FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DRAFT

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: **Gretchen Everhart School**	District Name: **Leon County Schools**
Principal: **Jane Floyd Bullen**	Superintendent: **Jackie Pons**
SAC Chair: **Debra Taube**	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

DRAFT

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	**Jane Floyd Bullen**	**M.S. in ESE, B.S. in Mental Handicaps Certification in M.H., SLD, Ed. Leadership, Principalship**	**17**	**14**	**N/A Schools don't receive grades due to all ESE enrollment 2005-2012 has not received AYP**
Assistant Principal	**Dr. Kent Hamilton**	**PhD in ESE M.S. in ESE B.S. in History/Political Science Certification in Principalship Ed. Leadership, ESE**	**9**	**31**	**N/A for the last 9 years Schools don't receive grades due to all ESE enrollment 2005-2012 has not received AYP**

DRAFT

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	**Lorriann Corry**	**B.S. in Speech Pathology M.S. Audiology certifications: Speech Correction Hearing Disability currently working towards Reading Endorsement**	**10**	**6**	**N/A school is not graded 2005-2012 has not earned AYP**

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. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	**Principal**	**ongoing**
2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff (to include committee assignments)	**Principal, Assistant Principal, Mentor Teachers**	**ongoing**
3. Extensive use of college practicum students and interns and volunteers from several Universities	**Assistant Principal**	**ongoing**
4. Soliciting referrals from current employees and district staff	**Principal**	**ongoing**

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
There are 0 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out of field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only)	**N/A**

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
39	**2.60%**	**23.10%**	**33.3%**	**41%**	**69.2%**	**100%**	**5.10%**	**5.10%**	**7.70%**

DRAFT

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
Melissa Herring	**N/A at this time**	**Melissa Herring is a highly effective teacher. She has met the district's Beginning Teacher Program Mentor qualifications and has successfully completed the district's Mentor Training Program**	**Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and Marzano's effective instructional practices as observed through the iObservation instrument will be the focus of the monthly meetings of the mentor and mentee. Release time is provided for required pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, and post observation feedback conferences.**

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III

DRAFT

Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

DRAFT

DRAFT

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. **The RtI Leadership is composed of the Guidance Counselor, ESE Program/Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist, School Social Worker and Administrator. The classroom teacher and other support staff that serves the student also attends the meeting to include when needed the Behavior Analyst**
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 based RtI Leadership Team meets at least monthly and more frequently when needed. They work with the teacher(s) to identify strategies and interventions and get involved in implementation of strategies when needed.**
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? **The RtI Leadership Team helps implement the identified school wide strategies to help students be successful in school especially when their expertise is needed for specific situations.**
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. **All of our students are Tier 3 students in all areas. The teachers maintain progress monitoring tools to document data in each area. The PBS Team monitors the behavioral data and oversees the school wide implementation of school expectations and interventions.**
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. **Monthly faculty meetings are used to provide ongoing training on RtI for students. The PBS Team shares data at faculty meetings regarding behavior and trends**
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Effective implementation of the MTSS.

DRAFT

The Administrators and Guidance Counselor will support the efforts of the Intervention Assistance Team in meeting the needs of students

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). **The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is composed of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and members from each department that serve on the curriculum committee.**
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). **The LLT meets at least monthly to review school efforts in literacy and curriculum. They bring concerns from the faculty and are a problem solving committee that designs implementation plans based on best practices and the input received. This group reviews curriculum materials and resources and helps to put professional development plans in place. They recommend their plan to the SITE Team who approves the allocation of professional development funds and the purchase of materials.**
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? **Major activities of this group will be to organize the SSS Access Points into curriculum maps for teachers to utilize school wide. This group will also help to develop common scoring rubrics and appropriate tools to use for Progress Monitoring purposes. The LLT will also be instrumental in determining the staff development plans and the allocation of staff development resources.**

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.

DRAFT

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

The RtI Team meets mid-year (if not before) on every PreK student that will be transitioning to Kindergarten the following year to determine if there is a need for providing additional interventions or assessments to make sure the student has a successful transition. A meeting is held in the Spring with the PreK teacher, parents/guardians and the receiving school the student will be attending in the fall to review progress, present level of skills, and suggestions for continued interventions to help with the student's overall success. A passport to Kindergarten is developed and given to each family to help with a successful transition.

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?

Every teacher is responsible for providing for an appropriate 90 minutes of direct reading instruction for their students each day. The reading strategies and progress that is being made is monitored through lesson plans, report cards, IEPs, and through the monthly Navigational meetings.

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?

Students at age 14 (or sooner) begin developing Transition Plans through the IEP process with the input from them, parents/guardians, agencies, teachers and staff. Four or more areas of instruction are targeted on these plans from Post Secondary education/training, Vocational skills, Self Management and Daily Living skills and arrangements, and Community Access.

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?

DRAFT

Students at Gretchen Everhart School are placed in the Post Secondary Department one to two years prior to exiting the school system (generally at age 20-22 years). The teachers and staff in that department focus instruction on helping students prepare for their post secondary placement through collaboration with agencies, parents, caregivers, and adult placement options. Students have an opportunity for ongoing visits to their post secondary placement prior to graduation to help with their successful transition.

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.

A 12 page "passport" (electronic and hard copy version) is developed for each student by teachers, staff, parents, caregivers, and the student to document strengths, weaknesses, likes, dislikes, interests, and best ways to communicate needs, wants, and displeasure. The Passport has been an excellent way for new people to acquaint themselves with our graduating students. 100% of the students that graduate from Gretchen Everhart School have an identified post secondary placement identified upon graduation. An exit conference is conducted for each student a month or two prior to their graduation to make sure appropriate plans are in place for the student.

DRAFT

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.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			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 reading.			1B.1. **Instruction at Level 4 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	1B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks.**	1B.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach**	1B.1 **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Reading assessments, and observations in classrooms.**	1B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Reading Assessments at least 2 times a year.**
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.	**9% of the Students assessed on the F.A.A. scored a Level 4 or higher** **31% scored a Level 3 or higher**	**9% of the students will score a Level 4 or higher** **35% will score a Level 3 or higher**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			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 reading.			2B.1. **Instruction at Level 7 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	2B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	2B.1 **Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach.**	2B.1. **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Reading assessments, and observations in classrooms.**	2B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Reading Assessments at least 2 times a year.**
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.	**3% of the students (2) scored a Level 7 or higher**	**3% of the students will score a Level 7 or higher**					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

DRAFT

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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Reading Goal #3A: **There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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 reading.			3B.1. **It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers.**	3B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	3B.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach**	3B.**1**. **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Reading assessments, and observations in classrooms**	3B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Reading Assessments at least 2 times a year.**
Reading Goal #3B: **It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **42% of the students made learning gains**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **45% of the students will demonstrate learning gains**					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

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. F.A.A: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. **It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers.**	4A.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	4A.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach**	4A.1. **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Reading assessments, and observations in classrooms**	4A.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Reading Assessments at least 2 times a year.**
Reading Goal #4: **It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **56% of the lowest 25% made learning gains**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **56% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains**					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2010-2011</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Reading Goal #5A:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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 subgroups:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</td><td>5B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>5B.1.</td><td>5B.1.</td><td>5B.1.</td><td colspan="2">5B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #5B:

Not enough numbers to report, no data given</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td colspan="2" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td colspan="2">5B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td colspan="2">5B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Not enough numbers to report, no data given	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
All students are SWD. Please see previous data	**see previous goals**	**See previous goals**					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #5E:

Not enough numbers to report, no data given</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

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
How to use technology tools to provide effective instruction to students	**Pre K – 12th**	**Courtney Benedix Lorrie Corry LATS**	**All teachers Paraprofessional staff**	**Weekly as needed**	**Demonstration in classrooms**	**Principal, Assistant Principal Technology Teacher**
Literacy utilizing 4 Blocks Balanced instruction	**K-12th**	**Lorrie Corry**	**COL based on components Needed**	**Monthly as needed**	**Observations in classrooms, lesson plans Teacher self reports**	**Lorrie Corry**
Literacy kits with adaptations	**K-12th**	**Lorrie Corry Courtney Benedix**	**Teachers, staff**	**Weekly as needed**	**Observations in classrooms, lesson plans**	**Lorrie Corry Courtney Benedix**
Visitations in other classrooms Possible use of Lesson Study	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Elaine Harrison Betsy Pittinger**	**Teachers interested in learning from others as part of their deliberate practice in iObservation**	**4 or more visits each semester**	**Reports from teams during faculty meetings and/or Navigational meetings**	**Jane Floyd Bullen TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger Curriculum Committee**
Communication and impact on literacy and academic instruction Common core vocabulary to include PIXONs	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen SLPs LATS FDLRS**	**All teachers Paraprofessional staff**	**Monthly as needed**	**Documented in iObservation visits to classrooms**	**Principal , Assistant Principal SLPs, LATS**
Effective strategies to use with students with autism	**Pre K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Alison Kiser**	**All teachers interested in the COL Book Study**	**Monthly meetings**	**Monthly sharing with others about implementation**	**TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger**
Effective instructional strategies based on Marzano's work on the Art and Science of Teaching	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Kent Hamilton Vicky Droze Zellanye Hutchins**	**All teachers**	**Bi monthly sharing of information at Faculty meetings and Navigational meetings**	**iObservation data Self Reflection / Assessments Peer Observations**	**Principal Assistant Principal**
Curriculum Mapping	**K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Curriculum Committee Chair**	**1-2 teachers from each department**	**Monthly committee meetings and more as needed**	**Monthly reports on progress of committee at department navigational meetings**	**Principal Curriculum Committee Chair**
Progress Monitoring instruments to use with students	**K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Jane Floyd Bullen Betsy Pittinger**	**Curriculum Committee members**	**Monthly committee meetings and more as needed**	**Monthly reports on progress of committee work at department navigational meetings**	**Principal Curriculum Committee Chair**

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
Literacy Kits	**Items needed for access to support learning**	**Instructional dollars**	**$500.00**
Unique Books and materials, student and teacher created books, Tarheel Reader books Books created for students with cognitive disabilities that are available online	**Printing and copying costs Lamination Velcro**	**Instructional dollars FDLRS District Media Center PTO funds**	**$5,000**
Online resources that support literacy	**Unique Learning Systems Education City Enchanted Learning EdHelper Mightybooks Tumblebooks A-Z Reading Weekly Reader National Geographic**	**Instructional dollars PTO funds Foundation ESE**	**$5,000**
PIXON Project Kit	**Kit of materials**	**FDLRS, TEC and Title II**	**$500**
Subtotal: $11,000			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Software and hardware to support literacy (Computer Access stations) use of technology tools to enhance instruction	**Word prediction software, switches, alternate keyboards, Smart Boards, iPads, specialized software, electronic communication boards with core vocabulary, laptops,**	**Technology dollars, grants, fundraisers, Foundation dollars**	**$20,000**
Subtotal: $20,000			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Visitations to classrooms and schools	**Travel expenses, substitutes**	**TEC and Title II**	**$2,000**

Team of teachers (1-2 from each department) will develop a curriculum map for all grades and will recommend progress monitoring tools to use.	**Stipends, release time**	**TEC and Title II**	**$2,000**
COL group to learn about effective strategies to use with students with autism	**Books, stipends**	**CARD Center**	**$300**
Teams of teachers who want to participate in Lesson Study in conjunction with iObservation	**Stipends, release time, books**	**TEC and Title II**	**$300**
COL groups to learn more about Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching	**Books, stipends**	**TEC and Title II**	**$300**
Training on the use of PIXON communication boards	**Materials, stipends, Kits Presenter**	**FDLRS, TEC and Title II**	**$2,000**
		Subtotal: $6,900	
Other:			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
		Total: $ 37,900	

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					

N/A	**N/A.**					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
N/A	**N/A**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: **N/A**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : **N/A.**					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

DRAFT

School 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.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1 **Instruction at Level 4 or higher is too challenging for most of the students..**	1B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	1B.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal,**	1B.1. **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Unique assessments, and observations in classrooms.**	1B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Unique and Math Assessments as deemed appropriate for individual students**
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.	**8% of the students assessed scored a Level 4 or higher** **33% scored a Level 3 or higher**	**8% will score a Level 4 or higher** **35% will score a Level 3 or higher**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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: **There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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 **Instruction at Level 7 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	2B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	2B.1 **Principal, Assistant Principal,**	2B.1. **Results on Progress Monitoring instruments, Unique assessments, and observations in classrooms.**	2B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool every 9 weeks, Unique and Math Assessments as deemed appropriate for individual students**
Mathematics Goal #2B: **Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **2% (1) of the students scored a level 7 or higher**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **2% will score a Level 7 or higher**					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

DRAFT

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	\ **N/A**	**N/A**					
			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. **Finding appropriate math materials to provide appropriate instruction**	3B.1. **Teachers will use math curriculum identified by the school as appropriate for different departments** **Equals Math will be used as a resource**	3B.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal**	3B.1. **Use of School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique assessments, observations in the classrooms**	3B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool, Unique Assessments**
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers.	**40% of the students made learning gains in mathematics**	**45% will make learning gains in mathematics.**					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

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. F.A.A. Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. **Finding appropriate math materials to provide appropriate instruction**	4A.1. **Teachers will use math curriculum identified by the school as appropriate for different departments** **Equals Math will be used as a resource**	4A.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal**	4A.1. **Use of School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique assessments, observations in the classrooms**	4A.1. **School Progress Monitoring tool, Unique Assessments**
Mathematics Goal #4: **It is very challenging to appropriate calculate learning gains for students. This is the first year we have received learning gain numbers**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **47% of the lowest 25% made adequate progress**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **50% of the lowest 25% will make adequate progress**					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2010-2011</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5A:

N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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 subgroups:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>5B.1.</td><td>5B.1.</td><td>5B.1.</td><td colspan="2">5B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5B:

Not enough numbers to report, no data given</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td colspan="2" rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td colspan="2">5B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td colspan="2">5B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
No data	**No data**	**No data**					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
All students at the school are SWD. See previous data	**See previous data**	**See previous data**					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5E:

No data</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Mathematics Goals

DRAFT

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	**N/A**	**N/A.**					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Scores are not divided by grade levels	**See previous school goal**	**See previous school goal**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			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.
Mathematics Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Scores are not divided by grade levels	**See previous school goals**	**See previous school goals**					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

DRAFT

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: **There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	**N/A**					
			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.
Mathematics Goal #3B: **Scores are not divided by grade levels**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	See previous school goals	**See previous school goals**					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td><td>4A.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Mathematics Goal #4:

There are no students at the school that take the FCAT.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" rowspan="2"></td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td><td>4A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td><td>4A.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

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**							
Mathematics Goal #5A: **N/A**								
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.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: **No data**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

DRAFT

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
No data	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Ass students at the school are SWD	**See previous data**	**See previous data**					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td><td>5E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #5E:

No data</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>See previous data</td><td>See previous data</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td><td>5E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td><td>5E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

DRAFT

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: **Scores are not divided by grade levels**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	See previous data	**See previous data**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: **Scores are not divided by grade levels**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	See previous data	**See previous data**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td><td>3.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mathematics Goal #3:

Scores are not divided by grade levels</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>See previous data</td><td>See previous data</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td><td>3.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td><td>3.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

DRAFT

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: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.
Baseline data 2010-2011

Algebra 1 Goal #3A:

N/A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="4">3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.

Algebra 1 Goal #3B:

N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A | N/A</td><td>3B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td colspan="2">3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td colspan="2">3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td colspan="2">3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td><td>3E.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Algebra 1 Goal #3E:

N/A</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td><td>3E.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td><td>3E.3.</td></tr>
</table>

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

DRAFT

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: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	**N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	**N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.
Baseline data 2011-2012

Geometry Goal #3A:

N/A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="4">3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3B:

N/A</td><td>3B.1.
White:
Black:
Hispanic:
Asian:
American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*
N/A</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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.
Geometry Goal #3E: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A.**					
			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 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
Visitations in other classrooms Possible use of Lesson Study	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Elaine Harrison Betsy Pittinger**	**Teachers interested in learning from others as part of their deliberate practice in iObservation**	**4 or more visits each semester**	**Reports from teams during faculty meetings and/or Navigational meetings**	**Jane Floyd Bullen TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger Curriculum Committee**
How to use technology tools to provide effective instruction to students	**Pre k – 12th**	**Courtney Benedix Lorrie Corry LATS**	**All teachers**	**Weekly as needed**	**Demonstration in the classroom**	**Principal Technology Teacher**
Communication and impact on literacy and academic instruction	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen SLPs LATS**	**All teachers**	**Monthly as needed**	**Documented in iObservation visits to classrooms**	**Principal , Assistant Principal SLPs, LATS**
Effective strategies to use with students with autism	**Pre K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Alison Kiser**	**All teachers interested in the COL Book Study**	**Monthly meetings**	**Monthly sharing with others about implementation**	**TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger**
Effective instructional strategies based on Marzano's work on the Art and Science of Teaching	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Kent Hamilton Vicky Droze Zellanye Hutchins**	**All teachers**	**Bi monthly sharing of information at Faculty meetings and Navigational meetings**	**iObservation data Self Reflection / Assessments Peer Observations**	**Principal Assistant Principal**

Curriculum Mapping	**K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Curriculum Committee Chair**	**1-2 teachers from each department**	**Monthly committee meetings and more as needed**	**Monthly reports on progress of committee at department navigational meetings**	**Principal Curriculum Committee Chair**
Progress Monitoring instruments to use with students	**K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Jane Floyd Bullen Betsy Pittinger**	**Curriculum Committee members**	**Monthly committee meetings and more as needed**	**Monthly reports on progress of committee work at department navigational meetings**	**Principal Curriculum Committee Chair**

Effective implementation of math curriculum by departments and school wide	**K – 12th**	**TEC Rep Curriculum Resource People**	**All interested teachers**	**Planning days Navigational meetings Trainings as needed**	**Observation in classrooms**	**TEC Rep Principal**

DRAFT

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
Math Curriculum Materials	**Math Curriculum to include Equals Math and Calendar Math**	**District Instructional Materials dollars**	**$5,000**
Subtotal: $5,000			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Software and hardware to support math instruction	**Smart Boards, iPads, switches, etc.**	**Technology dollars, grants, fundraisers, Foundation dollars**	**$1,000**
Subtotal: $1,000			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training on the use of Math Curriculums to include Equals Math	**Presenter Webinars**	**FDLRS, Ablenet**	**$2,000**
Training on Unique Curriculum	**Presenter Webinars**	**FDLRS, Ablenet**	**$2,000**
Subtotal: $4,000			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $10,000			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

* 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.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
There are no students at the school that take FCAT	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			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. **Instruction at Level 4 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	1B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	1B.1. **Principal / Assistant Principal**	1B.1. **Use of School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique assessments, observations in the classrooms**	1B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique Assessments**
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.	**12% of the students achieved a Level 4 or higher** **46% of the students achieved a Level 3 or higher**	**12% of the students will achieve a Level 4 or higher** **50% of the students will achieve a Level 3 or higher**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A: **There are no students at the school that take FCAT**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	**N/A**					
			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. **Instruction at Level 7 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	2B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	2B.1. **Principal / Assistant Principal**	2B.1. **Use of School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique assessments, observations in the classrooms**	2B.1. **Use of School Progress Monitoring tools, Unique assessments**,
Science Goal #2B: **Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	There were 0 students that scored a Level 7 or higher	**0 or more of the students will score a Level 7 or higher .**					
			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

DRAFT

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: **Scores are not divided by grade levels**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: **Scores are not divided by grade level**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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.
Biology 1 Goal #2: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A.**					
			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

DRAFT

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
Effective use of Unique curriculum and resources	**K – 12th**	**Betsy Pittinger Curriculum Chair**	**All teachers**	**Several times during the year through trainings and Navigational meetings**	**Observations in classrooms**	**Principal Assistant Principal**
Visitations in other classrooms Possible use of Lesson Study	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Elaine Harrison Betsy Pittinger**	**Teachers interested in learning from others as part of their deliberate practice in iObservation**	**4 or more visits each semester**	**Reports from teams during faculty meetings and/or Navigational meetings**	**Jane Floyd Bullen TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger Curriculum Committee**
How to use technology tools to provide effective instruction to students	**Pre k – 12th**	**Courtney Benedix Lorrie Corry LATS**	**All teachers**	**Weekly as needed**	**Demonstration in the classroom**	**Principal Technology Teacher**
Communication and impact on literacy and academic instruction	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen SLPs LATS**	**All teachers**	**Monthly as needed**	**Documented in iObservation visits to classrooms**	**Principal , Assistant Principal SLPs, LATS**
Effective strategies to use with students with autism	**Pre K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Alison Kiser**	**All teachers interested in the COL Book Study**	**Monthly meetings**	**Monthly sharing with others about implementation**	**TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger**
Effective instructional strategies based on Marzano's work on the Art and Science of Teaching	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Kent Hamilton Vicky Droze Zellanye Hutchins**	**All teachers**	**Bi monthly sharing of information at Faculty meetings and Navigational meetings**	**iObservation data Self Reflection / Assessments Peer Observations**	**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
Locate and purchase appropriate science curriculum materials	**Science curriculum and materials specially designed for learners with cognitive disabilities**	**District Instructional Material dollars**	**$5,000**
Subtotal: $5,000			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Software and hardware to support science instruction	**Smart Boards, iPads, switches, adapted devices,**	**Technology dollars, grants, fundraisers, Foundation dollars**	**$1,000**
Subtotal: $1,000			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training on the use of Unique	**Presenter Webinars**	**FDLRS, Ablenet**	**$2,000**
Sharing at Curriculum and Navigational meetings	**Release time, stipends**	**TEC and Title II**	**$200**
Subtotal: $2,200			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $8,200			

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.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Writing Goal #1A: **There are no students at the school that take FCAT**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. **Instruction at Level 4 or higher is too challenging for most of the students.**	1B.1. **Concentrate on increasing performance for all students and provide instruction at an appropriate instructional level. for each individual student paying particular attention to IEP goals and benchmarks**	1B.1. **Principal, Assistant Principal Reading Coach**	1B.1. **Use of school Progress Monitoring tools, observations in the classrooms**	1B.1. **School Progress Monitoring tools, Writing samples collected each 9 weeks**
Writing Goal #1B: **Most of the students at Gretchen Everhart are performing at a Participatory level and are provided instruction at that level. Most students will score below a Level 4 since a Level 4 indicates students are instructionally at a supportive level.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **17% of the students scored a Level 4 or higher 48% of the students scored a Level 3 or higher**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **17% will score a Level 4 or higher 50% will score a level 3 or higher**					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

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
AAC and Assistive Technology	**K – 12th**	**Courtney Benedix LATS**	**All teachers**	**Ongoing as needed**	**Observation in classrooms**	**Technology Teacher LATS Principal, Assistant Principal**
How to use technology tools to provide effective instruction to students	**Pre k – 12th**	**Courtney Benedix Lorrie Corry LATS**	**All teachers**	**Weekly as needed**	**Demonstration in the classroom**	**Principal Technology Teacher**
Communication and impact on literacy and academic instruction	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen SLPs LATS**	**All teachers**	**Monthly as needed**	**Documented in iObservation visits to classrooms**	**Principal , Assistant Principal SLPs, LATS**
Effective strategies to use with students with autism	**Pre K – 12th**	**Lorrie Corry Alison Kiser**	**All teachers interested in the COL Book Study**	**Monthly meetings**	**Monthly sharing with others about implementation**	**TEC Rep – Betsy Pittinger**
Effective instructional strategies based on Marzano's work on the Art and Science of Teaching	**Pre K – 12th**	**Jane Floyd Bullen Kent Hamilton Vicky Droze Zellanye Hutchins**	**All teachers**	**Bi monthly sharing of information at Faculty meetings and Navigational meetings**	**iObservation data Self Reflection / Assessments Peer Observations**	**Principal Assistant Principal**

DRAFT

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of technology to access instruction	**Alternate pencils, Computer Access Stations, Word Prediction software, lamination and printing,**	**Technology dollars, FDLRS, District media Center**	**$10,000**
Subtotal: $10,000			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Technology training as appropriate	**Presenter Stipends, release time**	**TEC, Title II, FDLRS,**	**$2,000**
Subtotal: $2,000			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $12,000			

End of Writing Goals

DRAFT

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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			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: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* **N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	**N/A**	**N/A**					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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. A majority of the students at Everhart have significant health and medical conditions (medically fragile) and frequent medical appointments that make school attendance a challenge.	1.1. Attendance secretary and Guidance Counselor will monitor attendance daily and will consult with teachers, Social Worker and Principal about who is absent and who there are attendance concerns with during monthly attendance meetings	1.1. Attendance Secretary Guidance Counselor Principal Teachers Social Worker (Attendance Committee)	1.1. Monthly attendance review meetings, Trends in data Meetings with families to resolve attendance issues when needed	1.1. Attendance data from Genesis
Attendance Goal #1: **The school has been working very hard on increasing attendance and reducing tardies for the students at Everhart. Teachers are entering attendance information daily and have increased the documentation of reasons why students are abent.**	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* **Average daily attendance of students at Everhart was 89.22%** 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **72% of the students were absent for 10 or more days**	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* **Average daily attendance for students will 90% or more..** 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) **60% or less of the students will be absent no more than 10 days**					

DRAFT

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	There were 24 students with excessive (10 or more) unexcused tardies	**There will be 15 or less students with excessive (10 or more) unexcused tardies**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

DRAFT

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

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
Appropriate use of Genesis and Pinpoint to document attendance	**Pre K – 12th**	**Gayle Dove Principal Guidance Counselor**	**All teachers**	**Pre Planning As needed throughout the year during faculty meetings or informally**	**Attendance reports reviewed monthly**	**Principal Attendance Secretary Guidance Counselor Technology Teacher**

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
Use of Genesis and Pinpoint	**Trainers Application on all computers**	**District funds**	**$0**
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training on the use of Pinpoint and Genesis	**Trainers**	**District funds**	**$0**
Subtotal:			
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Mailing of attendance warning letters to families	**Stamps, envelopes, printing**	**School funds**	**$20**
Subtotal: $20			
Total: $20			

End of Attendance Goals

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. Use of in school and out of school suspension is not appropriate or used at this school at this time.	1.1. Use of Positive Behavior Support in each classroom and use of staff to help respond to dangerous situations. Use of seclusion and restraint when deemed appropriate based on district and state guidelines.	1.1 Principal, Behavior Analyst, ESE Director District Behavior Analyst	1.1. Review of blue card data. Review of data by the Behavior Support Team committee. Review of data entered into the state data base for the use of seclusion and restraint.	1.1. Documentation of incidents on school developed Blue Cards. Review of data based on Blue Cards. Review of data in State data base
Suspension Goal #1: **There is no need for in school or out of school suspensions at this school at this time.** **The school hopes to reduce the occurrence of the use of Seclusion and Restraint for this next year.**	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	0	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	0	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	0	**0**					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	0	**0**					

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

DRAFT

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
How to complete school developed Blue Cards	**Pre K – 12th**	**Judi O'Neil Christi Cherpak**	**All teachers and all Paraprofessional staff**	**Ongoing as needed**	**Review at B.S.T. committee meetings**	**Principal Behavior Analyst**
How to complete restraint / seclusion reports online	**Pre K – 12th**	**Behavior Analyst**	**Selected teachers and staff**	**Ongoing as needed**	**Review of draft reports prior to submission to DOE**	**Principal Behavior Analyst**
CPI / TEACH training	**Pre K – 12th**	**CPI and TEACH Trainers**	**All Staff**	**Ongoing, yearly for each person**	**Staff implementation in classrooms, recertification yearly**	**Principal / Trainers**

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of DOE database	**DOE database**	**DOE**	**$0**
Subtotal: $0			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
How to enter Seclusion / Restraint reports	**School and district created forms Trainers**	**School funds**	**$0**
CPI / TEACH Training	**Trainers Stipends and release time**	**District ESE funds FDLRS School funds**	**$500**
Subtotal: $500			

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Mailing reports to families	**Stamps** **Copying and printing**	**School funds**	**$200**
Subtotal: $200			
Total: $700			

End of Suspension Goals

DRAFT

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. **Some students are not on the waiver when they graduate**	1.1. **Teachers, guidance counselor, and staffing specialist will begin talking with parents about applying for the waiver by the age of 14 or sooner during IEP meetings**	1.1. **Guidance Counselor ESE Staffing Specialist**	1.1. **School created form to document what families have in place**	1.1. **IEP**
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: Students are able to stay in school until they reach 21 years of age if there are unmet needs. **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* **0 students dropped out** 2012 Current Graduation Rate:* **100% of our students met graduation requirements**	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* **0 students will drop out** 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* **100% of our students will meet graduation requirements**	1.2. **Parents don't know about available services**	1.2. **School will maintain a Parent Connection Corner with computer access for parents and families** **School will host informational meetings for families**	**1.2. Guidance Counselor**	**1.2. Sign in logs**	**1.2. Sign in logs**
			1.3. There are limited post secondary options and placements for our students	**1.3. Students will spend their last 1-2 years visiting potential post graduation placement sites**	**1.3. Teachers in the Post Secondary Department**	**1.3. 100% of the graduates will have a placement identified upon graduation**	**1.3. Exit IEP conference upon graduation**

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Transition Fair	**6th – 12th grade**	**APD Reps Guidance Counselor Transition Committee**	**All interested students, caregivers and teachers**	**Spring, 2013**	**Information will be gathered for available services and placed in the Parent Connection Corner**	**Transition Committee Guidance Counselor**
How to conduct transition IEP meetings	**6th – 12th grade**	**ESE Staffing Specialist**	**All teachers**	**Monthly ESE Team meetings**	**Review of IEPs by staffing specialist**	**ESE Staffing Specialist**
How to write Quality IEPs	**Pre K – 12th**	**ESE Staffing Specialist Robin Garland Pam Erickson**	**All teachers**	**Fall, 2012**	**Review of IEPs by staffing specialist**	**ESE Staffing Specialist**

DRAFT

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
DOE Quality IEP manuals	**Manuals**	**DOE**	**$0**
Subtotal: $0			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
How to write Quality IEPs	**Trainers** **Release time**	**District ESE** **FDLRS**	**$0**
Transition Fair for families and staff	**Agencies and their Representatives**	**Agencies**	**$0**
Subtotal: $0			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Total: $0			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

DRAFT

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 don't clearly know expectations for students	**1.1** Newsletter, trainings, participation in IEP meetings, homework calendar, conferences, goal for parent participation for each classroom teacher.	**1.1.** Principal Teachers	**1.1.** Sign in sheets from meetings, attendance rates at IEP meetings, improvement in student attendance	**1.1.** Climate Survey, Genesis attendance data, school collected attendance sheets, data sheet for teachers to record parent participation in IEP meetings
Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Parent involvement is critical to the needs of our students and their ultimate success. Parents will be involved in IEP meetings and school functions.**	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* **82% of the parents were in attendance at IEP meetings** **Attendance at school sponsored activities will have at least 10 parents or more.**	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* **82% or more of the parents will be in attendance at IEP meetings** **Attendance at school sponsored activities will have at least 10 parents or more** **PreK Parent Support meetings will have at least 3 families monthly**					
			1.2. Parents don't feel they get information from the school in a timely and efficient manner	**1.2.** Maintain a Parent Connection Corner at the school where parents can access resources	**1.2.** Guidance Counselor	**1.2.** Sign in sheets from Users	**1.2.** Climate Survey results
			1.3. Parents don't feel they get information from the school	**1.3.** Send flyers home at least two times for events with one sent a	**1.3.** Receptionist Principal	**1.3.** Attendance at functions and input received from teachers/	**1.3.** Climate survey results, Attendance sheets

DRAFT

		in a timely and efficient manner	**week ahead, post events and announcements on the website, post events and announcements on the List Serv, staff will call families with limited computer access**	**PTO President Listserv Managers Teachers**	**parents**	

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 Trainings on topics identified by staff and parents	**Pre K – 12th**	**School personnel Invited speakers**	**Caregivers Staff**	**Throughout the year**	**Consultation with teachers and families Climate Survey Results**	**Administrators Teachers**
Training on Literacy and Communication	**Pre K – 12th**	**School staff Speakers**	**Caregivers Staff**	**Throughout the year**	**Consultation with teachers and families Climate Survey Results**	**Administrators Teachers**
Pre K Parent Support meetings	**Pre K**	**School staff Invited speakers**	**Caregivers Staff**	**Throughout the year**	**Consultation with teachers and families Climate Survey Results**	**Administrators Teachers**

DRAFT

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Access to computer resources	**Online resources available at the school**	**School funds, PTO funds, SMILE funds**	**$100**
Subtotal: $100			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Training events	**Childcare, handouts, lamination materials** **Printing and copying**	**SMILE funds** **Donations** **Agency funds**	**$300**
Subtotal: $300			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $0			
Total: $400			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

DRAFT

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. N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity 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

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)

DRAFT

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 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

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)

DRAFT

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: **N/A**	2012 Current Level :* **N/A**	2013 Expected Level :* **N/A**					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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)

DRAFT

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $37,900
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total: $10,000
Science Budget
Total: $8,200
Writing Budget
Total: $12,000
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total: $20
Suspension Budget
Total: $700
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total: $0
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $400
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total: $69,220

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		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐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.
Quarterly or more frequent meetings to review progress on the School Improvement Plan. The S.A.C. will make recommendations for continual school improvement activities.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
There are no S.A.C. funds allocated this year.	$0