

Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Gulf High School	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Kimberly Davis	Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Joy Phillips	Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Student Achievement Data:

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](#)

Highly Effective Administrators

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Kimberly Noyce Davis	MEd, BS / School Principal, Educational Leadership, Biology and Chemistry	0	8	2012 –grade pending-GHS- Reading 54, Math 68, Writing 83, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 59, Math 72; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 60, Math 68 2011 - A - AHS, failed to make AYP 2010 - F - AHS, failed to make AYP 2009 – B - SLHS- failed to make AYP 2008 – B - SLHS- failed to make AYP 2007 – N/A, district administrator
Assistant Principal	Maribeth Caldwell	MA, BS / Biology Secondary Education and Biology; Certification in Educational Leadership	0	4	2012 Grade pending - River Ridge High School - AYP met? No Reading 59, Math 64, Writing 99, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 60, Math 52; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 58, Math 34 2011 –A- River Ridge High School, failed to make AYP 2010 - C - River Ridge High School, failed to make AYP 2009 - B – River Ridge High School, failed to make AYP
Assistant Principal	Douglas Elias	MS, BS / Educational Leadership, Physical Education and Exceptional Student Education	2	4	2012 –grade pending-GHS- Reading 54, Math 68, Writing 83, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 59, Math 72; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 60, Math 68 2011 - B - GHS, failed to make AYP 2010 - B – GHS, failed to make AYP 2009 - FKMTEC- No Data 2008 - FKMTEC- No Data
Assistant Principal	Judy Gallagher	EdD.,MEd, BS / School Principal, Business Education, Elementary Education 1-6, Primary Education and Reading Endorsement	11	23.5	2012 –grade pending-GHS- Reading 54, Math 68, Writing 83, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 59, Math 72; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 60, Math 68 2011 - B - GHS, failed to make AYP 2010 - B – GHS, failed to make AYP 2009 - D - GHS, failed to make AYP 2008 - C – GHS, failed to make AYP 2007 - D - GHS, failed to make AYP

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

Assistant Principal	Steven Page	MEd, BS / Educational Leadership, Social Studies Education, MG Endorsement and Gift Endorsement	0	6	2012 – pending-LOLHS-Reading 71, Math 78, Writing 90, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 69, Math 73; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 61, Math 46 2011 – B – LOLHS, failed to meet AYP 2010 - A – LOLHS, failed to meet AYP 2009 - B – LOLHS, failed to meet AYP 2008 - B – LOLHS, failed to meet AYP 2007 - A – LOLHS, failed to meet AYP
---------------------	-------------	---	---	---	--

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Martha Babiarz	Med, BA Elementary Education, ESOL, Reading K-12, SLD	0	3	2012 B – Bayonet Point Middle School - AYP met? No Reading 59, Math 64, Writing 99, Science N/A; Learning Gains- Reading 60, Math 52; %Lowest 25 making gains in Reading 58, Math 34 2011 - A - Bayonet Point Middle School, failed to make AYP 2010 - A - Bayonet Point Middle School, failed to make AYP 2009 - B - Bayonet Point Middle School, failed to make AYP

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	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Grade Level Team Study Groups to review attendance, academics and behavior data	Grade Level Administrator	June 2013	

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

2. Department Team Study Groups to ensure a standards driven curriculum and implementation of common assessments	Department Chairs and Content Administrator	June 2013	
3. New Teacher Mentoring Program	Administration	June 2013	
4. LFS Training for new teachers and those who have not completed	Staff Development Coordinator	June 2013	
5. Provide opportunities for staff to attend school and district staff development based on staff needs and deliberate practice needs	Staff Development Coordinator and Administration	June 2013	
6. School-wide literacy focus and training will be provided for all staff	Literacy Coach and Administration	June 2013	
7. MTSS committee to review data and continue to work with staff on implementation of Tier 1 interventions	MTSS Team	June 2013	
8. Establish a Staff Recognition program	Administration	June 2013	
9. Us of Winocular and district HR department to help identify and screen highly qualified staff	Administration	June 201	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
Travis Priddy	Physical Education 6-12 ESE Student Education K-12	Co-Teach Physical Science and Self-Contained Physical Science	Mentor has been assigned. Mr. Priddy needs to take the Chemistry or Earth/Space Certification Exam this year. He will be supported through the Science Professional Learning Community Team.
Brett Wiest	Mathematics Grades 5-9 Physical Education 6-12 ESE Student Education K-12	Self-Contained Liberal Arts Math, Algebra 1A and 1B Co-Teach Algebra 1A and 1B	Mentor will be assigned. Mr. Wiest needs to take the Math 6-12 Certification Exam this year. He will be supported through the Math Professional Learning Community Team.
Amihai Uriel	ESE Student Education K-12 Reading Endorsed Social Sciences 6-12	Physical Science and Reading	Mentor has been assigned. Mr. Uriel needs to take the Chemistry or Earth/Space Certification Exam this year. He will be supported through the Science Professional Learning Community Team.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Roy Luksch	Biology 6-12 Earth/Space Science 6-12 Guidance K-12	Co-Teach Physical Science and Self-Contained Biology and Environmental Science	Mentor has been assigned. Mr. Luksch needs to take the Exceptional Student Education Certification Exam this year. He will be supported through the ESE Professional Learning Community Team.
------------	---	--	---

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
82	4.88% (4)	13.41% (11)	34.155% (28)	47.56% (39)	40.24% (33)	4.88% (4)	4.88% (4)		19.51% (16)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program 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
Martha Babiarz	Amihai Uriel	Reading certified coach	District and school-based beginning teacher program
Linda Dale	Sheri Wilbur	Certified Science Teacher	District and school-based beginning teacher program
Jeff Serletic	Travis Priddy	Certified ESE Teacher	District and school-based beginning teacher program
Jeff Serletic	Roy Luksch	Certified ESE Teacher	

Additional Requirements – N/A as GHS is not a Title I School

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Travis DeWalt, Kim Davis, Steve Page, Doug Elias, Judy Gallagher, Maribeth Caldwell, Mike Quarto, Jeff Serletic, Steve Emerson, Laurel Keesler, Devan Pontikos

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The school based MTSS Leadership Team meets regularly and serves as the support web for decision making. It reviews data, facilitates goal development and suggests appropriate resource allocation. Data reviewed by the team, at a minimum, includes ACT/SAT, Core K12, FAIR, FCAT, PERT, attendance, discipline and achievement data from AP tests, as well as walkthroughs and observations, end of course exams, and end of semester exams. Progress monitoring data, including the district's early warning system as reflected in an internal data warehouse (PascoSTAR) is accessed to inform next steps and guide school wide actions. The team presents data, findings and suggestions as appropriate to the staff and community. The goal of the team is to support student achievement and provide interventions focused on Tiered levels of support. In short, the MTSS leadership team serves to keep the school focused on the student achievement for all students.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The school based MTSS Leadership Team plays an integral role in developing the SIP. After careful review of all available data, members of the team and any interested staff identify commonalities and begin to narrow the focus to identify critical impact areas for school goals. Alignment of policies and procedures across classrooms, grade levels and within the school building is an overarching goal of MTSS.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Data management systems that will be utilized to summarize data include: PascoSTAR, TERMS, Core K-12 database, PMRN, PS/RtI database. Data sources that will be utilized to summarize data will include: common assessments, unit tests, FAIR, Core K-12, walkthroughs and observations, end of course exams, end of semester exams, FCAT and ACT/SAT.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

District Staff will be working to train teachers on the implementation of the problem-solving steps of RtI within a classroom setting.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Describe plan to support MTSS.

MTSS is in the implementation stage at GHS. The team will meet monthly to review data and identify next steps in implementation. During Grade level PLC's, Tier 1 strategies will be identified based on the data provided. During the year, the MTSS team will develop a plan to implement Tier 2 and 3 strategies and train staff on implementation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

Members of the LLT include the following: Martha Babiarz, Steve Emerson, Charlene Nibert, Laurel Keesler, Tanya Fuss, Wanda McClellan, Kim Davis

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The lead literacy team is incorporated in the Response to Intervention meeting. Once per month the committee reviews reading data and strategies to ensure student reading needs are being met. This committee is comprised of the Response to Intervention team members. Problem solving through the Response to Intervention model occurs monthly on current reading initiatives issues. The committee reviews data from FCAT and FAIR. In addition, the data allows a development for implementation of reading strategies and next steps for all staff members.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Text complexity/ Text Structure Instruction, Summarizing Instruction, Questioning Instruction, Multiple Strategy Instruction and Comprehension Monitoring.

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.

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

FCAT, FAIR, individual diagnostic, IB and Advance Placement test scores were reviewed for the school and for each teacher. All Professional Development plans will incorporate a reading strategy. Literacy in all content areas is one of our school wide focus areas. Strategies will include but not limited to: Text Structure Instruction, Summarizing Instruction, Questioning Instruction, Multiple Strategy Instruction, Comprehension Monitoring, and Writing for Understanding.

**High Schools Only*

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(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?

GHS has many courses that offer academics as well as career pathways. These courses integrate academics and applied learning that lead to challenging skill sets that will provide seamless pathways into the workforce, secondary technical institutions, community college or universities. Our Health Careers Academy provides substantial coursework connected with Pasco-Hernando Community College and St. Petersburg College, along with providing opportunities for industry certification. In addition, a focal point for all staff members is to provide a connection between what is taught and how it connects to the real world. Teachers provide this support to students on a regular basis in the classroom. This includes connecting classroom material to current career areas and real world situations. Additionally, as an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program school, GHS seeks to help students see global connections and to understand their roles in society, create active, lifelong learners who will promote worldwide intercultural understanding and respect linking local, state, national and international resources.

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?

Pasco has an award winning developmental guidance program that is replicated at each school. Providing academic and career planning to GHS students are a team of four guidance counselors and a career specialist who individually guide students through many important decisions concerning course selection, graduation requirements, career and post-secondary education choices. They communicate with students through personal meetings, emails and classroom groups.

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](#).

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

A focal point for all staff members is to provide a connection between what is taught and how it connects to the real world. Teachers provide this support on a regular basis in the classroom. During grade level PLC, teachers work together to develop ways of showing connections between the various content areas and real world applications. This includes connecting classroom material to current career areas and real world situations.

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		

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

<p>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p>	<p>1a.1. Students lack experience with complex text including higher depth of knowledge questions.</p>	<p>1a.1. Teachers will use more complex texts and higher DOK questions.</p>	<p>1a.1. Staff</p>	<p>1a.1. Observations and common assessments</p>	<p>1a.1. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #1a: Increase the percent of students reading at proficient level by 10%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance: *</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p>49% of ninth graders scored proficient. 54% of tenth grade scored proficient.</p>	<p>55% of ninth graders will score proficient. 60% of tenth graders will score proficient.</p>					
		<p>1a.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.</p>	<p>1a.2. Training on the following strategies will be used in PLC and staff development: Common Core State Standards, best practices, including (but not limited to) summarization, vocabulary, higher DOK</p>	<p>1a.2. Staff</p>	<p>1a.2. Observations</p>	<p>1a.2. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>	

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

		1a.3. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	1a.3. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	1a.3. Staff	1a.3. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	1a.3. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
		1a.4. Staff does not clearly understand FCAT 2.0	1a.4. Staff will participate in trainings focusing on unpacking benchmarks, developing standards driven lessons and using test specs for formative assessment development.	1a.4. Staff	1a.4. Observations, lesson plan analysis, formative assessment development	1a.4. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
		1a.5. Lack of student engagement resulting in discipline and attendance concerns	1a.5. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.	1a.5. Staff	1a.5. Discipline data, attendance data, observations, lesson plan analysis, grade distribution data	1a.5. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments, discipline data, attendance data, grade distribution data	
		1a.6. Diagnostic testing indicated a fluency issue with many of our boarder line students	1a.6. Implementation of Achieve 3000 reading program in the 9 th and 10 th grade reading classes.	1a.6. Literacy Coach	1a.6. Observations, data from program	1a.6. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, common assessments, Achieve 3000 data, DAR fluency diagnostics	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1b.1. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	1b.1. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	1b.1. Staff	1b.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	1b.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		

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

<p>Reading Goal #1b: Increase the percent of students reading at level 4, 5 or 6 by 10%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p>5.4% of our students scored at a level 4,5 or 6</p>	<p>6% of our students will score at a level 4,5,or 6</p>					
		<p>1b.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.</p>	<p>1b.2. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>1b.2. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1b.2. Observations</p>	<p>1a.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
		<p>1b.3. Lack of test taking skills and strategies</p>	<p>1b.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>1b.3. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1b.3. Observation</p>	<p>1b.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.</p>	<p>2a.1. Students lack experience with higher cognitive complexity level questioning</p>	<p>2a.1. Teachers will use more complex texts and higher DOK questions.</p>	<p>2a.1. Staff</p>	<p>2a.1. Observations and common assessments</p>	<p>2a.1. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #2a: Increase the percent of students reading at level 4 or 5 by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>23% scored level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 reading</p>	<p>27% will score level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading 2.0</p>					
		<p>2a.2. Teachers lack knowledge of FCAT 2.0 test specifications preventing them from identifying appropriate strategies</p>	<p>2a.2. Staff Development in PLC will focus on providing teachers with an understanding of FCAT 2.0, unpacking the benchmarks as well as CCSS.</p>	<p>2a.2. Staff</p>	<p>2a.2. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs</p>	<p>2a.2. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>	

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

		2a.3 Lack of school wide focus on a year's growth or more for every student (not just lowest 25%)	2a.3 School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.	2a.3 Staff	2a.3 Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	2a.3 FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2b.1. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	2b.1. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	2b.1. Staff	2b.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	2b.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		
Reading Goal #2b:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
Increase by 10% students scoring at 7 or higher							
	50% at 7 or higher	55% of students will score at 7 or higher					
		2b.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.	2b.2. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	2b.2. ESE Department Chair Administration	2b.2. Observations	2b.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data	

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

		3b.3. Lack of test taking skills and strategies	3b.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	3b.3. ESE Department Chair Administration	3b.3. Observation	3b.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3a.1. Students in CAR-PD classes need additional support.	3a.1. Literacy Coach will create a PLC team for CAR-PD teachers that will meet monthly.	3a.1. Administration and Literacy Coach	3a.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	3a.1. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments		
<u>Reading Goal #3a:</u> Increase the percent of students making learning gains by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

	59% of students made learning gains in FCAT Reading 2.0	65% of students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading 2.0					
		3a.2. Lack of student engagement	3a.2. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.	3a.2. Staff	3a.2. Discipline data, attendance data, observations, lesson plan analysis, grade distribution data	3a.2. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments, discipline data, attendance data, grade distribution data	
		3a.3. Lack of school wide focus on a year's growth or more for every student (not just lowest 25%)	3a.3. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.	3a.3. Staff	3a.3. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	3a.3. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
		3a.4. Diagnostic testing indicated a fluency issue with many of our boarder line students	3a.4. Implementation of Achieve 3000 reading program in the 9 th and 10 th grade reading classes.	3a.4. Literacy Coach	3a.4. Observations, data from program	3a.4. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, common assessments, Achieve 3000 data, DAR fluency diagnostics	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3b.1. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	3b.1. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	3b.1. Staff	3b.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	3b.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		

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

<p>Reading Goal #3b: Increase by 10% students making a learning gain on the alternative assessment.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p>50% of students made a learning gain</p>	<p>55% of students will make a learning gain on the alternative assessment.</p>					
		<p>3b.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.</p>	<p>3b.2. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>3b.2. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>3b.2. Observations</p>	<p>3b.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
		<p>3b.3. Lack of test taking skills and strategies</p>	<p>3b.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>3b.3. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>3b.3. Observation</p>	<p>3b.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>4a.1. Lack of student engagement</p>	<p>4a.1. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices; standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations. Purchase and implementation of Achieve 3000.</p>	<p>4a.1. Staff</p>	<p>4a.1. Discipline data, attendance data, observations, lesson plan analysis, grade distribution data</p>	<p>4a.1. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments, discipline data, attendance data, grade distribution data</p>		
<p>Reading Goal #4a: Increase by 15% the lowest quartile of readers making learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>60% of lowest quartile made learning gains.</p>	<p>69% of lowest quartile will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 reading.</p>					
		<p>4a.2. Lack of school wide focus on literacy and implementation of best practices in all content areas that support literacy</p>	<p>4a.2. Staff development and PLCs will focus on vocabulary, increased cognitive complexity, gradual release and CCSS.</p>	<p>4a.2. Staff</p>	<p>4a.2. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs</p>	<p>4a.2. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, common assessments</p>	

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

		4a.3. Diagnostic testing indicated a fluency issue with many of our boarder line students	4a.3. Implementation of Achieve 3000 reading program in the 9 th and 10 th grade reading classes.	4a.3. Literacy Coach	4a.3. Observations, data from program	4a.3. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, common assessments, Achieve 3000 data, DAR fluency diagnostics	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4b.1. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	4b.1. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	4b.1. Staff	4b.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	4b.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		
Reading Goal #4b:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
Increase by 1 the number of students in lowest quartile making a learning gain.							
	0% learning gains	1 student in lowest quartile will make a learning gain					
		4b.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.	4b.2. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	4b.2. ESE Department Chair Administration	4b.2. Observations	4b.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data	

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

		4b.3. Lack of test taking skills and strategies	4b.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	4b.3. ESE Department Chair Administration	4b.3. Observation	4b.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 During the 2010-2011 school year, 50% of the students were proficient.	54% of the students were proficient					75% or more of the students will be proficient in reading.
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> The percent of students scoring proficient in 2013 will increase by 10%. By the year 2016-2017, the % of students scoring non-proficient will be 25% or less.							
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

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5a.1. Students lack experience with complex text including higher depth of knowledge questions.</p>	<p>5a.1. Teachers will use more complex texts and higher DOK questions.</p>	<p>5a.1. Staff</p>	<p>5a.1. Observations and common assessments</p>	<p>5a.1. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> The number of white students scoring proficient on the FCAT Reading 2.0 will increase by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>In 2012, 52% of white students (244 9th and 10th grade students) scored proficient on the FCAT Reading 2.0.</p>	<p>In 2013 the number of white students scoring proficient will increase by 10% (25 students).</p>					
		<p>5a.2. Staff needs additional strategies to increase the reading proficiency of students.</p>	<p>5a.2. Training on the following strategies will be used in PLC and staff development: Common Core State Standards, best practices, including (but not limited to) summarization, vocabulary, higher DOK</p>	<p>5a.2. Staff</p>	<p>5a.2. Observations</p>	<p>5a.2. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments</p>	

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

		5a.3. Implementation of new focus areas for the 2012-2013 school year.	5a.3. Staff will use strategies to implement the following focus areas: literacy focused, student engagement, data-based instructional decisions	5a.3. Staff	5a.3. Observations, lesson plan analysis, walkthroughs	5a.3. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
		5a.4. Staff does not clearly understand FCAT 2.0	5a.4. Staff will participate in trainings focusing on unpacking benchmarks, developing standards driven lessons and using test specs for formative assessment development.	5a.4. Staff	5a.4. Observations, lesson plan analysis, formative assessment development	5a.4. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments	
		5a.5. Lack of student engagement resulting in discipline and attendance concerns	5a.5. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell- to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.	5a.5. Staff	5a.5. Discipline data, attendance data, observations, lesson plan analysis, grade distribution data	5a.5. FCAT Reading proficiency scores, FAIR data, SAT and ACT scores, common assessments, discipline data, attendance data, grade distribution data	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		

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

<u>Reading Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>					
Gulf High School Does not have this sub-group.							
	Gulf High School Does not have this sub-group	Gulf High School Does not have this sub-group					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>5D.1. Teachers do not differentiate instruction and assessment to meet the needs of these students.</p>	<p>5D.1. Provide staff development on differentiated instruction for both the mainstream and ESE teachers</p>	<p>5D.1. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE</p>	<p>5D.1. Lesson Plan, walk-throughs and conferences</p>	<p>5D.1. FCAT 2.0, FAIR, common assessments and observations</p>		
<p><u>Reading Goal</u> #5D: In 2013, SWD students scoring proficient will increase by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>In 2012, 18% of (19 students) scored proficient on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.</p>	<p>In 2013, the number of students scoring will increase to 20%</p>					

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

		5D.2. Basic education teachers do not understand the needs of the SWD.	5D.2. ESE Department will conduct meetings with basic education teachers to discuss the needs of the students,	5D.2. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	5D.2. Meeting Agendas and sign-in logs	5D.2. FCAT 2.0, FAIR, common assessments and observations	
		5D.3. ESE Teachers do not fully understand how to develop TIEPs to meet the individual needs of students	5D.3. ESE Department will attend district trainings.	5D.3. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	5D.3. Review of TIEPs	5D.3. FCAT 2.0, FAIR, common assessments and observations	
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. Nutritional concerns exits for students of poverty	5E.1. Increase the number of students participating in the free and reduced breakfast and lunch programs available to students and families	5E.1. Student Services	5E.1. Monitor number of applications for services completed and students taking advantage of services.	5E.1. FNS Data		

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. In 2013, the number FRL students scoring proficient will increase to 45%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
	In 2012, 41% (172) of FRL students scored proficient on FCAT 2.0 Reading	In 2013, the number FRL students scoring proficient will increase to 45%.					
		5E.2. Parents need information on resources available.	5E.2. Information and opportunities for assistance will be provided and monitored by staff	5E.2. Student Services, Social Worker, SSAP Staff	5E.2. Monitor students participating in programs	5E.2. Review of progress of students in need..	
		5E.3. Staff lacks skills and understanding of how to deal with students and families in poverty	5E.3. Provide Staff Development for staff on best practices for working with students in poverty	5E.3. Administration Social Worker	5E.3. Observations	5E.3. Review of student data, FAIR, FCAT 2.0 and common assessments	

Reading Professional Development

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Standards and Instructional Focus Calendars	All	Literacy Coach	School-wide and PLC	September for school-wide. PLC-Monthly meetings	Lesson Plan review and walkthroughs	Administration, Lead Literacy Team, Leadership Team and Literacy Coach
AP Writing Training	10 th Grade English Teachers and World History Teacher	Administration	10 th Grade English Teachers and World History Teacher	Semester 1	Lesson Plans and Walk-throughs	Administration, Department Chairs and Leadership Team
Learning Focused Strategies 4 day and Follow-up	New teachers-4 day, selected teachers for follow-up	District Office Staff	New teachers and teachers identified needing additional support	District availability of trainings	Lesson Plan review, walkthrough, new teacher mentor meeting	Administration
Introduction of Common Core State Standards	All	Literacy Coach	School-wide and PLC	June 2013	Lesson Plan review and walkthrough	Administration, Lead Literacy Team and Literacy Coach

Reading 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
Implementation of program to address Fluency	Achieve 3000	Student Fees	\$14,000
Subtotal:			
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implementation of program to address Fluency	Achieve 3000 With iPads	Technology Funds	\$18,000
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implementation of program to address Fluency	Achieve 3000		Included in purchase of program
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
--------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.	1.1. Limited access to native language support	1.1. Placement in a reading class where all ESOL students are grouped to provide additional support	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher	1.1. Administrative walkthroughs Student data from language learning software programs Lesson plan analysis	1.1. CELLA Tell Me More assessments	
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> In 2013, the number of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking on the CELLA will increase by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	9 th proficient – 1 of 7 (14%) 10 th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 11 th proficient – 2 of 7 (29%) 12 th proficient – 3 of 5 (60%) overall 6 of 26 proficient					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text 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	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. Limited access to native language support	2.1. Placement in a reading class where all ESOL students are grouped to provide additional support	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher	2.1. Administrative walkthroughs Student data from language learning software programs Lesson plan analysis	2.1. CELLA Tell Me More assessments	
CELLA Goal #2: In 2013, the number of students scoring proficient in Reading on the CELLA will increase by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u>					
	9 th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 10 th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 11 th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 12 th proficient – 1 of 5 (20%) overall 1 of 26 proficient					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		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	

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

<p>3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.</p>	<p>3.1. Limited access to native language support</p>	<p>3.1. Placement in a reading class where all ESOL students are grouped to provide additional support</p>	<p>3.1. Principal Assistant Principal ESOL Resource Teacher Classroom teacher</p>	<p>3.1. Administrative walkthroughs Student data from language learning software programs Lesson plan analysis</p>	<p>3.1. CELLA Tell Me More assessments</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> In 2013, the number of students scoring proficient in Writing on the CELLA will increase by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u></p>					
	<p>9th proficient – 1 of 7 (14%) 10th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 11th proficient – 0 of 7 (0%) 12th proficient – 1 of 5 (20%) overall 2 of 26 proficient</p>					
		<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>	<p>3.2.</p>
		<p>3.3</p>	<p>3.3</p>	<p>3.3</p>	<p>3.3</p>	<p>3.3</p>

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CELLA 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	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		

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

<p>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Algebra I Access Points Standards.</p>	<p>1.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment</p>	<p>1.1. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.1. Observation</p>	<p>1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #1: Increase by 10% the percent of students scoring 4, 5 and 6.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p>					
	<p>50% of students scored at levels 4, 5 and 6.</p>	<p>55% of students will score at level 4, 5 and 6.</p>					
		<p>1.2. Students lack basic math skills</p>	<p>1.2. Staff Development on differentiation of instruction and scaffolding to meet individual student needs</p>	<p>1.2. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.2. Observation</p>	<p>1.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
		<p>1.3. Students lack test taking skills</p>	<p>1.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>1.3. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.3. Observation</p>	<p>1.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	

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

		1.4. Students lack reading skills	1.4. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	1.4. ESE Department Chair Administration	1.4. Observations	1.4. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
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. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Algebra I Access Points Standards.	2.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment	2.1. ESE Department Chair Administration	2.1. Observation	2.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		
Mathematics Goal #2:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
Increase by 10% students scoring 7 and higher.							
	50% of students scored level 7 or higher	55% of students will score level 7 and higher.					

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

		2.2. Students lack basic math skills	2.2. Staff Development on differentiation of instruction and scaffolding to meet individual student needs	2.2. ESE Department Chair Administration	2.2. Observation	2.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
		2.3. Students lack test taking skills	2.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	2.3. ESE Department Chair Administration	2.3. Observation	2.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
		2.4. Students lack reading skills	2.4. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	2.4. ESE Department Chair Administration	2.4. Observations	2.4. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
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. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Algebra I Access Points Standards.	3.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment	3.1. ESE Department Chair Administration	3.1. Observation	3.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data		

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In the 2013 school year, we will increase the number of students making learning gains on the FAA by 10%							
	50% of students made a learning gain on the math portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment	In 2013, 55% of the students taking the FAA will make learning gains.					
		3.2. Students lack basic math skills	3.2. Staff Development on differentiation of instruction and scaffolding to meet individual student needs	3.2. ESE Department Chair Administration	3.2. Observation	3.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
		3.3. Students lack test taking skills	3.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	3.3. ESE Department Chair Administration	3.3. Observation	3.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
		3.4. Students lack reading skills	3.4. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	3.4. ESE Department Chair Administration	3.4. Observations	3.4. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
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		

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

<p>4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p>	<p>4.1. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Algebra I Access Points Standards.</p>	<p>4.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment</p>	<p>4.1. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>4.1. Observation</p>	<p>4.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #4: In the 2013 school year, we will increase the number of students making learning gains on the FAA by 50%</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>*</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>*</p>					
	<p>None of the students in the lowest 25% made a learning gain</p>	<p>In 2013, 50% of the students taking the FAA will make learning gains.</p>					
		<p>4.2. Students lack basic math skills</p>	<p>4.2. Staff Development on differentiation of instruction and scaffolding to meet individual student needs</p>	<p>4.2. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>4.2. Observation</p>	<p>4.2. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	

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

		4.3. Students lack test taking skills	4.3. Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	4.3. ESE Department Chair Administration	4.3. Observation	4.3. Florida Alternate Assessment data	
		4.4. Students lack reading skills	4.4. Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development	4.4. ESE Department Chair Administration	4.4 Observations	4.4 Florida Alternate Assessment data	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra 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		

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

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.</p>	<p>1.1. Excessively high number of students were placed in Algebra 1A track in 2010-11 and 2011-12.</p>	<p>1.1. Increase articulation with feeder middle school and review of student data.</p>	<p>1.1. AP for Curriculum and Staff</p>	<p>1.1. Monitor enrollment</p>	<p>1.1. Algebra 1 EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> Increase by 10% students scoring proficient on Algebra EOC exam.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>52% (90) scored proficient on Alg EOC.</p>	<p>57% (99) will score proficient on Algebra EOC.</p>					
		<p>1.2. Lack of student engagement</p>	<p>1.2. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell-to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.</p>	<p>1.2. Staff</p>	<p>1.2. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs</p>	<p>1.2. Algebra 1 EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>	
		<p>1.3. Teachers lack knowledge of Algebra EOC test specifications preventing them from identifying appropriate strategies</p>	<p>1.3. Professional development on unpacking standards and aligning with test specifications and CCSS.</p>	<p>1.3. Staff</p>	<p>1.3. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs</p>	<p>1.3. Algebra 1 EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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.	2.1. Lack of knowledge and experience with higher depth of knowledge questions	2.1. Teachers will use more cognitive complexity tasks and higher DOK questions.	2.1. Staff	2.1. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	2.1. Algebra 1 EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments		
<u>Algebra Goal #2:</u> Increase by 10% students scoring at level 4 or 5 on Algebra EOC exam.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	13% (23) scored level 4 or 5 on Alg EOC.	15% (26) will score level 4 or 5 on Algebra EOC exam.					
		2.1. An excessively high number of students were placed in Algebra 1A track in 2010-11 and 2011-12.	2.1. Increase articulation with feeder middle school and review of student data.	2.1. AP for Curriculum and Staff	2.1. Monitor enrollment	2.1. Algebra 1 EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	52% scored a level 3 or higher					76% of students will be proficient.

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

<p><u>Algebra Goal #3A:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring at proficient levels in Algebra will increase by 10%. By the year 2016-2017, the percentage of students scoring non-proficient will be reduced by 50%</p>							
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p>	<p>3B.1. Some students lack basic math skills prior to entering Algebra</p>	<p>3B.1. Extended School Day opportunities will be provided for students needing additional support. Also, student placement into remedial courses will be utilized to provide additional support</p>	<p>3B.1. Administration</p>	<p>3B.1. Observations, Extended School Day attendance,</p>	<p>3B.1. Core K-12 Data, Common Assessment Data, Algebra EOC</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #3B:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students in this subgroup making progress in Algebra will increase.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>The 2012 subgroup data is not yet available.</p>	<p>The percentage of students in this subgroup making progress in Algebra will increase.:</p>					

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

		3B.2. Teachers are not familiar with the Algebra standards and the relationship to the EOC	3B.2. Teachers will participate in staff development focusing on unpacking the standards and aligning with the EOC.	3B.2. Administration and Math Department Chair	3B.2. Lesson Plans, Common Assessments and Observations	3B.2. CORE K-12 Data, Common Assessment Data and Algebra EOC	
		3B.3. Teacher level of expectation and rigor are low	3B.3. Teachers will participate in staff development that will focus on increase knowledge and implementation of higher DOK levels.	3B.3. Administration and Math Department Chair	3B.3. Lesson Plans, Common Assessments and Observations	3B.3. CORE K-12 Data, Common Assessment Data and Algebra EOC	
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.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
<u>Algebra Goal #3C:</u> This is not a subgroup at GHS.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	3D.1. Teachers do not differentiate instruction and assessment to meet the needs of these students.	3D.1. Provide staff development on differentiated instruction for both the mainstream and ESE teachers	3D.1. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	3D.1. Lesson Plan, walk-throughs and conferences	3D.1. CORE K-12, Algebra EOC, common assessments and observations		

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

<u>Algebra Goal #3D:</u> The percentage of SWD making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	The subgroup data is not available at this time.	The percentage of SWD making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase by 10%.					
		3D.2. Basic education teachers do not understand the needs of the SWD.	3D.2. ESE Department will conduct meetings with basic education teachers to discuss the needs of the students,	3D.2. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	3D.2. Meeting Agendas and sign-in logs	3D.2. CORE K-12, Algebra EOC, common assessments and observations	
		3D.3. ESE Teachers do not fully understand how to develop TIEPs to meet the individual needs of students	3D.3. ESE Department will attend district trainings.	3D.3. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	3D.3. Review of TIEPs	3D.3. CORE K-12, Algebra EOC, common assessments and observations	
		3D.4. Some SWD need additional support	3D.4. Students will be placed in classes utilizing Support Facilitation and/or Co-Teach models of instruction	3D.4. ESE Department Chair and Administrator for ESE	3D.4. Review of TIEPs	3D.4. CORE K-12, Algebra EOC, common assessments and observations	
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

<p>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p>	<p>3E.1. Nutritional concerns exits for students of poverty</p>	<p>3E.1. Increase the number of students participating in the free and reduced breakfast and lunch programs available to students and families</p>	<p>3E.1. Student Services</p>	<p>3E.1. Monitor number of applications for services completed and students taking advantage of services.</p>	<p>3E.1. FNS Data</p>		
<p><u>Algebra Goal #3E:</u> The percentage of FRL students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>The subgroup data is not available at this time.</p>	<p>The percentage of FRL students making satisfactory progress in Algebra will increase by 10%.</p>					
		<p>3E.2. Parents need information on resources available.</p>	<p>3E.2 Information and opportunities for assistance will be provided and monitored by staff</p>	<p>3E.2. Student Services, Social Worker, SSAP Staff</p>	<p>3E.2. Monitor students participating in programs</p>	<p>3E.2. Review of progress of students in need..</p>	
		<p>3E.3 Staff lacks skills and understanding of how to deal with students and families in poverty</p>	<p>3E.3 Provide Staff Development for staff on best practices for working with students in poverty</p>	<p>3E.3 Administration Social Worker</p>	<p>3E.3 Observations</p>	<p>3E.3 Review of student data, FAIR, FCAT 2.0 and common assessments</p>	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

* 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		

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

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</p>	<p>1.1. Lack of student engagement</p>	<p>1.1. School wide expectations will be developed for non-negotiables including bell-to-bell instruction using best practices, standards based curriculum, data driven instruction and school wide discipline expectations.</p>	<p>1.1. Staff</p>	<p>1.1. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs</p>	<p>1.1. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>		
<p><u>Geometry Goal #1:</u> Exceed the district average in Geometry EOC scores.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>26% (54) at middle range T score with 60% (125) at upper range T score.</p>	<p>Be higher than the district average in Geometry EOC.</p>					
		<p>1.2. Low scores in Algebra EOC</p>	<p>1.2. Professional development on unpacking standards and aligning with test specifications and CCSS.</p>	<p>1.2. Staff</p>	<p>1.2. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs</p>	<p>1.2. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>	
		<p>1.3. Time needed for remediation for students who failed ALG EOC detracts from time from geometry instruction.</p>	<p>1.3. After school review sessions, boot camps, professional development on aligning algebra standards with geometry standards</p>	<p>1.3. Staff</p>	<p>1.3. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs</p>	<p>1.3. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments</p>	

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

		1.4 Teachers are unfamiliar with Geometry EOC and the alignment to the standards	1.4. Professional development on unpacking standards and aligning with test specifications and CCSS.	1.4. Staff	1.4. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	1.4. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments	
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 Teachers are unfamiliar with Geometry EOC and the alignment to the standards	2.1 Professional development on unpacking standards and aligning with test specifications and CCSS.	2.1 Staff	2.1. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	2.1. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments		
<u>Geometry Goal #2:</u> The percentage of student scoring at or above level 4 on the Geometry EOC will meet the district average.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	During the 2012 Geometry EOC, 60% of the students scored in the upper 3 rd of the T score range.	The percentage of student scoring at or above level 4 on the Geometry EOC will meet the district average.					
		2.2. Teachers are unfamiliar with the implementation of higher levels of DOK.	2.2. Professional development on Webbs Depth of Knowledge	2.2. Administration, Math Department Chair	2.2. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	2.2. Geometry EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

<p>3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p>						
<p><u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> The percentage of students scoring at a proficient level will be determined with the 2012-2013 baseline testing year.</p>							
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>		
<p><u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					

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

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					
		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

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

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards Implementation	All Math	Department Chair	All Math Teachers	Content Level PLC Monthly meetings	Lesson Plans and Walkthroughs	Administration and Department Chair
PLC-Standards and EOC Alignment	Algebra 1, Geometry and Liberal Arts Teachers	Department Chair	Algebra 1, Geometry and Liberal Arts Teachers	Content Level PLC Monthly meetings	Lesson Plans and Walkthroughs	Administration and Department Chair
PLC's-Teachers will focus on Literacy in the content	All Science Teachers	Administration	All Science Teachers	On going-Each PLC (3 times per month)	Lesson Plans and Walk-throughs	Administration

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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

End of Mathematics 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		

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

<p>1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Science Access Points Standards.</p>	<p>1.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment</p>	<p>1.1. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.1. Observation</p>	<p>1.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u> Maintain 100% of students scoring at a level 4, 5 or 6.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>100% (1 student) scored a level 6 during the 2011-2012 school year.</p>	<p>100 % of students will score a level 4, 5 or 6 .</p>					
		<p>1.2 Students lack test taking skills</p>	<p>1.2 Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>1.2 ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.2 Observation</p>	<p>1.2 Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
		<p>1.3 Students lack reading skills</p>	<p>1.3 Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>1.3 ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>1.3 Observations</p>	<p>1.3 Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</p>	<p>2.1. Teachers are unfamiliar with the Science Access Points Standards.</p>	<p>2.1. Staff development on unpacking the standards to better understand the alignment of the standards and the assessment</p>	<p>2.1. ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>2.1. Observation</p>	<p>2.1. Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>		
<p><u>Science Goal #2:</u> Increase the number of students scoring a level 7 by at least one student.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>None of the students scored a level 7.</p>	<p>At least one student will score a level 7.</p>					
		<p>2.2 Students lack test taking skills</p>	<p>2.2 Training on the best practices in the area of test-taking strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>2.2 ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>2.2 Observation</p>	<p>2.2 Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	
		<p>2.3 Students lack reading skills</p>	<p>2.3 Training on the best practices in the area of reading strategies will be used in PLC and staff development</p>	<p>2.3 ESE Department Chair Administration</p>	<p>2.3 Observations</p>	<p>2.3 Florida Alternate Assessment data</p>	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

Biology 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. Students lack experience with complex texts and high levels of DOK.	1.1. Professional development in PLCs will focus on increasing DOK and text complexity within lessons.	1.1. Staff	1.1. Observations, lesson plan analysis and walkthroughs	1.1. Biology EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments		
<u>Biology Goal #1:</u> Exceed the district average in Biology EOC scores.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	30% (83) at middle range T score with 34% (93) at upper range T score.	Be higher than the district average in Biology EOC scores.					

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

		1.2. Lack of reading proficiency of students	1.2. Teachers will implement best practices such as vocabulary, summarization, gradual release, writing, CCSS	1.2. Staff	1.2. Observations, lesson plan analysis and walkthroughs	1.2. Biology EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments	
		1.3. Teachers lack knowledge of Biology EOC test specifications preventing them from identifying appropriate strategies	1.3. Professional development on unpacking standards and aligning with test specifications and CCSS.	1.3. Staff	1.3. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	1.3. Biology EOC exam, CORE K-12 and common assessments	
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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology Goal #2: Be higher than the district average in Biology EOC scores.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					

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

	In 2012, 34% of our students scored in the upper 3 rd of the T scores	Be higher than the district average in Biology EOC scores.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Biology 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
PLC's-Teachers will unpack the standards and align with the EOC	9 th and 10 th Grade Biology Teachers	Administration	9 th and 10 th Grade Biology Teachers	October 2012	Focus Calendars and Common Assessments	Administration
PLC's-Teachers will focus on Literacy in the content	All Science Teachers	Administration	All Science Teachers	On going-Each PLC (3 times per month)	Lesson Plans and Walk-throughs	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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		
1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1a.1. Students lack the skills to develop a valid argument and defend their position	1a.1. Create a school wide focus on utilization of DBQ and synthesis (AP) writing	1a.1. Staff	1a.1. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	1a.1. FCAT Writes and Writing Samples		
<u>Writing Goal #1a:</u> Increase by 10% students scoring proficient on FCAT Writes!	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	83% (242) scored proficient.	91% will score proficient on FCAT Writing					
		1a.2. Lack of familiarity with FCAT rubric	1a.2. Professional development on FCAT rubric and other applicable rubrics identified by the lead literacy team.	1a.2. Staff	1a.2. Lesson plan analysis, observations and walkthroughs	1a.2. FCAT Writes and Writing Samples	

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

		1a.3. Writing not being incorporated throughout all content areas.	1a.3. Development of school wide writing expectation	1a.3. Administration and Writing Coordinator	1a.3. Lesson Plans and Focus Calendars	1a.3. FCAT Writes and Writing Samples	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.		
<u>Writing Goal #1b:</u> Maintain 100% proficiency.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	100% (2) students scored proficient.	100% proficiency.					
		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						
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

<p>(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.</p>						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
College Board Writing Workshop	10 th -English and Social Studies	College Board	10 th -English and Social Studies	November 2012	Writing Samples	Administration
PLC's will train on the Six Traits and FCAT Writes Rubric	ALL	English Teachers	ALL	September 2012	Writing Samples	All teachers

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
College Board Writing Workshop	10 th grade English Teachers and World History teachers will participate in a writing workshop focusing on Document Based writing and synthesis	School AP Funds	\$5,000
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

End of Writing Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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		

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

<p>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</p>	<p>1.1. Teacher and students lack of knowledge of the U.S. History EOC.</p>	<p>1.1. Professional Learning Communities and Staff Development to unpack the standards and align them with the test specifications.</p>	<p>1.1. Staff and Administration</p>	<p>1.1. Lesson Plans, Observations</p>	<p>1.1. Common Assessments, U.S. History EOC</p>		
<p><u>U.S. History Goal #1:</u> Exceed the district average T-scores on the U.S. History EOC scores.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>No data</p>	<p>Exceed district and state average</p>					
		<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		

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

<p>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</p>	<p>2.1. Teacher and students lack of knowledge of the U.S. History EOC.</p>	<p>2.1. Professional Learning Communities and Staff Development to unpack the standards and align them with the test specifications.</p>	<p>2.1. Staff and Administration</p>	<p>2.1. Lesson Plans, Observations</p>	<p>2.1. Common Assessments, U.S. History EOC</p>		
<p><u>U.S. History Goal #2:</u> Exceed the district average T-scores on the U.S. History EOC scores.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p>No data</p>	<p>Exceed district and state average</p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	

U.S. History Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community</p>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

(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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC's-US History teachers will participate in curriculum and test standards training	11 th Grade US History Teachers	Teachers and Administrators	All 11 th Grade US History Teachers	January 2013	Focus Calendars	Teachers and Administration
PLC's-Teachers will focus on Literacy in the content	All Science Teachers	Administration	All Science Teachers	On going-Each PLC (3 times per month)	Lesson Plans and Walk-throughs	Administration

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Structures of families and issues within those family structures allow students to be absent from school.	1.1. The MTSS team and teachers will design and implement an attendance incentive program.	1.1. MTSS Coach and team leaders as well as school social worker	1.1. Monitor attendance monthly	1.1. Attendance reports		

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

Attendance Goal #1: Decrease students with excessive absences by 50%.	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	9-12 grade 92.627%	Increase the attendance rate to 95% or greater					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	424 students missed 10 or more days for 3 or more periods during 1 st semester and 389 during 2 nd semester. Total population 1243.	220 or less students will miss 3 or more periods of the regular school day during 1 st semester and 200 during 2 nd semester.					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	299 students were tardy to 1 or more classes of (1243)	250 or less students will be tardy to 1 or more classes.					
		1.2. Lack of school wide application of consequences for non-attendance	1.2. Monitor attendance and report attendance violations to DMV, implement a “No Go” list for extracurricular activities in accordance with district policies and establish use of a privilege card system to reward student attendance	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2. Monitor attendance regularly to comply with rolling 90 days reporting requirement as well as comply with district extra curricular activity participation.	1.2. Attendance data	
		1.3. Lack of school wide application of consequences for tardies	1.3. Monitor tardies and establish use of a privilege card system to reward student attendance	1.3. Assistant Principal	1.3. Monitor attendance quarterly.	1.3. Attendance data	

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC groups will discuss issues surrounding students in low-socio-economic situations	All	Administration and District	All	First Semester	Monitor Attendance	Administration

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

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Create an Incentive Program for Attendance	Students earn Buccs Bucks for attendance and can use them to purchase items such as soap, shampoo and other personal items	Donations from local business and ABC	1,000
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
---------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Lack of school wide discipline expectations	1.1. Development of school wide discipline expectations. Development of a discipline matrix for interventions.	1.1. MTSS team Administration	1.1. Monthly review of discipline data and monitoring of IA's discipline interventions	1.1. Monthly review of discipline data		
Suspension Goal #1: The number of suspension incidents will decrease by 10%.	<u>2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	In 2012, 694 incidents lead to in-school suspension.	The number of in-school suspension incidents will decrease by 10%.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	In 2012, 266 students (21%) received in-school suspension.	The number of students receiving in-school suspension will decrease by 10%.					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	In 2012, 382 incidents lead to out-of-school suspension.	The number of out-of-school suspension incidents will decrease by 10%.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					

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

	In 2012, 158 students (13%) received out- of- school.	The number of students receiving out-of-school suspension will decrease by 10%.out- of- school					
		1.2. Lack of positive behavior plan	1.2. Develop a positive behavioral plan to include a privilege card system	1.2. MTSS team Administration	1.2. Monthly review of discipline data	1.2. Monthly review of discipline data and teacher discipline data	
		1.3. Lack of a Alternative to Suspension Plan	1.3. Development of an ATS plan as in intervention prior to suspension	1.3. MTSS team Administration	1.3. Monthly review of discipline data	Monthly review of discipline data and teacher discipline data 1.3.	
		1.4. Lack of student engagement during class	1.4. Professional Development on the implementation of Gradual Release of Responsibility and Webb's DOK	1.4. MTSS team Administration	1.4. Observations, Lesson Plans and discipline data	1.4. Monthly review of discipline data and teacher discipline data	
		1.5. Teachers need support with classroom behavior interventions	1.5. Professional Development focusing on classroom management and the implementation of Gradual Release of Responsibility	1.5. MTSS team Administration	1.5. Observations and review of discipline data	1.5. Monthly review of discipline data and teacher discipline data	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC groups will discuss issues surrounding students in low-socio-economic situations.	All	Administration and District	All	First Semester	Monitor Attendance	Administration
PLC's-Teachers will discuss and develop a school-wide discipline plan and expectations.	All	Administration and District	All	First Semester	Monitor Attendance	Administration

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

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 <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	1.1. SSAP has focused only on the students more than 3 credits behind	1.1. Create a system of identifying potential at-risk students in 9 th and 10 th grade prior to students failing courses.	1.1. SSAP Staff, MTSS team and administration	1.1. Review of student grades, discipline and attendance each quarter.	1.1. Review of student grades, discipline and attendance each quarter.		

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

<p>During the 2012-13 school year, we will decrease the number of students who dropout by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>The 2012 data is not available yet. During 2011, the dropout rate was .3%</p>	<p>Decrease the dropout rate by 10%.</p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p>The 2012 data is not available yet. During 2011, the graduation rate was 83%.</p>	<p>Increase the graduation rate by 10%.</p>					
		<p>1.2. No system of remediation for students not successful on EOC exams.</p>	<p>1.2. Departments/Courses with EOC exams will develop a plan of remediation during and after school</p>	<p>1.2. Department Chairs, SSAP and Administration</p>	<p>1.2. Review of attendance/ participation in remediation programs</p>	<p>1.2. Graduation and Dropout data</p>	
		<p>1.3. Monitoring students with the potential of dropping achievement levels on FCAT 2.0 (low level 3 students)</p>	<p>1.3. Identify students in this area and assign to SSAP for monitoring. English teachers will monitor during common assessments</p>	<p>1.3. Literacy Coach, SSAP, English teachers and Administration</p>	<p>1.3. Review of common assessment data, FAIR data</p>	<p>1.3. FCAT 2.0, FAIR data and common assessments</p>	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

<p>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning</p>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC groups will discuss issues surrounding students in low-socio-economic situations.	All	Administration and District	All	First Semester	Monitor Attendance	Administration

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
<p style="text-align: right;">Subtotal:</p>			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<p style="text-align: right;">Subtotal:</p>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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.

April 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

* 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 <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	1.1. No organized parent programs or events providing parents with needed information and skills to assist their children	1.1. Development of monthly parent nights to address issues concerning parents and student achievement	1.1. Social Worker and Administration	1.1. Attendance at organized parent events	1.1. Review of attendance data and feedback from parent surveys		
Other than athletic, SAC, Open House and IB events, there is minimal parental involvement or activities.	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
	During the 2012 school year, no data was collected regarding parent involvement other than SAC.	During the 2013 school year, we will increase the opportunities for parents to be involved in school activities and programs					

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

		1.2. No method of collecting data from organizations hosting parent events (HCA, IB, ROTC, Band and Guidance)	1.2. Develop a system of reporting and collecting data from parent events	1.2. Five-Star coordinator, Social Worker and Administration	1.2. Attendance at organized parent events	1.2. Review of attendance data and feedback from parent surveys	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring
PLC groups will discuss issues surrounding students in low-socio-economic situations.	All	Administration and District	All	First Semester	Monitor Attendance	Administration

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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: During the 2012-2013, we will review the courses offered that support STEM and identify courses/programs of study to implement during the 2013-2014 school year.	1.1. Lack of programs and courses to support a STEM program.	1.1. Develop a plan on increasing courses being offered. Survey parents, students and staff to determine courses needed/wanted	1.1. Administration	1.1. Survey results and review of course offerings	1.1. Review of courses offered 2013-2014 school year
	1.2. Teacher certification in CCTE courses that will support a STEM	1.2. Review of teacher certifications and certification needs for courses offered	1.2. CCTE District Staff and Administration	1.2. Review of courses and certification needs	1.2. Review of courses offered 2013-2014 school year
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

<p>CTE Goal #1:</p> <p>During the 2011-2012 school year no students earned industry certification in any CTE course offered at Gulf High School. During the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase the number of students successful earning an industry certification.</p>	<p>1.2. Teacher certification in CTE courses that will lead to industry certification</p>	<p>1.2. Review of teacher certifications and certification needs for courses offered</p>	<p>1.2. CCTE District Staff and Administration</p>	<p>1.2. Review of courses and certification needs</p>	<p>1.2. Review of courses offered 2013-2014 school year</p>
	<p>1.2. Students do not select several of our CTE courses as electives.</p>	<p>1.2. Review of course curriculum and survey parents and teachers to identify programs that better suit needs and interest of community</p>	<p>1.2. CCTE District Staff and Administration</p>	<p>1.2. Review of courses and survey results</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>

CTE Professional Development

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

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Enrollment and Retention of IB Students in our program	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1. Transportation to satellite/home schools	1.1. Work with transportation to identify additional PM drop-off sites	1.1. Steve Page	1.1. Increased Enrollment for those needing transportation	1.1. Monitor Enrollment		

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

Additional Goal #1: Increase our currently enrollment by 5% and our retention by 10%.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	In 2012, the graduating class only represented 40% of the original co-hort.	Increase our currently enrollment by 5% and our retention by 10%.					
		1.2. Lack of study, research and test taking skills	1.2. All 9 th grade students, beginning 2013-14, will take a inquiry skills class. We will use the 2012-13 to develop course.	1.2. Steve Page and Selected IB Teachers	1.2. Monitor enrollment and retention; Increased proficiency on Extended Essays	1.2. Monitor enrollment and retention; Increased proficiency on Extended Essays	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

Total:			
---------------	--	--	--

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2. when the menu pops up, select "checked" under "Default Value" header; 3. Select "OK", this will place an "x" in the box.)

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount