	A. Woods	School Wide	Monthly	Classroom Walk Thru	Principal/Assistant Principal

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Discovery Streaming	Online Resource	Title I	\$2,500
Subtotal:\$2,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$2,500.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1a.1. Students do not possess the necessary vocabulary skills.	1a.1. Tier 1: Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build vocabulary skills.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1a.1. Reading Leadership Team will review writing data after each writing assessment to determine the percent of increase of students scoring a 3.5 or higher.	1a.1. Writing Assessments.		
<p><u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> Seventy three percent of 4th grade students will score a level 3.0 and higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes.</p> <p>Data from School Grade Report.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

	73% (57)	76% (59)					
		1a.2. Students do possess the necessary grammar skill.	1a.2. Tier 1: Teachers will dedicate a set time during the day to build grammar skills.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1a.2. Reading Leadership Team will review writing data after each writing assessment to determine the percent of increase of students scoring a 3.5 or higher.	1a.2. Writing Assessments.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1b.1. Students do not possess the necessary vocabulary skills.	1b.1 Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build vocabulary skills.	1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1b.1. Reading Leadership Team will review writing data after each writing assessment to determine the percent of increase of students scoring a 3.5 or higher.	1b.1. Writing Assessments.		
<u>Writing Goal #1B:</u> Fifty five percent of students will score at 4 or higher in Writing.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	50% (1)	55% (1)					
		1b.2. Students do possess the necessary grammar skill.	1b.2. Teacher will dedicate a set time during the day to build grammar skills.	1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	1b.2. Reading Leadership Team will review writing data after each writing assessment to determine the percent of increase of students scoring a 3.5 or higher.	1b.2. Writing Assessments.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Block Implementation	K-5	Amy Woods Literacy Coach	School wide	Monthly	CWT	Principal/Assistant Principal
Melissa Forney	K-5	Melissa Forney	School Wide	August/September	CWT	Principal/Assistant 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:			

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

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Melissa Forney	Writing Workshop	Title I	\$1,600.00
Subtotal:\$1,600			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$1,600			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Students are not provided with positive reinforcement for attendance to school.	1.1. School will provide students with positive reinforcement for attendance to school.	1.1. Literacy Coach	1.1. Leadership Team will review attendance data monthly and determine progress toward goal.	1.1. Monthly Attendance Data		
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u> By June 2013, the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) will increase from 95% to 96%	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	95% (454)	96%(459)					

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

	<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>					
	21% (100)	13% (62)					
	<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>					
	6% (28)	5% (24)					
		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
Student Attendance	K-5	Assistant Principal	School wide PLC of Student Recognition	Monthly	Sign in sheets	Assistant Principal

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentives/Awards for Attendance	Certificates, ribbons	Title I	\$600.00
Subtotal: \$600.00			
Total: \$600.00			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Students are not provided with direct instruction in behavioral expectations for appropriate behavior.	1.1. Tier 1: Teachers will provide direct instruction in expected behaviors for appropriate behavior.	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. School Leadership Team will review discipline data monthly and determine if progress is being made toward the goal.	1.1. Monthly Office Discipline Referral and Suspension Data.		
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> By June 2012, number of suspensions and percent of students receiving suspension days will have decreased by 33%. Bowling Green Elementary does not use In-School Suspension.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	N/A	N/A					

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

	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	0.6% (3)	0.4% (2)					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	0.6% (3)	0.4% (2)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
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 Rate	K-5	Assistant Principal	Leadership team	Monthly	Sign in sheets	Assistant Principal
Book Study/Harry Wong	Beginning Teachers	Literacy Coach	Beginning Teachers	Bi-Monthly	Sign in sheets	Literacy Coach

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
Harry Wong	First Days of School (Classroom Management)	Title I	\$125.00
Subtotal: \$125.00			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: \$125			
Total: \$125			

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD 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 do not speak, write or understand English.	1.1. Every school notice sent home will be translated into Spanish. Edulink automated calls will be in English and Spanish.	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. Leadership team will review sign-in sheets to determine the success.	1.1. Parent involvement sign-in sheets.		
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> By June 2013, the percentage of parents who participated in school activities will increase by 2 percent to 79 percent.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	77% (1008)	79% (1034)					
		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

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
Community and Parent Involvement	K-5	Assistant Principal	PLC	Monthly	Sign in sheets, agendas	Assistant Principal
Title I Information Training	K-5	Assistant Principal	School Wide	August 15, 2012	Sign in sheets, agendas	Assistant Principal

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
Frog Publishing	Interactive Skill Base Activities	Title I	\$1,000
Subtotal:\$1,000			
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
Make and Take Workshop	Materials for workshop	Title I	\$250.00
Nutrition Nights	Materials for workshop	Title I	\$250.00
Subtotal: \$500			
Total:\$1,500			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:\$17,447.30
CELLA Budget	Total:\$250.00
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$10,726.00
Science Budget	Total:\$2,500.00
Writing Budget	Total:\$1,600.00
Civics Budget	Total: \$0
U.S. History Budget	Total: \$0
Attendance Budget	Total: \$600
Suspension Budget	Total: \$125
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: \$0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:\$1,500.00
STEM Budget	Total: \$0
CTE Budget	Total: \$0
Additional Goals	Total:\$0

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

Grand Total: \$34,148.30

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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

The School Advisory Council of Bowling Green Elementary will meet at least once each quarter. The SAC committee will meet to review, provide meaningful input and revise the Bowling Green Elementary Parent Involvement Plan annually prior to their approval of the plan. The SAC also provides input on the District Parent Involvement Plan, the School Improvement Plan, and the School Improvement Plan midyear review. The SAC approves the expenditure of federal money toward purchasing materials and supplies for parent involvement activities, professional development, summer Data Analysis and Curriculum Development, use for incentives for students showing improvement, and serving as a liaison and community contact for Bowling Green Elementary.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Classroom books, software, incentives, rewards, classroom library sets	\$ 2,000