FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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: Imagine Schools at South Lake	District Name: Lake
Principal: Mary Briggs	Superintendent: Dr. Susan Moxley
SAC Chair: Craig Dykstra	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mary Briggs	Educational Leadership K-12;Elementary Education, K-6; ESOL endorsement	2	5	2007, KCA School Grade of A; 95% AYP 2008, KCA School Grade of C, 95% AYP 2009, PMW School Grade of B; 90% AYP 2010, KCA School Grade of B, 79% AYP 2011,KCA School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2011, ISLC School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP
Assistant Principal					

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Kathleen Dial	Bachelor Elementary Education, K-6 Certified	3	2	2010, School Grade of A, 87% AYP 2011, School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP
Literacy	Joyce Hands	Bachelor's Degree in Early Childhood Education Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement Certified in K-3rd	7	2	2006, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2007, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2008, School Grade of B, 100% AYP 2009, School Grade of A; 97% AYP 2010, School Grade of A, 87% AYP 2011, School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP
Math / Science	Korrin Dykhouse	Bachelor of Fine Arts-Costume Design, K-6 Elem Ed Certified	5	2	2008, School Grade of B, 100% AYP 2009, School Grade of A; 97% AYP 2010, School Grade of A, 87% AYP 2011, School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP
Differentiated Instruction	Anne O'Leary	Master of Education with a specialization in Differentiated Instruction Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education; Early Childhood Cert with ESOL Endorsement	6	1	2006, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2007, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2008, School Grade of B, 100% AYP 2009, School Grade of A; 97% AYP 2010, School Grade of A, 87% AYP 2011, School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP
Data Coach	Patsy Ford	Bachelor's Degree in Elem Ed K-6; Master's Degree in Elementary Ed.; Certified Math grades 6-9	6	1	2006, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2007, School Grade of C; 100% AYP 2008, School Grade of B, 100% AYP 2009, School Grade of A; 97% AYP 2010, School Grade of A, 87% AYP 2011, School Grade of A, 90% AYP 2012, ISLC School Grade of A, % AYP

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. The mission of our Imagine school is based on the shared values of integrity, justice, and fun (based on the philosophy/book Joy at Work, written by our founder, Dennis Bakke.	Principal	On-going
2. Our school has a strong focus on the positive character development of our students.	Character Task Force Chairpersons	On-going
3. We actively recruit energetic, passionate teachers via trade opportunities (e.g. Teacher-Teacher.com) and also through Alternative Certification Programs (e.g. the E.P.I at Lake Sumter Community College)	Dean of Administration	On-going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
70	10%	70%	15%	5%	5%	100%	2%	0%	15%

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

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
Peggy Wamback	Courtney Flood	All of our mentors and mentees were paired by what subject or grade level they teach as well as their strengths and weaknesses as listed in the first meeting. Each mentor also had the opportunity to meet mentees prior to the selection process to be sure they were a functional working pair.	Mentor and Mentee are involved in our New Teacher mentoring program that meets monthly. We have group discussions, webinars, book studies and profession development exercises where the group shares experiences. In addition our staff participates in peer observations and peer walk throughs to enhance their classroom instruction.
Theresa Chubb	Danielle Ciccotelli		
Valorie Sierens	Suzanne Mini		
Anne O'Leary	Michelle Ragni		
Sherry Anderson	Rebecca Tramonte		
Robert Knapp	Melissa Fitzgerald		
Joyce Hands	Eileen Bellefleur		
Jennifer Osborne	Jennifer Goss		
Carrie Fairchild	Stephanie Bilella		
Beth Vollmer	Emily Conde		
Janelle Culverwell	Sandra Poonai		
Jennifer Badeaux	Maxine Welsh		

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: Mary Briggs, Principal; Peggy Wamback, K-2 RtI Specialist; Nikki Huth, 3-5 RtI Specialist; Jennifer Osborne, 6-8 RtI Specialist; Eileen Bellefleur, ESE Teacher
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 school works together in efforts to function in the best interest of the students. The MTSS/RtI team meets with the leadership of the school to coordinate the efforts and ensure accountability on behalf of the teachers.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The Problem-solving team meets once a week to support teachers in the RtI process. The Problem-solving team also meets with grade level teams and with the Leadership team to work with the process. The members of the RtI team participated in writing the goals of the SIP.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. SAT10, Fall and Spring, in grades K-8; FCAT; FAIR; benchmark assessments from Edusoft; FCAT Explorer, FastMath, FastForward
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Full staff inservice; Lake County trainings for the team and for interested teachers; grade level team meetings and one on one informational meetings
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Data chats and monthly meetings with grade levels to hold them accountable in the efforts of the MTSS

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Mary Briggs, Principal; Stephania Sherman, Kathleen Dial, Korrin Dykhouse, and Katie Pertschi, Education Directors; Joyce Hands, Literacy Coach
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Meetings are held monthly and the team forms task forces to accomplish tasks around the school.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The 2012-2013 Advanced Reading Challenge, an initiative through Imagine Schools; STAR reading challenge, a companion initiative for students in grades K-2; Family Reading Night; Book Character Parade; Peer Teacher Observations and Classroom Visitation; National Literacy Week

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

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.			1.1. Teachers need additional training in differentiated instruction.	1.1. Teachers will enroll in beneficial professional development courses approved through FDLRS, local universities, Lake County and other district offerings and will include a goal to acquire knowledge of differentiated instruction on their IPDP.	1.1. Principal; Literacy Coach	1.1. Peer Assessment, Principal Walkthroughs, Lesson Study	1.1. End of the Year review of the IPDP.
Reading Goal #1A: Our students have historically been good readers, with some of our cohorts scoring the highest percent proficient in Lake County. It is desirable to see the percent of students who score at least a Level 3 increase annually	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *67%(416)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *75%(500)*					
			1.2 Teachers in all subject areas need to increase their use of best practices in reading, particularly in our middle school.	1.2. Reading endorsement and CAR-PD will be encouraged for all middle school content area teachers.	1.2. Principal; Literacy Coach	1.2. Peer Assessment, Principal Walkthroughs, Lesson Study	1.2. End of the Year review of the IPDP
			1.3. Students do not feel the need to excel in programs or push themselves, and are accustomed to getting by with "just enough."	1.3. Classroom-based and school wide incentives for students who show improvement through incentives (e.g. field trips, character dollars)	1.3. Classroom Teachers	1.3. Data will be collected for individual students to show growth in specified areas.	1.3. FCAT

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:							
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2.1. Motivation of students to excel above the minimum requirements for honor roll.	2.1. Increased participation in the Imagine Schools Advanced Reading Challenge.	2.1.Literacy Coach	2.1. Opportunities for the students to showcase their accomplishments throughout the year.	2.1 Data will be collected to determine the number of students who complete reading and reporting on the required number of books.
Reading Goal #2A: *In 2012, %of our students scored a level 4 0r 5 in grades 3 and 4. % It is desirable to see us match or increase this numbers*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *36%(233)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *40%(300)*					
			2.2 Teachers who feel that they have the tools and resources to provide differentiation for students who are proficient readers.	2.2. Increased use of higher order thinking objectives in classroom instruction.	2.2. Principal, Literacy Coach	2.2. Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Study	2.2. FCAT

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.			3.1. Providing a balanced instructional setting for students at all levels	3.1. Increased awareness of the resources and strategies within the RtI process	3.1. All members of the Literacy Leadership Team	3.1.Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Study	3.1. Benchmark Assessments; FCAT
Reading Goal #3A: Historically, our students who have earned a level 3 on the FCAT have been able to maintain that level. It is somewhat more challenging for those who have scored at a level 4 or 5 to maintain that high level of proficiency, and to remain within those levels.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *71%(459)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *75%(487)*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4.1. Additional training in differentiated instruction needed.	4.1. Access to multiple sources of professional development	4.1. Principal	4.1. Inclusion of goals in the area of differentiated instruction and in the RtI process on the IPDP.	4.1. End of year review of the IPDP.
Reading Goal #4A: Ideally, we would wish to see the percent of students in the lowest quartile who make a year's growth in reading match or exceed the percent of proficient readers who do so.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *70%(452)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *72%(465)*					
			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

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** 64%	<mark>64%</mark>	<mark>70%</mark>	<mark>73%</mark>	<mark>76%</mark>	<mark>79%</mark>	<mark>82%</mark>

Reading Goal #5A:

The school is working hard to lower the achievement gap by implementing student data driven goals.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**		5A.1. Vocabulary development and text complexity are two major shifts in the Common Core we are addressing	5A.1. Increased vocabulary development	5A.1. Leadership Team	5A.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5A.1. FCAT	
Reading Goal #5B: It is desirable that every student in every subgroup demonstrates a similar level of proficiency, thereby reducing or eliminating the achievement gap.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:69% Black:56% Hispanic:62% Asian:81% American Indian:na	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White:72% Black:59% Hispanic:65% Asian:84% American Indian:na					
		5A.2. Teachers needed additional training in Text Complexity	5A.2. Opportunities for teachers to acquire professional development in text marking strategies	5A.2. Education Directors	5A.2. Inclusion of goals for professional development on IPDP	5A.2. End of year review of IPDP	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Vocabulary development is less robust among students who have less experience reading and conversing in English.	5C.1. Increased application of ESOL teaching strategies and best practices by all teachers	5C.1. Leadership Team	5C.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5C.1. FCAT
Reading Goal #5C: *40% of our English Language Learners are making satisfactory progress in reading. Although this number increased from last year, we would like to increase this number to mirror the total population.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *na*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60%*					
			5C.2. Teachers needed additional training in ESOL strategies	5C.2. Opportunities for teachers to acquire professional development in ESOL strategies	5C.2. Principal	5C.2. Inclusion of goals for professional development on IPDP	5C.2. End of year review of IPDP
			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. Vocabulary development is less robust among students who have less experience reading	5D.1. Increased application of ESE teaching strategies and best practices by all teachers	5D.1. Leadership Team	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5D.1. FCAT
Reading Goal #5D: *The percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress decreased 7%, we have a new ESE Teacher who has brought new strategies and our goal is to see further growth.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *31%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *48%*					
			5D.2. Teachers needed additional training in ESE strategies	5D.2. Opportunities for teachers to acquire professional development in ESE strategies	5D.2. Principal/ESE Teacher	5D2. Inclusion of goals for professional development on IPDP	5D.2. End of year review of IPDP
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Parents do not have the money for tutoring or additional assistance for their children.	5E.1. Offer online websites and resources that come with curriculum to practice skills at home	5E.1.classroom teachers	5E.1. progress monitoring	5E.1.FCAT
Reading Goal #5E: *Last year 41% of our economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory growth and this year only 25% performed satisfactory. We would like to see this increased!*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *25%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *51%*					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity	All Teachers	Literacy Coaches	School wide	Monthly Meetings	Data Analysis of learning gains as shown in benchmark assessments	Literacy Coaches Data Coach
RtI	All Teachers	Problem-solving Team members	School wide	Monthly Meetings	Data Analysis of learning gains as shown in benchmark assessments	Members of the Problem-solving Team
Differentiated Instruction	All Teachers	DI Coach	School wide	Monthly Round Tables	Classroom walkthroughs, Lesson Study	Principal Differentiated Instruction coach and Education Directors

End of Reading Goals

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

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. Vocabulary development	1.1. Increase use of robust vocabulary in the classrooms	1.1. Classroom teachers	1.1. teacher observation	1.1. CELLA
CELLA Goal #1: *Students scored very well in the Listening and Speaking and our goal is to increase this percentage to 100%*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: *86% (6/7)*					
		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. Text Complexity and nonfiction text	2.1. Teachers will need to implement graphic organizers for students to understand complex text	2.1. Classroom teachers	2.1. Observations	2.1. CELLA
CELLA Goal #2: *Reading for our ELL students will be a focus this year. Only one student scored proficient, 4 high intermediate and 2 low intermediate.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: *14% (1/7)*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: *Writing will continue to be a focus to bring everyone to proficient scores next year.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : *57%(4/7)*	2.1. Implementation Time	2.1.Integrting journals into daily classroom instruction through all subject areas	2.1. Classroom teachers	2.1. Observations	2.1. CELLA
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of CELLA Goals

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

Mathematics Goals

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

Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1.1. Continued professional Development on the GoMath series for teachers as they continue to explore this curriculum.	1.1. Provide inservice for elementary teachers to increase familiarity with the math curriculum, its resources and pedagogy, as well as inservice for the middle school math teachers to increase their familiarity with the next generation math standards.	1.1. Team Leaders	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review	1.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #1: Historically, our students have scored at a slightly lower level of proficiency in mathematics as they have in reading. It is desirable that the percent proficient in mathematics equal the percent proficient in reading, based on FCAT reporting.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *57%(368)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70%(452)*					
			1.1. Working with the needs of the students	1.1. Provide inservice for teachers on ways to differentiate instruction in the math class	1.1. DI Coach	1.1. Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review	1.1. FCAT
			1.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2.1. A number of students with the ability to work at an accelerated pace, are not challenged but simply working at grade level	2.1. Work with level 3, 4 and 5 students together to create higher level thinking	2.1. teachers	2.1. Progress monitoring; benchmark assessments; co-teaching in some classes	2.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #2A: In 2011 56% of 3rd graders, 28% of 4th graders, 42% of 5th graders, 48% of 6th graders, 39% of 7th graders, and 30% of 8th graders scored levels 4 and 5 on the FCAT. It is desirable to see math proficiency continue to increase in each level of proficiency	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *23% (149)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *45%(290)*					
			2.2. Students show the aptitude and desire to perform at the highest level	2.2. Provide the opportunity for a Math Counts Team or Math Superstars	2.2. teachers	2.2. Weekly club meetings to prepare for competition	2.2. End of year competition
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.

June 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 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.			3.1. The ability to correcting read and interpret the problems on the FCAT is related not only to mathematics knowledge but also reading skill.	3.1. Our school has identified students, most of whom scored at a level 1 or 2 on the FCAT for whom an additional elective period of mathematics enrichment will be offered	3.1. Advance mathematics teaching team	3.1. Progress monitoring, benchmark assessment	3.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #3A: Although students continue to make learning gains in mathematics at a similar level as they do in reading, it is desirable to increase the percent of students achieving at least a year's growth in a year's time by at least 4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *66%(423)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *70%(452)*					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.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
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1. Lack of cohesiveness and focus among teachers who work with these students	4.1. Provide opportunities throughout the year to increase collaboration between the classroom, teacher, special education teacher, and remedial teachers.	4.1.Data Coach	4.1. Progress monitoring, benchmark assessment	4.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #4A: It is desirable to see that the students who have the most to acquire in terms of basic mathematics skills make more than a year's growth each year. The learning gains goal should increase by at least 4%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *61%(394)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *65%(420)*					
			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

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** 52%	57%	60%	64%	68%	72%	76%
Mathematics Goal #5A: *The school is working hard to lower the achievement gap by implementing student data driven goals.*							

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. Math Fluency	5B.1. Increased practice with math fluency to increase speed and student confidence	5B.1. Leadership Team	5B.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5B.1. FCAT	
Mathematics Goal #5B: It is desirable that the mathematics proficiency of all learners matches the percent proficient for our average student percentage	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White:60% Black:42% Hispanic:47% Asian:76% American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 61% Black:49% Hispanic:55% Asian:79% 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

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. Math vocabulary is less robust among students who have less experience in English.	5C.1. Increased application of ESOL teaching strategies and best practices by all teachers	5C.1. Leadership Team	5C.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5C.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Last year the number of students that performed satisfactory was 30% we would like to see this number increased*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50%*					
			5C.2. Teachers needed additional training in ESOL strategies	5C.2. Opportunities for teachers to acquire professional development in ESOL strategies	5C.2. Principal	5C.2. Inclusion of goals for professional development on IPDP	5C.2. End of year review of IPDP
			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. Student understanding basic math facts	5D.1. Increased application of ESE teaching strategies and best practices by all teachers	5D.1. Leadership Team	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5D.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5D: *This numbers has fallen 7% and we need to focus on these students and their needs, we have a new ESE teacher in place this year who has new strategies to share with these students and our teachers.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *22%*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *39%*					
			5D.2. Teachers needed additional training in ESE strategies	5D.2. Opportunities for teachers to acquire professional development in ESE strategies	5D.2. Principal/ESE Teacher	5D2. Inclusion of goals for professional development on IPDP	5D.2. End of year review of IPDP
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Student understanding basic math facts	5D.1. Increased application of math fluency and scaffolding the teaching strategies and other best practices by all teachers	5D.1. Leadership Team	5D.1. Classroom walkthroughs, and review of lesson plans	5D.1. FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5E: *This numbers has fallen 11% from the previous year, it is up to us to raise this percentage and encourage math practices at home*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47%					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of 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. old textbooks	1.1.use of technology and hands on learning	1.1.classroom teachers and leadership team	1.1. progress monitoring and observations	1.1.EOC
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *We had 38 students take the Algebra EOC this year and our mean score was 423 which was 21 points higher than the state average, overall 95% of our students scored a level 3 or higher*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *50% [38]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *55%*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. it is always a challenge to differentiate the instruction for the higher levels	2.1. increase the taxonomy of work delivered to students so they are synthesizing and applying their skills	1.1.classroom teachers and leadership team	1.1. progress monitoring and observations	1.1.EOC
Algebra Goal #2: *Increase our levels 4 and 5% to exceed the numbers of level 3*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *45% [38]*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *50%*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

Math 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
Making Learning Gains in Math	All subjects	Ed Directors	Grade Level meetings	Early Release	Progress monitoring tools	Ed directors and data coach

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.			1.1. The proficiency rate in science has dropped three years in a row	1.1. The students will receive content-area reading strategies as a routine part of the science instruction. Students will participate in hands-on lab experiences in the science lab.	1.1. Science Team	1.1. Benchmark Assessment	1.1. FCAT
Science Goal #1: The percent proficient of science scores should mirror the success of our learners in reading and in mathematics. In 2011, the percent proficient was significantly lower than the year before at 52%. In 2012 the percent proficient dropped again to 48%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *48%(99)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *60%(124)*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2.2. We want to ensure that, even though the new science classroom is primarily for middle school students, all students have access to a well-equipped science lab.	2.2. Initiate Science Buddies throughout the primary grades	2.2. Science Team	2.2. Science Buddies will meet every other month.	2.2. Review of lesson plans.
Science Goal #2A: In 2011, 19% of our 5th grade students scored at a level 4 or 5 and 16% of our 8th grade students scored at a level 4 or 5. It is desirable that the level of proficiency in this area mirror the level of proficiency in reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *12%(26)*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *20%(41)*					
			2.3 Many students with a keen interest in science like to be able to showcase their knowledge and skills.	2.3 Continue the participation in the Imagine Schools Annual Science Fair.	2.3 Science Team	2.3 Science inquiry will be integrated into lessons.	2.3 Judging in the annual science fair.

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Marking	Grades K-8	Ed director	School-wide	Quarterly	classroom walkthroughs	Principal; Education Directors

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

End of Science Goals

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. Writing Goal #1A: In 2013 the proficiency score will be raised again to 4, we must be aware of our students using rubrics so the scores don't drop. The school will mirror the county's goal of 90% of students scoring a level 4 or higher.	1.1. The student's are having trouble writing papers at a level 4 or higher.	1.1. Continue to utilize best practices in writing to prepare the 4th grade students in narrative and expository writing and the 8th grade students in expository and persuasive writing.	1.1. Literacy Coach	1.1. There will be writing prompts three times annually, as benchmarks.	1.1. Florida Writes
2012 Current Level of Performance:* *83%(150)* *2013 Expected Level of Performance:** *90%(164)*	1.2.The teachers are feeling unprepared to understand the FCAT Writes for 2013	1.2. Professional Development Presentation on the writing process	1.2. Principal	1.1. There will be writing prompts three times annually, as benchmarks.	1.1. Florida Writes

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
Writers Workshop	All Teachers	Stephania Sherman	All Teachers to create a foundation for writing instruction	Regular intervention	Rubrics and continues ongoing assessment	Education Directors

	Subtotal:
	Total:

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. 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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. 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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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 Attendance Goal #1: Student attendance will become a priority for our Academic Achievement committee because we know that student daily attendance in class and their daily learning environment will increase student learning.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* *94%(839)* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *43%(386)* 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *1.4%(145)*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* *98%(987)* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) *20%(201)* 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) *1%(100)*	1.1. Traffic on Hartwood Marsh backs up from 8-8:30am therefore parents wait for it to clear to come in thus causing student tardiness.	1.1. Plan with the county to examine and revisit traffic control in the area	1.1. Principal	1.1. Daily attendance	1.1. Yearly attendance rate

Attendance Professional Development

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

End of Attendance Goals
June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: ISLC will continue to have less than 1% of students suspensions.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions *0*	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions *0*	1.1. ISLC does not offer Saturday or In School Suspensions. Due to this – it is harder to help accommodate parents regarding discipline.	1.1. Zero tolerance on bullying. Start a before / after school mentoring program who need to work through issues before they lead to suspensions.	1.1. Administration Lead Mentors	1.1. Monitor number of referrals written.	1.1. School Tracking method
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School *0*	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School *0*					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *0*	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions *0*					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School *0*	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School *0*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

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

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 Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

	Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

* 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 Parent Involvement Goal #1: As a school of choice, Imagine South Lake is the embodiment of Parent Involvement, so much so that it is one of the important measures on which we gauge the success of our school. 1. **95% of parents will respond positively that they are given opportunities to get involved in their child's education.** 2. **60% of parents will respond positively that they volunteer at our school.** 3. **88.5% of parents will respond positively that they will recommend our school to others.**	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* 1. **91%** 2. **57%** 3. **84%**	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* 1. **95%** 2. **50%** 3. **91%**	1.1. Many Parents are working two jobs or overtime and cannot find tine during the work day to volunteer at the school	1.1. Provide multiple opportunities outside of the school day such as evenings and Saturdays for parents to volunteer.	1.1. Whole Staff	1.1. Volunteer Logs Inputs at PTO and Board meetings Parent Newsletter	1.1. End of the year Annual Parent Survey
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Satisfaction and the role of the parent in the school	All	Imagine Schools Curriculum Leaders	All are invited to participate in the Imagine Schools Annual Forum, and be a part of Schools of Excellence reviews	Throughout the year	Spring Parent Satisfaction Survey	Principal

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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: *The school will use the computer and science lab as well as the laptop carts to introduce students to hands on experiences with science and technology*	1.1. time and availability	1.1.teachers will checkout time slots to share	1.1. Leadership	1.1. Observations	1.1. FCAT
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

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: *Students are setting personal goals for growth that will then be mirrored by the teachers in their academic growth plans*	1.1. Students understanding and using their own data to make goals	1.1. work with students one on one to create learning goals	1.1. Classroom teachers	1.1. Data chats	1.1. Review of goals
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

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 Additional Goal #1:ANTI-BULLYING The Anti-Bullying goal is to reduce the children's impulsive and aggressive behavior while increasing their social competence. The number of bullying incidents for 2010-2011 was less than 1% (4 students). By integrating Anti-bullying into our school-wide Positive Character. Our goal is to reduce the bullying number to 0% (no students).	2012 Current Level :* Less than 1%	2013 Expected Level :* There will be no incidents of bullying during the 2011/2012 school year.	1.1. - Students understanding of the definition of bullying	1.1. -Anti-Bullying Classroom Lessons - PSA's about bullying - Speak Out Hotline - School-wide expectations - Implement "Bully Box" where students can report bullying situations	1.1. - Classroom teachers - Administration	1.1. - Decrease in number of bullying incidents - Teacher/student survey - Discipline referrals	1.1. - 2011-2012 Discipline Referral Data
			1.2. - Teacher knowledge of bullying definition - Staff implementation	1.2. -Anti-Bullying discussions - Book study about bullying - School-wide expectations	1.2. - Classroom teachers -Administration	1.2. - 2011-2012 Discipline Referral Data - Tier 2 interventions data	1.2. Number of Bully – related discipline referrals.
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #2: Instructional Technology Instructional Technology: In order to enhance the impact of technology on student performance, all teachers will improve mastery and integration of educational technology	2012 Current Level :* *85%*	2013 Expected Level :* *100%*	1.1. - Teacher knowledge - Staff implementation	1.1. - Teachers mentoring teachers -workshops on technology -monthly newsletters with technology tips	1.1. - Classroom teachers -Administration	1.1. Administration walkthroughs Teacher survey the use of technology in the classroom and the school as a whole	1.1. Evidence of the implementation of technology

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
Bullying webinars	ALL	Dean	Availability to all teachers	Early release days	Discussion boards	Principal
Technology Tips	ALL	Ed Director	Monthly tips on tech teaching	Monthly	See in lesson plans and classroom	Principal

End of Additional Goal(s)

Differentiated Accountability

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

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

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The main goal of the School Advisory Council is to support the goals of the School Improvement Plan. That being said we will: 1. Develop a timely schedule to monitor the school improvement plan through the year that is consistent with current performance levels of students. 2. Review budgetary allocation and devise a student support services plan that address additional instructional resources, i.e., technology and guidance needed to facilitate active learning and achievement for all students. 3. Increase parental and business partner ownership and support of the school improvement plan by forming a task force to encourage their participation, as leaders, in the review of information. 4. Develop a systematic calendar to ensure the school vision and related surveys are shared with all stakeholders and are revisited periodically to assure alignment with the school improvement.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
The School has no SAC funds	0

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