# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

## 2012-2013

# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### School Information

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Union Park Elementary | District Name: Orange |
| Principal: Ruth Velazquez | Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins |
| SAC Chair: Thomas Swonger | Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013 |

### Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

### Administrators

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

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Ruth Velazquez | BS-Mercy College MS-Herbert Lehman College Ed. Specialist- Nova Southeastern Certification- State of Florida ESOL Certification - State of Florida= Elementary Education Specific Learning Disabilities Ed. Leadership | 0 | 8 | Assistant Principal at Azalea Park 2004-2007 2004-2005 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 76%, Math Mastery: 64%, Writing Mastery 66%, Science Mastery: NA,AYP 93%, SWD students did not make AYP 2005-2006 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 65%, Science Mastery: NA, Writing Mastery 73%, AYP 82%ELL and SWD students did not make AYP 2006-2007 Grade B, Reading Mastery 72%, Math Mastery: 64%, Writing Mastery 63%, Science Mastery 26%, AYP 74%, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD students did not make AYP Assistant Principal at Legacy Middle School 2007-2010 2007-2008 Grade A, Reading Mastery 74%, Math Mastery: 69%, Writing Mastery: 91% Science Mastery: 52% AYP 87% Economically Disadvantage did not met AYP in reading, ELL did not make AYP, SWD did not make AYP in math 2008-2009 Grade A, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math Mastery: 66%, Writing Mastery 98%, Science Mastery 45%, AYP 72%, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP, ELL did not make AYP in math and SWD did not make AYP 2009-2010 Grade A Reading Mastery:73%, Math Mastery: 66%, Writing Mastery: 82%, Science Mastery:44%, AYP 82% Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD student did not make AYP 2010-2011 Grade C Reading Mastery :77%, Math mastery: 74%, Writing Mastery 74%; Science Mastery: 43% AYP: 72%nreading, 47% math, Hispanic: 58% reading, 62% math, Economically Disadvantaged: 62%% reading, 63% math: ELL; 45% reading, 56% math 2011-2012 Grade C Reading Mastery: 48%, Math Mastery: 45%, Writing Mastery 61%, Science Mastery 37%, Students |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | making learning gains in the lowest 25 %: Reading 70% and Math: 64%. The applied points were 438. Elementary: Principal of Cheney Elementary June 2012 |
| Assistant Principal | Amy Klaber | BA-Music Med-Ed Leadership | 1 | 1 | Instructional Coach at Bonneville Elementary rated an A school. 2009-2010, Reading Mastery:83%, Math Mastery 84%, Writing Mastery 82%, Science Mastery 65%, Learning Gains in Reading 63%, Learning Gains in in Math 58%, Lowest 25% Reading 58%, Lowest 25% Math 54, AYP met 84% 2008-2009, Reading Mastery 88%, Math 87%, Writing 94%, Science 59%, Learning Gains in Reading 76%, Learning Gains in Math 69%, Lowest 25% in Reading 69%, Lowest 25 in Math 70%. 95% AYP met. Assistant Principal of Union Park Elementary 2011 to Current: Reading Mastery:53 %, Math Mastery: 54 %, Writing Mastery: 59%, Science Mastery 41%, Learning Gains in Reading: 69%, Learning Gains in Math:76 %, Lowest 25% Reading:79 %, Lowest 25% Math : 64%, Was at Little River Elementary 2010-2011: Moved School Grade from B to A. Reading Mastery: 72 %, Math Mastery: 76%, Writing Mastery: 92%, Science Mastery 52%, Learning Gains in Reading: 64%, Learning Gains in Math: 75%, Lowest 25% Reading: 59%, Lowest 25% Math : 73%, AYP:95% 2010-2011 AYP criteria increased from 79% to 95%. Was at Bonneville Elementary rated an A school. 2009-2010, Reading Mastery:83%, Math Mastery 84%, Writing Mastery 82%, Science Mastery 65%, Learning Gains in Reading 63%, Learning Gains in in Math 58%, Lowest 25% Reading 58%, Lowest 25% Math 54, AYP met 84% 2008-2009, Reading Mastery 88%, Math 87%, Writing 94%, Science 59%, Learning Gains in Reading 76%, Learning Gains in Math 69%, Lowest 25% in Reading 69%, Lowest 25 in Math 70%. 95% AYP met. |

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

## Instructional Coaches

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading/Writing | Jennifer Summers | BS: Communications MA: Elementary K-6 Reading Endorsement ESE ESOL | 0 | 0 | Teacher at Little River Elementary 2010 to 2012. Moved School Grade from B to A. Reading Mastery: 72 %, Math Mastery: 76%, Writing Mastery: 92%, Science Mastery 52%, Learning Gains in Reading: 64%, Learning Gains in Math: 75%, Lowest 25% Reading: 59%, Lowest 25% Math: 73%, AYP: 95% 2010-2011 AYP criteria increased from 79% to 95%. |
| Math/Science | Sandra Sampayo | BS: Elementary Education MA: Early Childhood K-6 ESOL | 0 | 0 | 2011-2012 Math Coach at Ventura Elementary. Reading Mastery: 43 %, Math Mastery: 43%, Writing Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery 43%, Learning Gains in Reading: %, Learning Gains in Math: %, Lowest 25% Reading: 80%, Lowest 25% Math : 72%, |
| | | | | | |

## Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Mentoring New Teachers | CRT; Instructional Coaches | June 2013 |
| 2. Bi-Weekly Meeting | CRT; Instructional Coaches | June 2013 |
| 3. Coaching and Support | CRT; Instructional Coaches | On Going |
| 4. Encourage local partnership of local universities of education to recruit and retain quality, highly effective teachers. | Assistant Principal; CRT | On Going |

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

## *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 2 | They are assigned a mentor and taking the necessary courses to complete the requirements to becoming highly effective. |

## *Staff Demographics*

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44 | 25% (11) | 30% (14) | 27% (12) | 16%(7) | 23% (10) | 98%(42) | 9%(4) | 7% (3) | 77% (34) |

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

*Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan*

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|
| Shauna Alder | Jennifer Stapleton | Experienced teacher/has served as a mentor in previous years/ has supervised senior interns/has clinical educator training/ instructing same subject/Team Leader | PLC Activities; Monthly beginning teacher meetings; Meet daily/weekly to plan lessons and discuss areas of need and progress in completion of Teacher Induction Program components. |
| Kimberley Klein | Gabriela Morris | Experienced teacher/has served as a mentor in previous years/has supervised senior interns/has clinical educator training/instructing same subject/Team Leader | PLC Activities; Monthly beginning teacher meetings; Meet daily/weekly to plan lessons and discuss areas of need and progress in completion of Teacher Induction Program components. |
| Laura Ferringer | Cristina Vales | Experienced teacher/has served as a mentor in previous years/ has supervised senior interns/has clinical educator training/ instructing same subject/Team Leader | PLC Activities; Monthly beginning teacher meetings; Meet daily/weekly to plan lessons and discuss areas of need and progress in completion of Teacher Induction Program components. |
| Dayanara Soto | Megan Rosenberg | Experienced teacher/has served as a mentor in previous years/has supervised senior interns/has clinical educator training/Team Leader. | PLC Activities; Monthly beginning teacher meetings; Meet daily/weekly to plan lessons and discuss areas of need and progress in completion of Teacher Induction Program components. |

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

**Additional Requirements**

*Coordination and Integration-*<span style="color:red">**Title I Schools Only**</span>
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 <br><br> Union Park Elementary is a Title I school, therefore receives additional federal funding for use with high needs students. The majority of our Title I funds are used to fund staff positions and provide additional instructional support. The remainder of the funds are used for staff development, instructional materials and parental involvement activities. |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant <br> NA |
| Title I, Part D <br> NA |
| Title II <br> The district receives Title II funds which are subsequently distributed to schools to be utilized for staff development activities for school based staff. At Union Park ES, funds will be used to provide staff development in the areas of reading and math. |
| Title III <br> Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of English Language Learners. Any additional funds are distributed to the school for purchase of instructional materials. |
| Title X- Homeless <br> Homeless district and school based personnel provide resources such as clothing, school supplies, social services referrals for Students identified as homeless (under the McKinney-Vento Act). |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) <br> SAI funds will provide tutoring services for our level 1 and 2 students in grades 4 &5.  We will also provide tutoring for previously retained 3rd graders. The remainder of the funds will be used to purchase instructional materials. |
| Violence Prevention Programs <br> NA |
| Nutrition Programs <br> Our Physical Education department provides instruction in how to make healthy food choices. Students are given opportunity to plan healthy meal selections for breakfast, lunch, snack and dinner. Food services manager displays the food pyramid which has suggested nutritional daily portion requirements for healthy eating. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Housing Programs<br>NA | |
| Head Start<br>NA | |
| Adult Education | |
| Career and Technical Education<br>NA | |
| Job Training<br>NA | |
| Other<br>NA | |

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

| *Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)*School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.<br>Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.<br>Principal: Ruth Velazquez<br>Assistant Principal: Amy Klaber<br>RTI Coordinator:  Kristin DeSanctis<br>School Psychologist:  Maria Soong<br>Classroom Teachers<br>Speech and Language: Mary Hazlinsky<br>CRT: Sandra Sampayo<br>Reading Coach: Jennifer Summers<br>ESE Teacher: Joan Skrivseth |
| 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?<br>Principal and Assistant Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making,<br>ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures<br>implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI<br>implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities<br>Instructional Support and RTI Coordinator, provides services and expertise on interventions for individual students.<br>Instructional staff primary and intermediate will delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and<br>integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.  ESE teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials<br>into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Reading<br>Instructional Specialist: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in<br>data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional<br>planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.  School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis<br>of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and<br>technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection Guidance Counselor and staffing specialist:<br>provides background information on children and what services the child is receiving. |
| 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?<br>Looking at previous year's school data the team collaborated in compiling a plan to address areas of strength and weaknesses (concerns) for reading, math, writing, science, attendance, CELLA, demographic deficits and parent involvement. |
| MTSS Implementation |
| Teachers and MTSS team will identify at risk students based PLC data meetings which will include classroom performance and periodic assessment. MTSS team (includes teachers who work with the students) meet to discuss appropriate interventions and strategies to address identified needs. Principal |

assigns tasks to team members regarding instructional materials, who will provide intervention, and progress monitoring
duties and professional development to address the needs of all students.
Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Assessment and Information Management System (AIMS
web), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, AIMS web, Curriculum Based Measurement
(CBM), FCAT Simulation Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), End of year: FAIR, AIMS web, FCAT
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis Data will be input weekly on SharePoint for preview by
administration weekly and RtI team bi-weekly.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Assessment and Information Management System (AIMS
web), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, AIMS web, Curriculum Based Measurement
(CBM), FCAT Simulation Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), End of year: FAIR, AIMS web, FCAT
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis Data will be input weekly on SharePoint for preview by
administration weekly and RtI team bi-weekly. Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time, Wednesday professional
development whole group and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs
during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS
Meeting with the MTSS monthly to look at trends noted during the RTI meeting in order to incorporate FCIM into our school wide focused plans.

*Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)*

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

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br>Jennifer Summers---reading coach<br>Ruth Velazquez---principal<br>Amy Klaber---assistant principal<br>Adrian Green---Instructional Support<br>Dawn Plagianes---Instructional Support<br>Kristin DeSanctis---ESE<br>Sandra Sampayo---CRT<br>Dayanara Soto---classroom teacher<br>Melissa Silva---classroom teacher<br>Don Kuhl- PE Teacher |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).<br>The team will meet monthly to focus on all 6 areas of the reading process this will encourage, provide support, ideas and motivation for reading throughout the school. Based on school reading trends data they will make recommendations and review any recommendations for further interventions. The Union Par ES School Literacy Team meets monthly to discuss Literacy Activities that will address areas of deficits in reading. Brainstorming sessions are held to determine what strategies best address the areas of weakness and this council will function as a PLC. Parent Initiatives are planned. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?<br>The expansion of our Accelerated Reader program. The establishment of reading goals for grade levels and individual students concerning AR. Exploring parent resource centers at other schools with the future goal of implementing one at LCE and conducting two Literacy Nights to increase parent involvement. Provide support to ensure that students are receiving appropriate intervention and enrichment instructions. |

*Public School Choice*

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  *Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.*

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

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

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

Students attending Union Park Elementary pre-school attend full day. They are given the opportunity to visit kindergarten classrooms during the last nine week quarter to experience the kindergarten classroom. They also participate in lunch and field trips with the current kindergarten students. Their parents have the opportunity to participate in training sessions on preparing their children for kindergarten.

*\*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?

NA

*\*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?

NA

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?

Union Park ES is incorporating Destination College in grades 3-5 this school year.  The school is also promoting college and career readiness throughout the school displaying where faculty and staff have attended universities or vocational schools to encourage future goals and visions.

*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.

NA

**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. Student population includes a high number of students who are ELL and considered Economically Disadvantaged who consistently demonstrate limited vocabulary and word usage needs. | 1A.1. Focus on building vocabulary through enhanced instructional strategies Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher Instructional Coaches Kathy Lathrop | 1A.1. Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations,  Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | 1A.1. FAIR, Imagine It!, Edusoft, Formative Assessments, FCAT 2.0 |
| Reading Goal #1A:  Number of students performing at level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 30% or higher. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *2012 FCAT results showed that 25% (76) of all students scored a level 3.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *By July 2013, 30% (92) of all students taking FCAT will score a level 3* | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. High Percentage of students not reading on grade level. | 1A.2. Provide appropriate differentiated instruction and monitor student progress Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, RTI Team, Classroom Teacher | 1A.2. Literacy Leadership Meetings, Renaissance Place data and SuccessMaker data monitoring | 1A.2. FCAT 2.0 Reading, FAIR, SuccessMaker data, STAR data, Eudosft, Imagine It! Benchmarks |
| | | | 1A.3. Lack of consistent use effective evidence based instructional practices. | 1A.3. Professional development addressing evidence based best practices on instructional delivery and presentation Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Team, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher, Instructional Coach Kathy Lathrop | 1A.3. PLC professional development follow up meetings, formal and informal observations and data dialogues | 1A.3. Edusoft, Formative Assessments, Thinking Maps, FCAT 2.0, Marzano Evaluation Model |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Reading Goal #1B: NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in* | | | | | |

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

| | this box. | this box. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 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 and 5 in reading.** | | | 2A.1. Providing effective enrichment to maintain and/or accelerate reading achievement. | 2A.1. Work with grade levels to address planning for differentiated instruction that will meet the needs of all students. | 2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, CRT, RtI Team, Classroom Teacher Kathy Lathrop | 2A.1. Compliance teacher will monitor afternoon program. Compliance teacher will review data with bilingual instructor to see where weaknesses exist. | 2A.1. 2013 FCAT Reading FAIR Imagine It Benchmark Assessments AR Success Maker Reports Edusoft Benchmark and Mini Assessments |
| Reading Goal #2A: Number of students performing at level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase by 5% resulting in at least 31% or higher | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *2012 FCAT results showed that 26% (80) of all students scored a level 4 or 5.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *By July 2013, 31% (95) of all students taking FCAT will score a level 4 or 5.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Providing Higher Order thinking activities that promote student enrichment. | 2A.2. Work with grade levels to address planning for differentiated instruction that will meet the needs of all students | 2A.2. Teacher Media Specialist Reading Coach CRT Instructional Coach Principal Kathy Lathrop | 2A.2. Compliance teacher will monitor afternoon program. Compliance teacher will review data with bilingual instructor to see where weaknesses exist. | 2A.2. Benchmark Assessments Imagine It Tests Formative Assessments FAIR |
| | | | | | | | |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.** | | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| Reading Goal #2B: NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

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

| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.** | | | 3A.1. Lack of understanding how to deconstruct standards for standards based instruction. | 3A.1. Provide professional development and coaching support on deconstructing standards and standards based teaching | 3A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Instructional Coach, grade level team leaders | 3A.1. Review and discuss data with grade level teams and leadership team | 3A.1. FCAT 2.0, FAIR, Imagine It! Benchmark Assessments, Renaissance Place monitoring data, SuccessMaker data, Edsoft and observations |
| Reading Goal #3A: *Number of students performing at level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase by 5% resulting in at least 68% or higher* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *2012 FCAT results showed that 63% (193) of students made learning gains.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *By July 2013, 68% of students taking FCAT will make learning gains.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2. Lack of understanding the importance of standards based instruction. | 3A.2. Provide professional development and coaching support on deconstructing standards and standards based teaching | 3A.2. Teacher Media Specialist Reading Coach CRT Principal | 3A.2. Use of Common Assessment Data Dialogue PLC Observations Focus Calendars | 3A.2. FCAT 2.0, FAIR, Imagine It! Benchmark Assessments, Renaissance Place monitoring data, SuccessMaker data, Edsoft and observations |
| | | | 3A.3. Lack deep understanding of appropriate use of progress monitoring and using data to drive/change instruction. | 3A.3. Monthly progress monitoring meetings to support and continue training on making decisions based on student progress. | 3A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI team, classroom teachers | 3A.3. Review, coach and discuss data with individual teachers, grade level teams and RtI team | 3A.3. Progress monitoring graphs, appropriate data monitoring posted on SharePoint |
| **3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.** | | | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| Reading Goal #3B: **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4A.1. Accurately targeting students in need of reading interventions. | 4A.1. Focus on intervention and RTI process across all grade levels | 4A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach RTI Team Kathy Lathrop | 4A.1. Review data with RTI team and teacher that will focus on success of intervention groups | 4A.1. 2013 FCAT Reading FAIR Imagine It Benchmark Assessment Success Maker Reports Edusoft |
| Reading Goal #4A: *Number of students in the lowest 25% FCAT will improve by 5%, resulting in 75% of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 72% of the Lowest 25% made learning gains.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013 75% of the Lowest 25% students will make leaning gains.* | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2. Students not wanting to read. | 4A.2. To utilize Accelerated Reader Incentive Program to promote reading. | 4A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teachers | 4A.2. Monitor the use of Accelerated Reading by classroom and students | 4A.2. AR Reports FAIR |
| | | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. |
| **4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. |
| Reading Goal #4B: NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. |
| | | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. |

| 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** | In 2012 FCAT reading 57% of the students were proficient. | In 2013 it is expected that 61% of the students will be proficient in reading. | In 2014 it is expected that 65% of the students be proficient in reading. | In 2015 it is expected that 69% of the students be proficient in reading. | In 2016 it is expected that 73% of the students be proficient in reading. | In 2017 it is expected that 77% of the students be proficient in reading. |
| Reading Goal #5A:<br><br>The Number of students making progress based on FCAT will improve by 4% each consecutive year resulting in the specific targeted goals being met. | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5B.1.<br>Students in the AYP group black and Hispanics are not making satisfactory gains in reading. | 5B.1.<br>Provide direct research based instruction as part of their intervention (phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, EIR)<br>Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 5B.1.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Reading Coach<br>Classroom Teacher<br>Instructional Coaches Kathy Lathrop | 5B.1.<br>Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | 5B.1.<br>Imagine It! Benchmark Assessments, Renaissance Place progress monitoring data, Reading Success intervention data, matrix data, Edusoft, FCAT 2.0 |
| Reading Goal #5B:<br><br>Number of students in specific subgroups making progress in FCAT will improve by 5% resulting in the specific targeted goals being met by the students. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 61%<br>Black:41%<br>Hispanic:51%<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:68%<br>Black:58%<br>Hispanic:58%<br>Asian: N/A<br>American Indian: N/A | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2.<br>Understanding and effective execution of teaching reading comprehension skills and strategies. | 5B.2.<br>Implementation of a "What Counts" box to help students with understanding and personal monitoring. Implementation of writing throughout all content areas<br>Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 5B.2.<br>Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Instructional Coach and classroom teachers Kathy Lathrop | 5B.2.<br>Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | 5B.2.<br>Imagine It! Benchmark Assessments, Renaissance Place progress monitoring data, Reading Success intervention data, matrix data, Edusoft, FCAT 2.0 |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | 5C.1 Student population includes a high number of students who are ELL and considered Economically Disadvantaged. | 5C.1 Focus on building vocabulary through enhanced instructional strategies Florida Ready Reading as intervention | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher Instructional Coaches Kathy Lathrop | Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | FAIR, Imagine It!, Edusoft, Formative Assessments, FCAT 2.0 |
| Reading Goal #5C: *Number of ELL students making progress in FCAT will make 5% progress in reading, resulting in 51% making reading progress.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 46% of the ELL students were proficient* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013, 51% of the ELL students will be proficient.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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 Students with disabilities are not retaining vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. | 5D.1 Focus on building vocabulary through enhanced instructional strategies Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 5D.1 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom Teacher Instructional Coaches Kathy Lathrop | 5D.1 Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | 5D.1 FAIR, Imagine It!, Edusoft, Formative Assessments, FCAT 2.0 |
| Reading Goal #5D: *Number of student with disabilities (SWD) in FCAT will make 5% progress, resulting in 31% of the SWD making reading progress.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 26% of the SWD students made progress.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013, 31% of the SWD students will make progress in reading.* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2 Lack of effective evidence based instructional practices | 5D.2 Professional development addressing evidence based best practices on instructional delivery and presentation Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 5D.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Team, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher, Instructional Coach Kathy Lathrop | 5D.2 PLC professional development follow up meetings, formal and informal observations and data dialogues | 5D.2 Edusoft, Formative Assessments, Thinking Maps, FCAT 2.0, Marzano Evaluation Model |
| | | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | 5E.1. Students who are economically disadvantaged are not retaining vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. | 5E.1 Focus on building vocabulary through enhanced instructional strategies Florida Ready Reading as intervention | 5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Team, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher, Instructional Coach Kathy Lathrop | 5E.1. Monitoring Instruction, Common Board Configuration, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, FAIR, Imagine It! Edusoft | 5E.1. FAIR, Imagine It!, Edusoft, Formative Assessments, FCAT 2.0 |

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* |
|---|---|---|
| Reading Goal #5E: *Number of economically disadvantaged students will making progress on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in 59% of the economically disadvantaged students making leaning gains.* | *In 2012 48% of the economically disadvantaged students made progress.* | *In 2013, 59% of the economically disadvantaged students will make progress in reading.* |

| | 5E.2. Teachers uncomfortable with providing small group centers. | 5E.2. Professional Development on developing effective small group centers. | 5E.2 Principal, Assistant Principal Reading Coach CRT Classroom Teacher | 5E.2. Monitoring classrooms during small group instruction. | 5E.2. Imagine It Formative Assessments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consultant to do demonstration lessons and side by side coaching driven by data. | K-5 | Kathy Lathrop | K-5 Instructional | Throughout the year | Looking at data after demonstrated lessons and coaching. | Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |
| Pre-Pre Planning Professional Development focuses on EIR, SRA, and Language for Learning, Reading Success. | K-5 | Kathy Lathrop | K-2 Instructional | Summer | Observations during intervention plus student data meetings | Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach |
| How to plan for small group instruction | K-5 | CRT/Reading Coach | K-5 Instructional/Para-Professionals | Throughout the year | Observations of instructional | Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT |
| Staff development in building vocabulary capacity. | K-5 | CRT/Reading Coach | Grade Level professional development | Throughout the year | Classroom observations (word walls, vocabulary lists) | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach and CRT |

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

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

| Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Florida Ready | FCAT Preparation | Title 1 | $ 6580.50 |
| Reading Plus | Reading Intervention | General Fund | $10, 308.00 |
| | | | Subtotal:$16,888.50 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Success Maker | Program to reinforce and progress monitor students in reading. | General Funds | $19,496.00 |
| Renaissance Learning (Accelerated Reader) | To encourage and progress monitor reading | General Funds | $4,400.00 |
| | | | Subtotal:$23,896.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Kathy Lathrop | Demonstrate reading lessons for intervention groups, coaches and consults with teachers, | Title 1 | $2550.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$2550.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total:$43334.50 |

*End of Reading Goals*

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

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #1:<br><br>In June of 2013, 51% of LY students taking the CELLA will be proficient in listening and speaking. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:<br><br>Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking for 2011/2012 school year. 45% (108) | 1.1 Parents have a language barrier and have trouble supporting students at home. | 1.1 Establish bilingual classes for parents 2 times a week to increase listening and speaking skills. | 1.1 Principal Assistant Principal Compliance Teacher Bilingual Instructor | 1.1 Compliance teacher will monitor afternoon program Review data every two weeks to ensure parents are increasing skills | 1.1 Parents will be tested on the LAB and MAT to determine level of proficiency to establish baseline data<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Quizzes/Oral Assessments |
| | | 1.2 Students unable to improve their listening and verbal skills. | 1.2 Media center specials will be implemented during the 2012/2013 school year. Students will rotate through media center for additional time to read and reinforce strategies taught in the classroom. Imagine Learning will be implemented to focus on listening and verbal skills. | 1.2 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Media Specialist Compliance Teacher | 1.2 Progress monitoring data meetings will be held every two weeks to discuss increase in proficiency for all LY students. | 1.2 OCPS benchmark tests, FAIR, Success Maker reports, fluency testing in intervention groups.<br><br>Renaissance Place |
| | | 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.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #2:<br><br>In June of 2013, 47% of LY students taking the CELLA will be proficient in reading. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:<br><br>Students scoring proficient in reading for 2011/2012 school year. 41% (79) | 2.1 Parents have a language barrier and have trouble supporting students at home. | 2.1 Bilingual classes will be held 2 times a week to help increase reading skills of parents. | 2.1 Principal Assistant Principal Compliance Teacher Bilingual Instructor Reading Coach | 2.1 Compliance teacher will monitor afternoon program. Compliance teacher will review data with bilingual instructor to see where weaknesses exist. | 2.1 Baseline data from LAB and MAT to determine level of proficiency.<br><br>Lesson Plans<br><br>Quizzes/Weekly meetings with parents to discuss increase in reading skills. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.2. Students have a language barrier that impedes them from being proficient reading. | 2.2 Students will be placed in intervention groups based on level of proficiency using appropriate in program placement assessment/test. | 2.2 Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Classroom teachers Compliance Teacher | 2.2 Weekly progress monitoring of LY students.<br><br>Data meetings to be held every two weeks to examine data.<br><br>Monitor pacing/amount of lessons completed weekly | 2.2 OCPS benchmark tests, FAIR, Success Maker reports. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| 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.**<br><br>CELLA Goal #3:<br><br>*Students scoring proficient in writing for 2011/2012 school year.  40% (71)* | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br><br>*In June of 2013, 45% of LY students taking CELLA with be proficient in writing* | 2.1. Lack of oral language skills: vocabulary, speaking, writing, in English.<br><br>Mobility rate is high in our school | 2.1.  Provide all teachers with information on the writing standards to be taught and assessed in their grade level including changes to the FCAT Writing<br><br>Writing will be done throughout all grade levels inclusive of grades K through 3 with emphasis on 3rd grade to prepare students for future test | 2.1. Principal Assistant Principal Compliance Teacher Writing Coach | 2.1. Provide PD for teachers in Write from the Beginning.<br><br>Update sessions on FCAT changes for all staff, visits classrooms during the writing block to see strategies taught. | 2.1.  Copies of sign in sheets from PD sessions, agendas and handouts, classroom walkthrough documents |
| | | Parents have a language barrier and have trouble supporting students at home.<br><br>Students lack the motivation for writing and being creative. | 2.2. Provide specific PD to 3rd and 4th grade teachers on the writing process and rubric training. | 2.2. Assistant Principal Principal Instructional Coach Writing Coach Compliance teacher | 2.2. Conduct PD for teachers, visit classrooms during the writing block to see strategies being taught | 2.2. Copies of sign in sheets from PD sessions, agendas and handouts, samples of student writing |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

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

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Parent ESOL Classes | Parents will be offered English classes twice a week after school. | Title III | $3040.00 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$3040.00** |
| | | | **Total:$3040.00** |

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1A:<br><br>Number of students performing at level 3 on FCAT will increase by 5% resulting in at least 29% of students scoring at level 3. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 24% students scored a level 3 in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 29% students will score a level 3 in mathematics* | 1A.1.<br>Effective implementations of instructional practices that help students learn conceptual understanding of mathematics. | 1A.1.<br>Conduct professional development to enhance teachers' own content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge on how to teach mathematical concepts to mastery (in contrast to procedural knowledge)<br><br>As well as coaching (conferencing, feedback, reflection), modeling, and co-teaching to enhance teachers' skills. | 1A.1.<br>Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) | 1A.1.<br>Monitoring formative and summative assessments, Classroom observation of math instruction | 1A.1.<br>Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| | . | | 1A.2.<br>Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 1A.2.<br>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction. PD on differentiated instruction. Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | 1A.2.<br>Principal Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) | 1A.2.<br>Data Meetings Classroom observation of math instruction | 1A.2. 1A.2.<br>Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| | | | 1A.3.<br>Lack of mathematics fluency in current and previous grades. | 1A.3.<br>Usage of SuccessMaker Math<br><br>Professional development on how to develop mathematical fluency at all grade levels with real-time strategies that do not include drilling of skills. | 1A.3.<br>Principal Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) Teachers | 1A.3.<br>1A.3.<br>SuccessMaker reports Timed math assessments | 1A.3. 1A.3.<br>Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1B:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in* | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |

| | *this box.* | *this box.* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 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 and 5 in mathematics.** | | | 2A.1. Teachers' ability to provide challenging and enriching learning experiences for students so they continue to make progress and maintain or increase their mathematical proficiency. | 2A.1. Professional development on ways to teach and assess at higher levels of cognitive complexity (Webb's Depth of Knowledge); as well as ways to develop critical thinking (CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice) and 21st Century Skills. | 2A.1. Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) | 2A.1. Monitoring formative and summative assessments, Classroom observation of math instruction | 2A.1. Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| Mathematics Goal #2A: Number of students performing at level 4 and 5 on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 31% of students scoring at level 4 and/or 5. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 26% students scored a level 4 and 5 in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2012 31% students will score a level 4 and 5 in mathematics* | | | | | |
| | . | | 2A.2. Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 2A.2. Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction. Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress | 2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) | 2A.2. Data Meetings Classroom observation of math instruction | 2A.2. Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| | | | 2A.3. Since so many more students are performing below or at grade level, there is limited time to address the needs of our higher achieving students so they continue to grow. | 2A.3. The intervention schedule for reading will include a rotating block for the "enrichment" group which will include math enrichment. | 2A.3. CRT (Math Coach) Enrichment teachers | 2A.3. Monitoring formative and summative assessments, Enrichment teachers planning meetings | 2A.3. Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | | 2A.1. | 2A.1. . | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| NA | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3A.1. Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 3A.1. Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction. Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | 3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT (Math Coach) | 3A.1. Data Meetings, Classroom observation of math instruction | 3A.1. Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| Mathematics Goal #3A:<br><br>**Number of students making learning gains on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 74% of students scoring at level 4 and/or5.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 69% students made learning gains in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 74% students will make learning gains in mathematics* | | | | | |
| | | | 3A.2 Effective implementations of instructional practices that help students learn conceptual understanding of mathematics. | 3A.2 Conduct professional development to enhance teachers' own content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge on how to teach mathematical concepts to mastery (in contrast to procedural knowledge)<br><br>As well as coaching (conferencing, feedback, reflection), modeling, and co-teaching to enhance teachers' skills. | 3A.2 Assistant Principal CRT/Math Coach | 3A.2 Monitoring formative and summative assessments, Classroom observation of math instruction | 3A.2 Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| | | | 3A.3. Lack of using formative assessments to track progress and inform planning. | 3A.3. Conduct professional development to enhance teachers' ability to create formative assessments. Co-plan with teachers to create and plan for formative assessment. | 3A.3. Assistant Principal CRT/Math Coach | 3A.3. Instructional Resource Teachers planning with teams, Classroom observation of math instruction | 3A.3. 3A.3. Observation record Formative assessments, Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |

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

| 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:<br><br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. | | | 4A.1.<br>Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 4A.1.<br>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction.<br><br>Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | 4A.1.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT | 4A.1.<br>Data Meetings,<br>Classroom observation of math instruction | 4A.1.<br>Formative assessments,<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |
| Mathematics Goal #4A:<br><br>**Number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 69% of the students in the lowest 25% making learning gains.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 64% students in the lowest 25%made learning gains in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 69% students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics* | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2.<br>Tutoring attendance | 4A.2.<br>Provide access to after school tutoring | 4A.2.<br>SES Coordinators | 4A.2.<br>Monitor student academic programs and performance data | 4A.2.<br>Attendance roster<br>Formative assessments,<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4A.3.<br>Lack of materials to use for remediation. | 4A.3.<br>Professional development on how to use the Envision Intervention kit, IMS resources, and math resource room materials. | 4A.3.<br>CRT/Math Coach | 4A.3.<br>Data meetings,<br>Classroom observation of math instruction | 4A.3.<br>Formative assessments,<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |
| **4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #4B:<br><br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:** <br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | |
| | | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. |
| | | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. |

| 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%.**<br>Mathematics Goal #5A:<br><br>The Number of students making progress based on FCAT will improve by 4% each consecutive year resulting in the specific targeted goals being met. | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | In 2012 FCAT mathematics 54% of the students were proficient. | In 2013 it is expected that 53% of the students will be proficient in math. | In 2014 it is expected that 58% of the students be proficient in math. | In 2015 it is expected that 63% of the students be proficient in reading. | In 2016 it is expected that 67% of the students will be proficient in math. | In 2017 it is expected that 72% of the students will be proficient in math. |
| 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 | |

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

| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5B.1.<br>Students come from various backgrounds and individual needs vary greatly. | 5B.1.<br>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to conduct differentiated instruction to meet the various needs in the classroom. | 5B.1.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT (Math Coach) | 5B.1.<br>Data Meetings,<br>Classroom observation of math instruction | 5B.1.<br>Observation record<br>Formative assessments,<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br><br>**Number of students in our subgroups making learning gains on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 69% of students making learning gains.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>White:66<br>Black:48<br>Hispanic:51<br>Asian: NA<br>American Indian: NA | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>White: 58<br>Black: 43<br>Hispanic: 53<br>Asian: NA<br>American Indian: NA | | | | | |
| | | | 5B.2.<br>Ethnicity subgroups' progress is not monitored. | 5B.2.<br>Use EDW to print reports for teachers based on ethnicity subgroups to disaggregate during data meetings. | 5B.2.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT | 5B.2.<br>Monitor students' progress per reporting categories. | 5B.2.<br>Benchmark<br>Mini-Benchmark<br>FCAT |
| | | | 5B.3.<br>Lack of parent involvement and understanding of Mathematics. | 5B.3.<br>Focus on parent involvement at all family events and encourage support through parent liaison | 5B.3.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Parent Liaison | 5B.3.<br>Teacher and student feedback, student assessment, informal and formal observations | 5B.3.<br>Sign-in sheets at parent involvement events |

| 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.<br>Students who are English language learners have a limited academic vocabulary. | 5C.1.<br>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to provide effective vocabulary instruction. | 5C.1.<br>CRT/Math Coach<br>Reading Coach | 5C.1.<br>Classroom observation<br>Student progress on assessments | 5C.1.<br>Observation record<br>Formative assessments,<br>enVision Math Tests (online data),<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |
| Mathematics Goal #5C:<br><br>**Number of Ell students making progress on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 48% of students making progress in mathematics.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 47% of ELL students made progress in FCAT 2.0* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 50% of ELL students will make progress in mathematics* | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2<br>Lack of parent involvement and understanding of Mathematics. | 5C.2<br>Focus on parent involvement at all family events and encourage support through parent liaison | 5C.2<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Parent Liaison | 5C.2<br>Teacher and student feedback, student assessment, informal and formal observations | 5C.2<br>Sign-in sheets at parent involvement events |
| | | | 5C.3.<br>Lack of use of manipulative in mathematics instruction. | 5C.3.<br>Instructional coaches plan with teams and ensure there is a balance of manipulative use in their lesson plans. | 5C.3.<br>Instructional coaches | 5C.3.<br>Classroom observation<br>Lesson Plan Audits | 5C.3.<br>Observation record<br>Formative assessments,<br>enVision Math Tests (online data),<br>Mini Benchmark tests, |

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

| | | | Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
|---|---|---|---|

| 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. Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 5D.1. Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction.<br><br>Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | 5D.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT | 5D.1. Data Meetings, Classroom observation of math instruction | 5D.1. Formative assessments, enVision Math Tests (online data), Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br><br>**Number of students with disabilities (SWD) making progress on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 23% of SWD making progress in mathematics.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 16% students in the SWD made learning gains in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 21% SWD students will make learning gains in mathematics* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. Teachers have difficulty adjusting lessons so SWD have access to the content being taught. | 5D.2. Instructional Coaches will plan with teams and ensure use of the ESE strategy resources available, including on IMS. | 5D.2. Instructional Coaches Staffing Specialist | 5D.2. Classroom observation Lesson Plan Audits | 5D.2. Observation record Formative assessments, enVision Math Tests (online data), Mini Benchmark tests, Benchmark (Edusoft) test FCAT |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5E.1. Lack of parent involvement and understanding of Mathematics. | 5E.1. Focus on parent involvement at all family events and encourage support through parent liaison | 5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Parent Liaison CRT (Math Coach) | 5E.1. Teacher and student feedback, student assessment, informal and formal observations | 5E.1. Sign-in sheets at parent involvement events |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br><br>**Number of Economically Disadvantaged students making progress on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 54% of the students making progress in mathematics.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 52%of Economically Disadvantaged - students made satisfactory progress in mathematics* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 54%of Economically Disadvantaged - students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics* | | | | | |

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

| | | 5E.2.<br>Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction. | 5E.2.<br>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct differentiated instruction.<br><br>Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | 5E.2.<br>Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT (Math Coach) | 5E.2.<br>Data Meetings,<br>Classroom observation of math instruction | 5E.2.<br>Formative assessments,<br>Mini Benchmark tests,<br>Benchmark (Edusoft) test<br>FCAT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*


## 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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:* | | | | | |

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

| NA | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 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 and 5 in mathematics.** | | | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2A:<br><br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 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:<br><br>NA. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |

| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

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

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

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

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5A: *NA* | | | | | | | |

| 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: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |

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

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

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

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

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*


## 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

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

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

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*

## 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 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:<br><br>*NA* | **2012 Current Level of Performance:\*** / **2013 Expected Level of Performance:\*** *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| **3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | | | | | | |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3A:<br><br>*NA* | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.** | | | 3B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Algebra 1 Goal #3B:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| | | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. |
| | | | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. |

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

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

**<u>Geometry End-of-Course Goals</u>** *(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: <br> NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br> *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br> *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Geometry Goal #2: <br> NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <br> *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <br> *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2011-2012** | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3A: <br><br>*NA* | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | 3B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| Geometry Goal #3B:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

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

| 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. |
| Geometry Goal #3E:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| PLC: Instructional coaches supporting use of IMS to support planning for ESE and ELL students. | K-5 | Instructional Coaches | K-5 | Ongoing weekly | Lesson plan review and teacher feedback | Instructional Coaches |
| Creating higher order (DOK) learning experiences and assessments | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | January 2013 | Classroom observations | Administration and Instructional Coaches |
| Data Disaggregation | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | K-5 | October 2012 | Data meetings | Administration and CRT |
| Differentiating Instruction and Utilizing small group instruction | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | K-5, paraprofessionals | September/October 2012 | Classroom observations | Administration and CRT |
| Vocabulary Instruction and Strategies | K-5, Specials | Jennifer Summers/Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | October 2012 | Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews | Administration and CRT |
| Creating and Using Formative Assessments | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | January 2013 | Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews | Administration and CRT |

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

| Using enVision Intervention Materials | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | K-5 | January 2013 | Data meetings and classroom observations | Administration and CRT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mathematical Content and Pedagogical Knowledge to Enhance Conceptual Understanding | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | Ongoing | Classroom observations | Administration and CRT |

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Success Maker | Instruction and Progress Monitoring | General Funds | $19,496.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$19,496.00** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$19,496.00** |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.** | | | 1A.1. Time constraints – teachers feel there is no time to teach science. | 1A.1. Teachers daily schedules are created with a 45 min block built in for Science allowing teachers to follow the Science CIA Blue Print. Social studies will be integrated with reading. | 1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teachers | 1A.1. Administrators will audit lesson plans. Resource teachers will monitor planning process during planning meetings to ensure implementation. | 1A.1. Science Fusion Unit Tests Science Benchmark Tests FCAT 2.0 Science |
| Science Goal #1A: **Number of 5th grade students performing at level 3 on FCAT will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 31% of student scoring at level 3.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 26% (27)of the students scored level 3 in science* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013 31% of the students will score level 3 in science* | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. Limited resources to teach NGSSS | 1A.2. Provide PD for teachers on the appropriate and effective use of the resources in the Science Fusion textbook. | 1A.2. Resource Teachers | 1A.2. Resource teachers will monitor planning process during planning meetings to ensure implementation. | 1A.2. Science Fusion Unit Tests Science Benchmark Tests FCAT 2.0 Science |
| | | | 1A.3. Large number of students come with limited background and limited vocabulary in the area of Science. | 1A.3. Follow the Science CIA Blue Print, which details which vocabulary words to focus on. Use higher level instructional strategies and learning experience to allow for students to engage with new Science words at a deeper level. | 1A.3. Resource Teachers | 1A.3. Resource teachers will monitor planning process during planning meetings to ensure implementation. | 1A.3. Science Fusion Unit Tests Science Benchmark Tests FCAT 2.0 Science |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Science Goal #1B: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | 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 and 5 in science.** | | | 2A.1. Teacher content knowledge in rigorous Science concepts limited. | 2A.1. Have PD for 5th grade science teacher to build capacity Science Boot Camp to enhance content of the science curriculum. | 2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal | 2A.1. Monitor formative and summative assessment results | 2A.1. Formative assessments Science Benchmark Test Science Fusion Unit Tests FCAT 2.0 Science |
| Science Goal #2A: **Number of 5th grade students performing at levels 4 and 5 will increase by 5%, resulting in at least 19% of students scoring at levels 5 and 5.** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *In 2012 14% (15)of the students scored level 4 and/or  in science* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* *In 2013 19% of the students  will score level 4 and/or 5  in science* | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. Teachers' ability to provide challenging and enriching learning experiences for students so they continue to make progress and maintain or increase their mathematical proficiency. | 2A.2. Professional development on ways to teach and assess at higher levels of cognitive complexity (Webb's Depth of Knowledge); as well as ways to develop critical thinking, and 21st Century Skills. | 2A.2. Assistant Principal CRT/Math Coach | 2A.2. Monitoring formative and summative assessments, Classroom observation of Science instruction | 2A.2. Formative assessments Science Benchmark Test Science Fusion Unit Tests FCAT 2.0 Science |
| | | | | | | | 2A.3. |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| Science Goal #2B: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 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*

## 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:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Science Goal #2:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |

| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

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

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

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

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

| | | 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*

## 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 |
| PLC: Instructional coaches supporting use of IMS to support planning for ESE and ELL students. | K-5 | Instructional Coaches | K-5 | Ongoing weekly | Lesson plan review and teacher feedback | Instructional Coaches |
| Creating higher order (DOK) learning experiences and assessments | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | January 2013 | Classroom observations | Administration and Instructional Coaches |
| Data Disaggregation | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | K-5 | October 2012 | Data meetings | Administration and CRT |
| Differentiating Instruction and Utilizing small group instruction | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | K-5, paraprofessionals | September/October 2012 | Classroom observations | Administration and CRT |
| Vocabulary Instruction and Strategies | K-5, Specials | Jennifer Summers/Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | October 2012 | Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews | Administration and CRT |
| Creating and Using Formative Assessments | K-5 | Sandra Sampayo | School-wide | January 2013 | Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews | Administration and CRT |

## 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 |
| Science Boot Camp | Science intervention program | Title I | |
| | | | |
| | | Subtotal: | 2,283.23 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

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

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| PD to deconstruct standards to enhance science content in Fusion Science | CRT will provide training on Fusion Science Text | District | 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: 2,283.23** |

*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.**<br><br>Writing Goal #1A:<br><br>**The 4<sup>th</sup> grade students made 57% progress in the FCAT 2.0 will increase by 5% percentage points resulting in at least a 62% of students** *being proficient in writing.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2012 57% (60)of the students scored level 3 in writing* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*In 2013 62% of the students will score level 3 in writing* | 1A.1. Lack of progress monitoring of student's writing samples. | 1A.1. Writing process will be used daily; all writing will be dated, scored, and placed in a writing notebook for monitoring. Write from the beginning training. | 1A.1. Literacy Coach , Instructional Support, Teachers Principal Assistant Principal | 1A.1. A school wide consistent method of saving student work will be kept by every 4th grade teacher in Writing Folders. | 1A.1. Progress of writing samples throughout the year using Write Score. |
| | | | 1A.2. Lack of the use of expository and narrative planning sheets. | 1A.2. Provide students with effective strategies/skills to create an effective narrative and | 1A.2. Instructional Support, Teachers Principal Assistant Principal | 1A.2. Teachers will check to make sure all parts of the planning sheets are correctly and effectively incorporated. | 1A.2. Planning sheet check list. |

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

| | | | expository planning page and use it as a tool for their writing samples. Training on writing across the curriculum. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1A.3. Lack of foundational writing skills. | 1A.3. School wide writing and monitoring plan Training on creating writing buddies centers. | 1A.3. Instructional Support, Teachers Principal Assistant Principal | 1A.3. Classroom visits | 1A.3. Writing Samples using scales. | |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.** | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | |
| Writing Goal #1B: <br><br> **NA** | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |

## Writing Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Writing Training | 2-5, all subjects | Instructional Support | Teachers Grades 2-5 | Training, Pre-Planning | Monitoring writing exercises and activities completed in class (including but not limited Making Meaning, Definition Mode, Acrostic Paragraph Formation) | Instructional Support |
| Writing Buddies | Grades 3-4 | Instructional Support | Teachers Grade 3-4 | 4th Quin. | Classroom visits | Teachers, Instructional Support |
| Writing Across Curriculum Areas | All | Instructional Support | School-wide | December | Classroom visits. | Teachers, Instructional Support |

## Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)
**June 2012**
**Rule 6A-1.099811**
**Revised April 29, 2011**

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

| 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 |
| Write From the Beginning | Program to enhance writing instruction. | General Funds | $750.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$750.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Write Score | Analyze writing data 4 times in the school year to drive instruction. | General Funds | $716.04 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$716.04 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal:$1466.04 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

*End of Writing Goals*

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

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

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

| Civics EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Civics Goal #1: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Civics Goal #2: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

**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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

*End of Civics Goals*

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

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

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

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

| U.S. History EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.**<br><br>U.S. History Goal #1:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 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. |
| 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.**<br><br>U.S. History Goal #2:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

## U.S. History Professional Development

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

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: |

*End of U.S. History Goals*

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

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Attendance** | | | 1.1. Parent involvement, monitoring and enforcement of the tardy/absence policy. | 1.1. Enforce rules early with consistency and fidelity. Consistent communication with parents through meetings, school functions and school/home communication to reinforce parent awareness of attendance rules; closely monitoring of student absences and daily tardy report | 1.1. Classroom Teachers, Attendance Clerk, Social Worker, Guidance Counselor | 1.1. Keep copies of documentation regarding communication with parents; speak with parents during dismissal and arrival times. | 1.1. Monitor EDW (OCPS Data Warehouse) bi-weekly. SMS |
| Attendance Goal #1: Union Park Elementary continues to focus on increasing student engagement. Students are encouraged to be present every day. We will be addressing attendance concerns and the importance of consistency with attention through our PLC, SAC, PTA, parent conferences, and any other meetings parents attend. We will also address our attendance concerns at every staff meeting. Teachers are expected to increase communication with parents about the impact attendance has on their child's success. Attendance awards will be given out at the end of every 9 weeks to students with perfect attendance. Attendance records will be closely monitored by the attendance clerk and social worker. Our social worker will work with parents to get their student in daily and on time. We are part of a truancy program through the State Attorney's office aimed at increasing student | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Attendance Rate: 95.38% | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: 97% | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more): 198 | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more): 175 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardiness (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardiness (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardy (10 or more): 121 | 2013 Expected number of Students with Excessive Tardy (10 or more): 115 | | | | | |

| attendance | | 1.2.<br>Low grades, poor performance in school, low self-esteem. | 1.2.<br>Assign a mentor to students who need guidance and encouragement through selected staff and volunteer mentors through Big Brother/Big Sister and COMPACT Mentor Program. | 1.2.<br>Leadership team, classroom teachers, guidance counselor, ADDitions Coordinator | 1.2.<br>Monitor student attendance; keep of list of staff members and volunteers who are willing to serve as mentors and discuss student attendance at RtI meetings. | 1.2<br>OCPS EDW, SMS, list of mentors and students served. RtI team notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| . | | 1.3.<br>Chronic absences and tardy. | 1.3.<br>PD on attendance procedures and laws during pre-planning week and periodically throughout the school year. Reminders will be posted in the school newsletter. Students who have 5 absences in 30 days or 10 within 90 days will require a Child Study Team Meeting which will include putting a contract in place for the student and parent. Consequences for non-attendance will be explained.<br><br>Continue Early Truancy Intervention Program through the State Attorney's office | 1.3.<br>Attendance Clerk, classroom teachers, School social worker, Guidance Counselor, State Attorney's officer | 1.3.<br>Monitor student attendance records. | OCPS EDW and SMS. |

**Attendance Professional Development**

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>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 |
| Professional Development on Attendance policies to prepare for Early Truancy Interventions. | K-5 | Guidance Counselor Social Worker | All instructional and school staff, | September 5, 2013 – Wednesday Faculty PLC | Communication with teachers/families of homeless students | Guidance Counselor |
| PLC Truancy | K-5 | Dean | Entire School staff | Throughout the year | Monitor and document incidences of campus on attendance and tardiness | Big Brother/Big Sister and COMPACT Mentor Program ETI |
| | | | | | | |

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

**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 0 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount 0 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount 0 |
| A | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: 0** |
| | | | **Total: 0** |

*End of Attendance Goals*

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

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Suspension Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Suspension**<br><br>Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>- - A selected group of leadership team members and teachers from UPES along with our school psychologist will attend CHAMPS training (A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom Management) through FDLRS. The group will then come back and train faculty and staff on the CHAMPS model so we can begin to implement a consistent school wide TIER 1 behavior prevention and intervention system. Through using this behavior prevention and intervention system we will teach our students school and classroom expectations which will provide a safe learning environment. Using CHAMPS school wide will help the faculty and staff employs consistent expectations thus reducing the number of discipline referrals. We will also implement RtI for Behavior and provide interventions along with data collection and progress monitoring for | 2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions<br><br>2012 number of students in school suspension<br>.5% or 2 offenses<br>.5% or 2 students<br><br><br><br>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School<br><br>2012 number of students out of school suspension<br>5% or 31 offenses<br>5% or 31 students<br>ACTUAL number of students out of school suspensions<br>3% or 22 offenses | 2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions<br><br>2013 number of students in school suspensions<br>Will decrease by .5%.<br><br><br><br>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School<br><br>2013 number of students in school suspensions<br>Number of out of school suspensions will decrease by 5%. | 1.1.<br><br>Teachers not being consistent in their classroom expectations | 1.1.<br><br>Establish RtI for behavior team and train the teachers on CHAMPS. Consistently use CHAMPS school wide. | 1.1.<br><br>RtI for behavior team, school administration and classroom teachers | 1.1.<br><br>Instructional time will be maximized through the use of CHAMPS infused throughout the classroom, a system is in place for tracking discipline calls to the office, review the code of conduct with each student at the beginning of the school year, review the code of conduct each marking period, review the code of conduct with students who are new to OCPS when they enter. Provide support to new teachers through PLC's and PD for the RtI process for behavior and maintaining consistency in the classroom for behavior expectations. | 1.1.<br>1.1<br>Classroom walkthroughs, EDW and SMS, teacher data collection, review of call log to the office and discipline referral tracking each marking period |
| | | | 1.2. Families having cultural differences and parents whose discipline style varies at home from school | 1.2.<br>Instruct faculty and staff about cultural differences in parenting per Ruby Payne's A Framework for Understanding Poverty. Teachers will communicate with parents regularly to review classroom expectations. Parenting classes on campus through Alternative Directions | 1.2.<br>RtI for behavior team; OCPS school social worker, and school administration | 1.2.<br>Teachers will use school planners and phone logs to monitor communication with families, send social worker to the home if teacher isn't receiving returned communication from parents, handouts and sign-in sheets from PD and parenting classes, communication between behavior | 1.2.<br>School planners and phone conference logs, EPT notes from parent meetings, weekly contact with social worker to review referrals, evaluations from PD's and parenting classes, surveys from parents on effectiveness of parenting classes. |

| teachers that have students who demonstrate severe behavior issues over a period of time. | | | (SEDNET provider) to review behavior expectations within the OCPS Student Code of Conduct and to provide behavior and parenting strategies at home. Utilize the Union Park Neighborhood Center for Families as a resource for parents to receive support at home with parenting and/or counseling. | | team and Alternative Directions and Neighborhood Center about referrals and services provided. | |

## 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 |
| School wide training by team that is attending CHAMPS training | K-5 | Champs Team | School Wide | October 2012 | Monitor Referrals | Dean |
| PD-Ruby Payne A Framework for Understanding Poverty | K-5 | Dean/Guidance Counselor | School Wide | November | Signup Sheet | Dean |
| | | | | | | |

## 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 0 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: 0 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount 0 |
| NA | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Subtotal: 0** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount 0 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: 0** |
| | | | **Total: 0** |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## 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**<br><br>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br><br>*3% (19) of students were retained at the end of the 2011-2012 school years *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.* | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:\*<br><br>*3% (19) of students were retained in 2012.*<br>2012 Current Graduation Rate:\*<br>*97% (287) of students were promoted in 2012.* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:\*<br><br>*2% (15) of students are expected to be retained in 2013.*<br>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:\*<br>*In July 2013, the number of 100% graduating students will be 98%* | 1.1.<br>6% (17) of our target students have severe attendance records | 1.1.<br>ETI Truancy meetings to inform parents of the attendance laws for students and parent responsibility | 1.1.<br>ETI Team, Attendance Secretary, Dean, Guidance, Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom teachers | 1.1.<br>Monitoring of students attendance and monitoring of truancy procedures. | 1.1.<br>Attendance reports, report cards, progress monitoring, FCAT 2.0 |

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

**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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |

**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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |

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

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

| | **Total: 0** |
|---|---|

## 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**<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>Parent involvement is crucial for the academic success of students. We are a Title I school and we implement a variety of strategies to ensure parents receive communion from school and attend parent involvement events. | 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*<br><br>In June 2012 52% of all families were actively involved at Union Park Elementary as measured by attendance at family oriented school events. | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*<br><br>Union Park Elementary School's expected level of Parent Involvement will be 57% for the 2012-2013 school years. | 1.1.<br>Many parents do not speak English fluently | 1.1.<br>Provide communication to home in English, Spanish and other languages including letters, newsletters and Connect Ed | 1.1.<br>Principal and Parent Involvement Resource Teacher | 1.1.<br>Collect sign in sheets for all events and utilize data to help increase our parent attendance | 1.1.<br>Sign in sheets and Parent Surveys |
| | | | 1.2. Parents may be intimidated by the process of school or may not have time to communicate with their child's teacher often. | 1.2.<br>We will provide to each child a planner/agenda that the teacher will use to communicate back and forth with the parents. Classroom teachers will also send home weekly newsletter to keep parents updated. Incorporate parent night once a month through Alternative Directions where parents will meet and discuss ideas for school, how to get more involved in their child's success. | 1.2.<br>Principal and Teachers Alternative Directions Parent Involvement Resource Teacher | 1.2.<br>Teachers will log all parent communication/documentation on an on-going basis. | 1.2.<br>Communication/Phone logs. Sign in sheets for parent night |
| | | | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Parents work nights and cannot attend evening events | Promote the ADDitions program to encourage parent and community members to volunteer at the school and help with activities or to help from home if they cannot come during the day. | Parent Involvement Resource Teacher and ADDitions Coordinator District Parent Liaison | Monitor our volunteer hours monthly and promote the use of volunteers with the teachers | Reports of volunteer hours. Parent Involvement checklists collected at the end of the school year. |
| | | 1.4 Lack of parent involvement and membership in PTA/School Advisory Committee and PLC | 1.4 Hold numerous memberships drives to assist parents in registering for PTA. Recruit officers for PTA/SAC and PLC to increase parent involvement. Provide various dates and times for parents to have an opportunity to join organizations. | 1.4 PTA President SAC President PLC President Principal Parent Involvement Resource Teacher ADDitions Coordinator | 1.4 Maintain log of all parents who participate in meetings and events at school. Inform parents of sponsored events by Connect ED and adding messages to the school marquee. Sending out flyers in various languages to parents of upcoming events. Teachers will keep parents informed whenever they meet or talk with them. | 1.4 Maintain membership log for all PTA members. Sign in sheet for all meetings and sponsored events. Teacher communication log Connect Ed emails |

**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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |

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

|  |  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| NA | | | | |
| | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount $1,232 | |
| Planner | Planners given to students 1-5 | Title I | | |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal:** $1,232 | |
|  |  |  | **Total:** $1,232 | |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

## 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:<br><br>We will increase the percent of teachers using problem based through engineering challenges. | 1.1.<br>Teacher lack of knowledge in STEM content. | Support teachers in implementing STEM activities into their plans, guided by the CIA Blue Print | 1.1.<br>Resource teachers | Collaborate in planning meetings to ensure understanding of STEM activities and that they are incorporated into lesson plans | 1.1.<br>Observation |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7"><strong>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</strong><br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus</td><td>Grade Level/Subject</td><td>PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader</td><td>PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)</td><td>Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)</td><td>Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td></tr>
<tr><td>Use of CIA Blue Print to implement STEM activities</td><td>K-5</td><td>Sampayo</td><td>Instructional Teachers, Para-Professionals</td><td>Second Semester</td><td>Lesson Plans and observations</td><td>Principal, Assistant Principal and Instructional Support</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| In House Professional Development | PD on CIA blue prints and how to plan for STEM instructions activities | NA | 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |

| | **Total: 0** |
|---|---|

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## 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:<br><br>*NA* | 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 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

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

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

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

## Additional Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Additional Goal(s)</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8"><strong>1. Additional Goal</strong></td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Goal #1:<br><br><em><strong>We will increase by 5 % the percent of Pre-K students who will enter elementary school ready.</strong></em></td>
<td><u>2012 Current Level :*</u><br><br><em><strong>83% of students in Pre-K 2012 demonstrated preliminary readiness.</strong></em></td>
<td><u>2013 Expected Level :*</u><br><br><em><strong>We expect 88% of Pre-K students to demonstrate preliminary readiness.</strong></em></td>
<td>Lack of oral language and vocabulary skills.</td>
<td>Lessons planned to target and enrich oral language and enhanced vocabulary</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher, Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Progress monitoring through the VPK reporting system, Observations</td>
<td>VPK Assessment through the FLDOE,FLKRS</td>
</tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="2"></td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td><td>1.3.</td></tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Additional Goal #2:<br><br>We will increase by 5% who read by grade level by age 9.</td>
<td>Lack of oral language.</td>
<td>Implementation for Language for Learning in Kindergarten classrooms</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher, Reading Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal</td>
<td>End of lesson assessments monitored</td>
<td>End of lesson assessments, FAIR, FLKRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Additional Goal #3:<br>We will increase College and Career Awareness</td>
<td>Skill necessary to choose college or career options.</td>
<td>School wide initiative to visualize future choice in life options.</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coaches Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Destination College Binders</td>
<td>Destination College Binders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Additional Goal 4:<br><br>We will decrease the disproportionate classification in Special Education</td>
<td>Disaggregate data to process need for ESE evaluation.</td>
<td>Utilize the RTI process to ensure evaluations are appropriate for placement into ESE.</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Principal RTI Coordinator Staffing Specialist Psychologist Social Worker Classroom Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="3">Additional Goal 5:<br><br>We will increase the progress monitoring of student performance reviewing benchmarks, and data.</td>
<td>Lack of progress monitoring of student performance according to benchmarks, and the use of that data to differentiate instruction differentiated instruction.</td>
<td>Professional development to enhance teachers' abilities to collect math proficiency data, use the data to guide instruction, and conduct</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Principal CRT</td>
<td>Data Meetings, Classroom observation of math instruction</td>
<td>2013 FCAT Reading FAIR Imagine It Benchmark Assessment Success Maker Reports Edusoft</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Conduct monthly data meetings to monitor students' progress. | | | |
| Additional Goal 6:<br><br>Students will continue to attend Fine Arts | | Lack of motivation to participate in Art and Music Club. | Promote the Art and Music Club during Wednesday Special area schedule | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Art Teacher | |
| Additional Goal 7:<br>Students will increase in math fluency. | | Students will utilize Success Maker Math to increase fluency. | Scheduled computer lab to use Success Maker 20 minutes. | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Classroom Teacher | Progress Monitoring<br>Data Meeting |

## 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |

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

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

| NA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:** |

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| **Reading Budget** | |
| | **Total: $43,334.50** |
| **CELLA Budget** | |
| | **Total:$3040.00** |
| **Mathematics Budget** | |
| | **Total:$19,496.00** |
| **Science Budget** | |
| | **Total:2,283.23** |
| **Writing Budget** | |
| | **Total:$1466.00** |
| **Civics Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **U.S. History Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **Attendance Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **Suspension Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **Dropout Prevention Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **Parent Involvement Budget** | |
| | **Total:** $1,232 |
| **STEM Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **CTE Budget** | |
| | **Total: 0** |
| **Additional Goals** | |
| | **Total:$71,845.77** |
| | **Grand Total:** |

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

**<u>Differentiated Accountability</u>**

**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 |
| NA | NA | Na |

- 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.

X 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. |
|---|
| WE will every month to discuss progress of our School Improvement Plan |

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

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