

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



BROOKSHIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Orange County Public Schools

School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: BROOKSHIRE ELEMENTARY	District Name: ORANGE
Principal: MARC RUMMLER	Superintendent: DR. BARBARA JENKINS
SAC Chair: SUSAN VARAN	Date of School Board Approval: 1/29/13

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Marc Rummler	EdD – Ed Leadership MA – Ed Leadership BS – Phys Ed	2	16	<p>2011-2012: Principal Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-75%, Math-72%, Writing-87%, Science-78% • %Making Learning Gains Read-80%, Math-88% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-72%, Math-81% • School Grade – A <p>2010-2011: Principal Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • %Meeting High Standards Read-89%, Math-92%, Writing-79%, Science-84% • %Making Learning Gains Read-78%, Math-59% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-71%, Math-53% • School Grade – A AYP – 87% <p>2009-2010: Principal East Lake Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-89%, Math-90%, Writing-94%, Science-65% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 73%, Math- 69% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 57%, Math 77% • School Grade- A AYP – 100% <p>2008-2009: Principal East Lake Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-90%, Math-88%, Writing-98%, Science-59% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 72%, Math- 76% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 63%, Math 78% • School Grade- A AYP – 100% <p>2007-2008: Principal East Lake Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-92%, Math-86%, Writing-93%, Science-67% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 72%, Math- 63% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 68%, Math 61% • School Grade- A AYP – 95% <p>2006-2007: Principal East Lake Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-87%, Math-88%, Writing-94%, Science-64% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 72%, Math- 75%

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

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 58%, Math 77% • School Grade- A AYP – 100% 2005-2006: Principal East Lake Elementary School • % Meeting High Standards Read-86%, Math-85%, Writing-86% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 68%, Math- 76% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 57% • School Grade- A AYP – 95% (Met Provisional Status) 2004-2005: Principal Bonneville Elementary School • % Meeting High Standards Read-82%, Math-81%, Writing-94% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 66%, Math- 79% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 50% • School Grade- A AYP – 100% 2003-2004: Principal Bonneville Elementary School • % Meeting High Standards Read-80%, Math-67%, Writing-97% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 68%, Math- 71% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 61% • School Grade- A AYP – 97% 2002-2003: Principal Bonneville Elementary School • % Meeting High Standards Read-73%, Math-65%, Writing-86% • % Making Learning Gains Read- 68%, Math- 73% • Lowest 25% Progress- Read- 65% • School Grade- A AYP – 97% 2001-2002: Principal Three Points Elementary School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Grade (new school) 2000-2001: Principal LakeWeston Elementary School 1999-2000: Principal LakeWeston Elementary School 1998-1999: Principal LakeWeston Elementary School 1997-1998: Assistant Principal Bonneville Elementary School 1996-1997: Assistant Principal Lakemont Elementary School
Assistant Principal	None				

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Grade 5 Teacher	Amber Helsel	B.S. – Education Studies M.A. – Elementary Ed	7	1	<p>2011-2012: Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-75%, Math-72%, Writing-87%, Science-78% • %Making Learning Gains Read-80%, Math-88% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-72%, Math-81% • School Grade – A <p>2010-2011: Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • %Meeting High Standards Read-89%, Math-92%, Writing-79%, Science-84% • %Making Learning Gains Read-78%, Math-59% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-71%, Math-53% • School Grade – A AYP – 87%
CRT	Annette Gidus	B.S. – Elementary Ed	3	2	<p>2011-2012: CRT Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % Meeting High Standards Read-75%, Math-72%, Writing-87%, Science-78% • %Making Learning Gains Read-80%, Math-88% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-72%, Math-81% • School Grade – A <p>2010-2011: CRT Brookshire Elementary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • %Meeting High Standards Read-89%, Math-92%, Writing-79%, Science-84% • %Making Learning Gains Read-78%, Math-59% • Lowest 25% Progress Read-71%, Math-53% • School Grade – A AYP – 87%

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

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Teacher Mentors/Mentees Monthly Meetings	Annette Gidus – CRT Amber Helsel – Instr. Coach	Ongoing
2. Great Beginnings – OCPS	Annette Gidus – CRT	Ongoing
3. Data Meetings	Marc Rummler – Principal	Ongoing
4. PLC Meetings	Marc Rummler – Principal Annette Gidus – CRT Team Leaders	Ongoing
5. Provide Professional Development	Marc Rummler – Principal Annette Gidus – CRT	Ongoing

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
<p>10% (5) teachers out-of-field in ESOL</p> <p>2% (1) rated below Effective</p>	<p>Currently working on ESOL endorsements</p> <p>Providing Mentor Additional Professional Development</p>

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
51	0% (0)	21% (11)	43% (22)	35% (18)	35% (18)	98% (50)	2% (1)	7% (4)	67% (34)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amber Helsel	Laura Hamilton	Mentor is trained and successfully worked with mentee last year	Weekly Meetings Monthly Classroom Observation w/ Feedback

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

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only – n/a

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

Title I, Part A n/a
Title I, Part C- Migrant n/a
Title I, Part D n/a
Title II n/a
Title III n/a
Title X- Homeless n/a
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) n/a
Violence Prevention Programs n/a
Nutrition Programs n/a
Housing Programs n/a
Head Start n/a
Adult Education n/a
Career and Technical Education n/a
Job Training n/a
Other n/a

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co teaching. PLC Team (Five Math Strands) Leaders: develop grade level support team to monitor reading fluency on a bi-weekly basis; evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and intervention monitoring. School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities and will also be part of the grade level support team that is handling ongoing progress monitoring of ESE students. Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills. Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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 Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers, and in our students? The team meets once per month to engage in the following activities: Review blogs posted by teachers, reports from grade level support team, review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify student needs and recommend intervention adjustments and additional resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Team Leaders met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), SuccessMaker Reports, fluency timings by grade level support team, and Houghton-Mifflin Unit Tests: Vocabulary and comprehension. Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation- Edusoft Benchmark Testing Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA) End of year: FAIR, FCAT Frequency of Data Days: twice per month for data analysis</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be on going during teachers' common planning time and one day after school per month. The Rtl team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the monthly Rtl Leadership Team meetings.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS. Professional development will be on going during teachers' common planning time and one day after school per month. The Rtl team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the monthly Rtl Leadership Team meetings.</p>

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Amber Helsel – Grade 5/Instructional Coach Renee Anderson – Grade 4 Annie Dickman – Grade 3 Melodie Mihailoff – Grade 2 Candice Behl – Grade 1 Peggy Lenfest – Grade K Patty Moenssens – Media Specialist Betty Walsh – Rtl Coach/CCT Annette Gidus - CRT Marc Rummler – Principal
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The LLT meets monthly to collaborate on the reading curriculum and instruction at the school. We utilize FAIR data, STAR data, Edusoft data and teacher anecdotal data to monitor student reading trends and possible gaps in student learning. The LLT evaluates sample research based materials to determine if it is a program that could supplement a strong instructional match to close the gaps in student learning.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The LLT will offer additional intervention and supplemental support for individual classes and students based on student academic need. The LLT has implemented a change in the school wide infrastructure with an intense focus on teaching the 90 minute Core reading block with fidelity. The LLT has initiated a move in school-wide processes that better provide the Immediate Intensive Intervention beyond the 90 minute block for children in need with adopted curriculum materials.

Public School Choice

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

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

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

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

n/a

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

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

n/a

****High Schools Only***

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

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

n/a

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?

n/a

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](#).

n/a

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Lack of exposure to higher level thinking opportunities.	1A.1. Teacher training in Houghton-Mifflin strategies. Flexible grouping in classrooms. PLC focus on higher-level thinking.	1A.1. Principal Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations PLC Minutes	1A.1. Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
Reading Goal #1A: To ensure students acquire necessary reading skills to demonstrate grade level proficiency as measured by a 3% increase of Level 3 students in reading on FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% (64) FCAT Level 3	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 28% FCAT Level 3	1A.2. Students not reading text on their level.	1A.2. Revamp Accelerated Reader program to focus on each student's independent reading level. Better instructional match of text to small group instruction. Flexible grouping of students.	1A.2. Principal Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Grouping Lists of Students	1A.2. STAR Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
			1A.3. Students' lack of on-grade level fluency.	1A.3. Support staff to administer and record bi-weekly fluency timings. Implement Read 2 Succeed program. Implement 6-minute Solution program.	1A.3. CRT Support Staff	1A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.3. Programs Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A
<u>Reading Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>N/A – less than 10 students</i>	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. – N/A	1B.2. – N/A	1B.2. – N/A	1B.2. – N/A	1B.2. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Reading Goal #2A: To ensure students continue to be challenged and to demonstrate growth with above grade level skills as measured by a 3% increase in Level 4 & 5 in reading on FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 52% (133) Level 4+ FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 55% Level 4+ FCAT	Lack of exposure to higher level thinking opportunities.	Teacher training in Houghton-Mifflin program. Flexible grouping in classrooms. PLC focus on higher-level thinking.	Principal Classroom Teachers	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations PLC Minutes	Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			Teachers' ability to differentiate instruction for high achieving students.	Teachers visit classrooms of other schools with successful differentiation of instruction and with a similar student body. Flexible grouping in classrooms.	Principal CRT Classroom Teachers	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Review	Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
		To ensure core reading instruction is being implemented with fidelity.	Agenda of weekly team meetings. Teacher training in Houghton-Mifflin program. Improved utilization of the Houghton-Mifflin series.	Principal CRT Team Leaders Classroom Teachers	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Review	Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A
Reading Goal #2B: N/A – less than 10 students	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Insufficient time during the school day for supplemental activities.	3A.1. Establish before and after school times for the computer lab to be open for students to get extra time on Kids' College. Ensure homework is rigorous and relevant. Revise teacher schedule to maximize reading time.	3A.1. Literacy Leadership Team	3A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Review	3A.1. Kids' College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations
Reading Goal #3A: To provide appropriate instruction and monitor progress to ensure students on all levels have opportunity to make learning gains as measured by a 3% increase.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 81% (206) Learning Gains on FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 84% Learning Gains on FCAT	3A.2. Insufficient materials for differentiation of instruction	3A.2. Implement Elements of Reading. Utilize Corrective Reading for students working one year or more below grade level.	3A.2. Literacy Leadership Team	3A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Review	3A.2. Program Assessments Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations
			3A.3. Sustaining growth of high achieving students.	3A.3. Involve gifted teachers in planning high level activities. Revise schedules to maximize learning opportunities. Better implementation of differentiated instruction within the enrichment block. Flexible grouping within the enrichment block.	3A.3. Literacy Leadership Team	3A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Review	3A.3. Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>N/A – less than 10 students</i>	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4A: To provide supplemental instruction for 100% of the students in the lowest 25% and to closely monitor to ensure growth as measured by a 3% increase on FCAT.			4A.1. Students with limited background knowledge.	4A.1. Increase use of non-fiction text. Revamp Accelerated Reader program. Introduce and implement Kids' College computer program. Utilize Fundamentals of Grammar. Schedule relevant field trips.	4A.1. Principal CRT	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Teacher Feedback	4A.1. AR Reports Kids' College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations		
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	4A.2. Insufficient additional blocks of reading time.	4A.2. Revise schedule of ESE and support staff to work with at-risk students on "plus-more" reading instruction. Revamp after-school tutoring program to start earlier in the year. Open computer labs before and after school.	4A.2. Principal CRT ESE Team	4A.2. Progress Monitoring Teacher Feedback	4A.2. Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
			74% (31) Learning Gains on FCAT	77% Learning Gains on FCAT	4A.3. Administrative and instructional staff still learning the RtI process.	4A.3. Build effective RtI infrastructure. Train staff in RtI procedures. Develop better tracking system of students. Expand RtI meetings to twice per month.	4A.3. Principal RtI Team	4A.3. RtI Meetings Teacher Feedback	4A.3. Data collected from RtI meetings

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

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. -N/A	4B.1. -N/A	4B.1. -N/A	4B.1. -N/A	4B.1. -N/A
Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>N/A – less than 10 students</i>	N/A	N/A					
			4B.2. -N/A	4B.2. -N/A	4B.2. -N/A	4B.2. -N/A	4B.2. -N/A

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017												
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	Black – 50% on target White – 81% SWD – 45%	Black – 54% on target White – 83% SWD – 50%	Black – 59% on target White – 84% SWD – 55%	Black – 63% on target White – 86% SWD – 60%	Black – 68% White – 88% SWD – 65%	Black – 73% White – 90% SWD – 70%													
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> To raise the achievement level of designated subgroups.		ED – 62% Overall: 77	ED – 66% Overall: 79	ED – 69% Overall: 81	ED – 73% Overall: 83	ED – 76% Overall: 85	ED – 80% Overall: 88													
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool													
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. Students that come to Brookshire with a limited vocabulary.	5B.1. Implement Elements of Vocabulary. Utilize Kids’ College program. Utilize Thinking Maps.	5B.1. Principal CRT Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Progress Monitoring RtI Meetings	5B.1. Kids’ College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT													
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> To decrease the achievement gap of Black students by 15%.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">White: 19% (32)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">White: 15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Black: 55% (18)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Black: 40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Hispanic: 21% (9)</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Hispanic: 15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Asian: <10</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Asian:<10</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">American Indian:<10</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">American Indian:<10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 19% (32)	White: 15%	Black: 55% (18)	Black: 40%	Hispanic: 21% (9)	Hispanic: 15%	Asian: <10	Asian:<10	American Indian:<10	American Indian:<10		5B.2. Students’ lack of motivation to achieve reading success.	5B.2. Develop an incentive program for performance on Kids’ College. Revamp incentive program for Accelerated Reader. Provide each student with an adult mentor.	5B.2. Principal CRT Mentors	5B.2. Progress Monitoring RtI Meetings	5B.2. Kids’ College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT	
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																			
White: 19% (32)	White: 15%																			
Black: 55% (18)	Black: 40%																			
Hispanic: 21% (9)	Hispanic: 15%																			
Asian: <10	Asian:<10																			
American Indian:<10	American Indian:<10																			
			5B.3. Students live too far away to participate in after-school tutoring.	5B.3. Provide transportation for after-school tutoring.	5B.3. Principal	5B.3. Attendance at tutoring program	5B.3. Tutoring data													

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Students that enter Brookshire will lack necessary literacy skills.	5C.1. Continue intense individual and small group instruction provided by CCT and bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.1. CCT	5C.1. Progress Monitoring Principal Observations	5C.1. CELLA Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
Reading Goal #5C: ELL students currently outperform all subgroups. Goal is to accelerate the momentum by further decreasing by 3% the students not making satisfactory progress.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 18% (4) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 15% Level 1 & 2 FCAT					
				5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Lack of adequate knowledge by staff on providing rigorous curriculum and instruction.	5D.1. Develop a PLC with a specific focus on ESE academic rigor. Provide professional development to all staff working with SWD on appropriate curriculum. Provide substitutes for teachers to observe effective classrooms at other schools.	5D.1. Principal Staffing Specialist ESE Team	5D.1. Teacher Feedback PLC Meeting Notes Principal Observation	5D.1. Alternate Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
Reading Goal #5D: To increase the rigor of the instruction of SWD as measured by a 10% decrease in students not making sufficient progress.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 68% (26) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 58% Level 1 & 2 FCAT					
				5D.2. Students often have several teachers and 'ownership' of each student's goals and IEP can be overlooked.	5D.2. Schedule bi-weekly meetings between ESE teacher and general education teacher. All teachers participate in all IEP Team Meetings.	5D.2. Staffing Specialist Principal	5D.2. Progress Monitoring Notes from Collaboration Meetings Notes from IEP Team Meetings

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Lack of necessary supplies and supplemental reading materials to be successful.	5E.1. Provide supplies for those students in need. Proceeds from Book Fair used to provide books for those in need. Utilize PTA Angel Fund to purchase books for students.	5E.1. Principal Office Clerk	5E.1. Teacher Feedback	5E.1. Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
Reading Goal #5E: To provide the necessary materials and strategies to students as measured by decreasing by 3% the students not making satisfactory progress.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 39% (36) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 36% Level 1 & 2 FCAT	5E.2. Students' lack of grade level fluency.	5E.2. Support staff to administer and record bi-weekly fluency timings. Implement Read 2 Succeed program. Implement 6-minute Solution program.	5E.2. CRT Support Staff	5E.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	5E.2. Programs Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
RTI	K-5	RTI Team	School-Wide	RTI Team Meetings – third Friday of every month. School-Wide RTI Meetings – second Wednesday of every month.	Monthly Team Meetings RTI Admin Team Monthly Meetings Data Collection	Principal RTI Team
Literacy Leadership Team	K-5	CRT Instructional Coach	Literacy Team	Monthly Meeting to review data and analyze NGSSS and CCSS.	Data Collection Agenda Item at Monthly Team Meetings	CRT Instructional Coach Literacy Leadership Team
PLC ESE Academic Rigor	ESE	Principal Staffing Specialist	ESE	Monthly PLC Meeting	Weekly Team Meeting	Principal

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

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Florida Ready Reading Books to increase reading skills	FCAT 2.0 Prep – Grades 3 - 5	General Budget	\$800.
			Subtotal: \$800
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Kids' College to increase reading skills	Software	Extended Day	\$5,000
Accelerated Reader to increase comprehension	Additional AR Tests	PTA	\$2018.
STAR Reading	Diagnostic Tool	General Budget	\$470.
			Subtotal: \$7,488
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Observing effective instruction at other OCPS schools	Provide Substitutes	General Budget	\$3,300
			Subtotal: \$3,300
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
After School Tutoring	Tutoring	General Budget – SAI	\$8,910.
Media Center Books to increase literacy skills	Assorted Book Titles	General Budget	\$2,444.
			Subtotal: \$11,354
			Total: \$22,942

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1: To provide the necessary strategies for students to improve as measured by a 3% increase in the Proficiency level on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:	Four of the students are language impaired	Create audio versions of books Pre-teach key vocabulary words Utilize peer conferencing	CCT Bilingual Paraprofessional Classroom Teachers	Teacher Feedback Classroom Observation	CELLA Benchmark Assessments FCAT
	58% (11)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		Six of the students have parents that do not speak English	Provide after-school tutoring More frequent PLC meetings to share strategies	Principal CCT	Attendance in Tutoring Attendance at PLC	CELLA Benchmark Assessments FCAT
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2: To provide the necessary strategies for students to improve as measured by a 3% increase in the Proficiency level on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	Five of the students receive SLD services	Implement Elements of Vocabulary Build sight word vocabulary in small group instruction Provide visual aids during instruction	CCT Bilingual Paraprofessional Classroom & ESE Teachers	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observation	CELLA Benchmark Assessments FCAT
	26% (5)					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		Six of the students have parents that do not speak English	Provide after-school tutoring More frequent PLC meetings to share strategies	Principal CCT	Attendance in Tutoring Attendance at PLC	CELLA Benchmark Assessments FCAT

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: To provide the necessary strategies for students to improve as measured by a 3% increase in the Proficiency level on CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	Limited grammar skills impairs the writing process	Implement School-Wide Fundamentals Grammar Kits Implement GCOPS Implement Reader's Response journals	CCT Bilingual Paraprofessional Classroom Teachers	Progress Monitoring Classroom Observation	Student Grammar Work Samples Benchmark Assessments CELLA FCAT
	21% (4)	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		Six of the students have parents that do not speak English	Provide after-school tutoring More frequent PLC meetings to share strategies	Principal CCT	Attendance in Tutoring Attendance at PLC	CELLA Benchmark Assessments FCAT

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
School-Wide Fundamentals of Grammar to increase grammar skills	Grammar Workbooks	General Budget	\$1,006.
			Subtotal: \$1,006
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
(see Reading Budget)			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$1,006

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. The ability to cover all the material necessary in the time frame allotted.	1A.1. Teachers to analyze NGSSS & CCSS. Teachers to analyze and revise scope and sequence. Allocate additional personnel for added math instruction.	1A.1. Math PLC Principal	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.1. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#1A:	27% (70) Level 3 FCAT	30% Level 3 FCAT					
To ensure students on grade level are being instructed with fidelity as measured by a 3% increase in Level 3s on FCAT.							
			1A.2. Students lacking basic math facts.	1A.2. Utilize Bulldog Basics basic math facts program for all students. Train staff and implement Bulldog Basics math program.	1A.2. Math PLC Principal	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Bulldog Basics Data	1A.2. Weekly Math Assessments Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of an implementation of a technology component.	1A.3. Implement First in Math program for school and home use. Train staff in Envision technology component on Pearson Successnet.	1A.3. Math PLC Principal	1A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Bulldog Basics Data	1A.3. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Lack of understanding in solving multi-step math problems.	2A.1. Provide additional training for teachers in Envision. Implement Envision program with fidelity. Implement Envision Problem of the Day.	2A.1. Math PLC Principal	2A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Check	2A.1. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
To ensure students have a higher understanding of math as measured by a 3% increase in Level 4s & 5s on FCAT.	47% (118) Level 4 & 5 FCAT	50% Level 4 & 5 FCAT					
			2A.2. The ability to cover all the material necessary in the time frame allotted.	2A.2. Increase math instruction time. Utilize home component of First in Math. Math emphasis on AM Bulldog	2A.2. Math PLC Principal	2A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Check	2A.2. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
			2A.3. Lack of an implementation of a technology component.	2A.3. Purchase and implement First in Math program for school and home use. Train staff in Envision technology component on Pearson Successnet.	2A.3. Math PLC Principal	2A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Check	2A.3. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A – less than 10 students	N/A	N/A					
			2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Students lacking basic math facts.	3A.1. Implement Bulldog Basics basic math facts program for all students.	3A.1. Math PLC Principal	3A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations Bulldog Basics Data	3A.1. Weekly Math Assessments Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
To continue to accelerate the momentum of the math learning gains by increasing by 3%.	89% (227) Learning Gains FCAT	92% Learning Gains FCAT					
			3A.2. The ability to cover all the material necessary in the time frame allotted.	3A.2. Increase math instruction time. Teachers to analyze and revise scope and sequence. Allocate additional personnel for added math instruction.	3A.2. Math PLC Principal	3A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	3A.2. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A	3B.1. – N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A – less than 10 students	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A	3B.2. – N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Inadequate time for additional math instruction.	4A.1. Open computer before and after school. Provide after-school tutoring. Provide transportation for after-school tutoring. Increase math block time.	4A.1. Math PLC Principal	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	4A.1. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT SuccessMaker Reports
Mathematics Goal #4A: To provide additional math instruction and to closely monitor growth as measured by a 3% increase in learning gains.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * 85% (36) Learning Gains FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * 88% Learning Gains FCAT					
4A.2. Lack of knowledge in the use of Envision Intervention Kits.							
4A.3. Students lacking basic math facts.			4A.3. Implement Bulldog Basics basic math facts program for all students.	4A.3. Math PLC Principal	4A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	4A.3. Weekly Math Assessments First in Math Reports Bulldog Basics Data FCAT	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1. – N/A	4B.1. – N/A	4B.1. – N/A	4B.1. – N/A	4B.1. – N/A
Mathematics Goal #4B: <i>N/A – less than 10 students</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <i>N/A</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <i>N/A</i>					
4B.2. – N/A							

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: To raise the achievement level of designated subgroups.	Baseline data 2010-2011		Black – 45% on target SWD – 45% on target Overall: 71	Black – 50% on target SWD – 50% on target Overall: 73	Black – 55% on target SWD – 55% on target Overall: 76	Black – 60% on target SWD – 60% on target Overall: 79	Black – 65% SWD – 65% Overall: 81	Black – 70% SWD – 70% Overall: 84
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: To decrease the achievement gap of Black students by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*		5B.1. Students that come to Brookshire with limited basic math knowledge.	5B.1. Implement Bulldog Basics. Utilize Kids’ College program.	5B.1. Principal CRT Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Progress Monitoring RtI Meetings	5B.1. Kids’ College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT	
	White: 22% (38) Black: 61% (20) Hispanic: 26% (11) Asian: <10 American Indian: <10		5B.2. Students’ lack of motivation to achieve success in math.	5B.2. Develop an incentive program for performance on Kids’ College. Provide each student with an adult mentor.	5B.2. Principal CRT Mentors	5B.2. Progress Monitoring RtI Meetings	5B.2. Kids’ College Reports Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT	
	White: 20% Black: 46% Hispanic: 23% Asian: <10 American Indian: <10		5B.3. Students’ live too far away to participate in after-school tutoring.	5B.3. Provide transportation for after-school tutoring.	5B.3. Principal	5B.3. Attendance at tutoring program	5B.3. Tutoring data	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Students lacking basic math skills necessary for success.	5C.1. Continue intense individual and small group instruction provided by CCT and bilingual paraprofessional. Provide extra time for First in Math and Kids' College.	5C.1. CCT	5C.1. Progress Monitoring Principal Observations	5C.1. CELLA Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Computer Reports
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> *					
To decrease the number of ELL students not making progress by 3%.	32% (7) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	29% Level 1 & 2 FCAT					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Lack of adequate knowledge by staff on providing rigorous curriculum and instruction.	5D.1. Develop a PLC with a specific focus on ESE academic rigor. Provide professional development to all staff working with SWD on appropriate curriculum. Provide substitutes for teachers to observe effective classrooms at other schools.	5D.1. Principal Staffing Specialist ESE Team	5D.1. Teacher Feedback PLC Meeting Notes Principal Observation	5D.1. Alternate Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u> *					
To increase the rigor of the instruction of SWD as measured by a 10% decrease in students not making sufficient progress.	63% (24) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	53% Level 1 & 2 FCAT					
			5D.2. Students often have several teachers and 'ownership' of each student's goals and IEP can be overlooked.	5D.2. Schedule bi-weekly meetings between ESE teacher and general education teacher. All teachers participate in all IEP Team Meetings.	5D.2. Staffing Specialist Principal	5D.2. Progress Monitoring Notes from Collaboration Meetings Notes from IEP Team Meetings	5D.2. Alternate Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Lack of ability to access technology to enhance learning.	5E.1. Ensure students have access to math computer programs at school.	5E.1. Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Teacher Feedback	5E.1. Kids' College Reports First in Math Reports Benchmark Assessments FCAT
Mathematics Goal #5E: To provide the necessary materials and strategies to students as measured by decreasing by 3% the students not making satisfactory progress.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 42% (39) Level 1 & 2 FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 39% Level 1 & 2 FCAT					
				5E.2. Students lacking basic math skills necessary for success.	5E.2. Implement and monitor Bulldog Basics. Ensure students have achievable goals for Bulldog Basic program.	5E.2. CRT	5E.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals – N/A

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1. N/A	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1A.2. N/A	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3. N/A	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3. N/A	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. - N/A	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			2A.2. - N/A	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3. - N/A	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.- N/A	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			2B.2. - N/A	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3. - N/A	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1 – N/A	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3A.2. – N/A	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3. – N/A	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. – N/A	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. – N/A	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3. – N/A	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
	Mathematics Goal #5A: N/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	5B.1. – N/A	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	N/A							
			5B.2. – N/A	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3. – N/A	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.		

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals – N/A

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: <i>N/A</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>					
			1.2. – N/A	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3. – N/A	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. – N/A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: <i>N/A</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>					
			2.2. – N/A	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3. – N/A	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. – N/A	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3.2. – N/A	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3. – N/A	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals – N/A

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. – N/A	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3. – N/A	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. – N/A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. – N/A	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3. – N/A	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: N/A							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	Algebra 1 Goal #3B:		3B.1. – N/A	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
	N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*						
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
		N/A						
		3B.2. – N/A	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.		
		3B.3. – N/A	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.		

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1. – N/A	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			3E.2. – N/A	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3. – N/A	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

Geometry End-of-Course Goals – N/A

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. – N/A	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3. – N/A	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. – N/A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. – N/A	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3. – N/A	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Geometry Goal #3A: N/A	Baseline data 2011-2012						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*		3B.1. – N/A	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	N/A						
			3B.2. – N/A	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3. – N/A	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1. – N/A	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math PLC	K-5	PLC Chairperson	Grade Level PLC Reps	Monthly Meetings	Share Information at Quarterly Staff Meetings Discussion at Monthly Data Meetings Data Collection	PLC Chairperson CRT Principal
RtI	K-5	RtI Team	School-Wide	RtI Team Meetings – third Friday of every month. School-Wide RtI Meetings – second Wednesday of every month.	Monthly Team Meetings RtI Admin Team Monthly Meetings Data Collection	Principal RtI Team
Computer-Based Programs: First in Math Kids' College	K-5	Lead Teachers	All Staff	Two Trainings	Monthly morning meetings for teachers in need of additional training	Lead Teachers

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

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FCAT Practice to increase math skills	Buckle Down Workbooks	General	\$1,977
FCAT Practice to increase math skills	Florida Ready	General	\$800
			Subtotal: \$2,777
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
First in Math – computer based instruction to enhance math skills	Computer-Based Instruction	General Budget	\$3,213
Kids’ College (see Reading Budget)			
			Subtotal: \$3,213
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Bulldog Basics – improve basic math facts skills	Worksheets of basic math skills	General Budget	\$1,500
Bulldog Basic Incentives	Motivational materials for students	General Budget	\$800
After-School Tutoring (see Reading Budget)			
			Subtotal: \$2,300
			Total: \$8,290

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Inadequate time during the school day to provide necessary science instruction.	1A.1. School-wide increased focus on science. Revise schedules to include daily science instruction. Provide FCAT SCAT for 5 th grade students. Utilize Kids' College science component.	1A.1. Science PLC Principal	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.1. Science Mini-Benchmark Teacher Assessments FCAT Kids' College Reports FCAT Explorer Reports
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
To provide the necessary strategies for students to improve as measured by a 3% increase in the number of students scoring at level 3 on FCAT.	42% (37) Level 3 FCAT	45% Level 3 FCAT					
			1A.2. Students lack of prior content knowledge.	1A.2. Provide teacher training in creating inquiry-based lessons in science. Revise schedules to include daily science instruction.	1A.2. Science PLC Principal	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.2. Science Mini-Benchmark Teacher Assessments FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of emphasis on the importance of science.	1A.3. Provide Science Night for families. Participate in Science Olympiad. Conduct Science Fair and have all students view projects.	1A.3. Science PLC Principal	1A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.3. Science Mini-Benchmark Teacher Assessments FCAT
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A	1B.1. – N/A
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A – less than 10 students	N/A	N/A					

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Lack of knowledge in teaching inquiry-based lessons/labs.	2A.1. Provide teacher training in creating inquiry-based lessons in science. Utilize Destination College strategies and Cornell notes as part of the Scientific Inquiry Method.	2A.1. Science PLC Principal	2A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	2A.1. Science Mini-Benchmark Teacher Assessments FCAT
Science Goal #2A: To provide the necessary strategies for students to improve as measured by a 3% increase in the number of students scoring at levels 4 & 5 on FCAT.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 36% (32) Level 4 & 5 FCAT	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 39% Level 4 & 5 FCAT					
			2A.2. Inadequate time during the school day to provide necessary science instruction	2A.2. School-wide increased focus on science. Revise schedules to include daily science instruction. Provide FCAT SCAT for 5 th grade students.	2A.2. Science PLC Principal	2A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	2A.2. Science Mini-Benchmark Teacher Assessments FCAT
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A	2B.1. – N/A
Science Goal #2B: N/A – less than 10 students	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A					
			2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A	2B.2. – N/A

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals-N/A

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

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. – N/A	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3. – N/A	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. – N/A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. – N/A	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3. – N/A	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals – N/A

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. – N/A	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3. – N/A	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2.1. – N/A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. – N/A	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3. – N/A	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science PLC	K-5	PLC Chairperson	Grade Level PLC Reps	Monthly Meetings	Discussion at Monthly Data Meetings Data Collection	PLC Chairperson CRT

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Hands-on Materials – FCAT SCAT	Materials for hands-on science	PTA	\$1,000
Science Kit	Materials for 5 th grade science class	General Budget	\$250
			Subtotal: \$2,500
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Kids’ College (see Reading Budget)			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Olympiad	Funds for 5 th grade students to participate in the annual Science Olympiad at UCF	PTA	\$500
Wekiwa Camping Trip	Supplies for fifth grade students’ annual trip to experience hands-on science activities.	PTA	\$500
			Subtotal: \$1,000
			Total: \$3,500

End of Science Goals

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

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Inadequate student use of basic conventions.	1A.1. Convene a team of teachers to analyze student data/writing samples. Continue school-wide implementation of GCOPS. Implement Sadler-Oxford grammar workbooks.	1A.1. Writing PLC Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.1. Monthly Writing Samples FCAT
Writing Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
To enhance the writing process at every grade level as measured by a 3% increase on FCAT.	87% (93) Level 3 FCAT	90% Level 3 FCAT					
			1A.2. Lack of training on the writing process.	1A.2. Train teachers on the FCAT rubric. Utilize teachers on staff previously trained in the writing process.	1A.2. Writing PLC Principal	1A.2. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.2. Monthly Writing Samples FCAT
			1A.3. Lack of school-wide consistency in the writing process.	1A.3. Articulation meetings between grade levels to determine where gaps in the writing process are located. Implementation of GCOPS.	1A.3. Writing PLC Principal	1A.3. Progress Monitoring Classroom Observations	1A.3. Monthly Writing Samples FCAT
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. -N/A	1B.1. -N/A	1B.1. -N/A	1B.1. -N/A	1B.1. -N/A
Writing Goal #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A – less than 10 students	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. -N/A	1B.2. -N/A	1B.2. -N/A	1B.2. -N/A	1B.2. -N/A

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing PLC – analyze monthly writing prompts and train staff on NGSSS	Writing	PLC Chairperson	K-5	Monthly Meetings	Data from Monthly Writing Prompts Follow-Up Training as needed PLC Minutes	CRT PLC Principal
FCAT Rubric	Writing	Lead Teachers	K-4	One Training	Monthly Progress Monitoring Meetings	CRT

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
Sadler-Oxford Grammar Series to enhance grammar skills	Textbooks and workbooks	General Budget	\$2,264
			Subtotal: \$2,264
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			n/a
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			n/a
			Subtotal:

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Supplies to continue implementation of school-wide writing process	GCOPS program	General	\$1,000
Substitutes for 4 th grade teachers to hold individual student conferences	Conferencing to provide specific feedback to students	General	\$550
			Subtotal: \$1,550
			Total: \$3,814

End of Writing Goals

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals – N/A

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development – N/A

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development-N/A

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Lack of understanding by the parents on the importance of being at school and on time.	1.1. Provide information to parents via calendar/handbook, newsletter, and Connect-Orange. Earlier contact of parents of students at-risk of excessive tardies and/or absences.	1.1. Principal Child Study Team	1.1. Child Study Team monitors data	1.1. EDW Attendance Reports
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
To better identify at-risk students early in the year and provide necessary support for these students to be in school and on time that will lead to a 3+% decrease in the number of students missing 10+ days of school.	96% (512)	97%					
	<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>					
	23% (127)	< 20%					
	<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>					
	13% (68)	< 10%					
			1.2. Lack of incentive for these students to arrive to school on time.	1.2. Continue Perfect Attendance dog tag rewards. Encourage participation in Bulldog Basic reward incentives. Announce random winners in the First in Math Player of the Day.	1.2. Principal	1.2. Principal monitors data	1.2. EDW Attendance Reports

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

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

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
None						

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentive awards for students	Perfect Attendance Dog Tags	PTA	\$1000
			Subtotal: \$1,000
			Total: \$1,000

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal #1: To continue to accelerate the momentum in the effort to keep students in school so they do not miss instruction.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Students who enroll at Brookshire that are not familiar with the procedures that keep our suspension rate very low.	Principal reviews procedures at the beginning of the year. Teachers review procedures with all new students throughout the year.	Principal Classroom Teachers	Monitor Discipline Referrals	Discipline Referrals Suspension Rate
	.2% (1)	0%					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	.2% (1)	0%					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	0% (0)	0%					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
0% (0)	0%						

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

Suspension Professional Development – N/A

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
None						

Suspension Budget – None

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: None

End of Suspension Goals

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention			1.1. Lack of identifying specific deficit skills.	1.1. Better identification of skills needing improvement. Better utilization of reading diagnostics. Better alignment of instructional interventions.	1.1. Principal Literacy Leadership Team RtI Team	1.1. RtI Meetings	1.1. Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
Research shows that students that are retained are more likely to drop out of school than those students that have never been retained.	1% (5) students retained	.5% students retained					
The goal is to provide the students the necessary tools to be successful that will reduce the likelihood of being retained.	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	99% (528) students promoted	99.5% students promoted					
			1.2. Finding extra time for students to get additional help.	1.2. Revise schedule of ESE and support staff to work with at-risk third grade students. Revamp after-school tutoring program to start earlier in the year. Open computer labs before and after school.	1.2. Principal Literacy Leadership Team	1.2. RtI Meetings After School Tutoring Enrollment Computer Lab Attendance	1.2. Houghton-Mifflin Assessments Benchmark Assessments FAIR FCAT Principal Classroom Observations

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Using Appropriate Interventions	K-5 Reading	RtI Team	School-Wide	Wednesday RtI Trainings	Monthly RtI Meetings	RtI Team

Dropout Prevention Budget - None

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
After-School Tutoring (see Reading Budget)			
			Subtotal:
			Total: None

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Parents lack of understanding of the volunteering process.	1.1. Educate parents during PTA meetings on the volunteer process. List information in calendar/handbook and newsletters. Develop an e-mail distribution list.	1.1. ADDitions Coordinator Principal	1.1. Monitor ADDitions hours	1.1. ADDitions hours
Parent Involvement Goal #1: To better utilize the parents to help the students be successful.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 6,452 Parent Volunteer (ADDitions) hours	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 6,500+ Parent Volunteer (ADDitions) hours	1.2. Lack of a database to match volunteer with need of school.	1.2. Survey parents regarding their availability and desire to help. Survey teachers regarding their needs. Develop database to match ADDitions volunteers with teacher needs.	1.2. ADDitions Coordinator Principal	1.2. Monitor ADDitions hours	1.2. ADDitions hours
			1.3. Teachers not using parents as a resource.	1.3. Educate teachers as to the volunteer procedures and confidentiality policies. Survey teachers regarding their needs. Utilize database to match teacher needs with ADDitions volunteers.	1.3. ADDitions Coordinator Principal	1.3. Monitor ADDitions hours	1.3. ADDitions hours

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ADDitions Overview	K-5	ADDitions Coordinator	ADDitions Volunteers	August	ADDitions Hours	ADDitions Coordinator
Room Rep Training	K-5	Room Rep Coordinator	Volunteer Room Reps	September	ADDitions Hours	Room Rep Coordinator

Parent Involvement Budget - None

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: None

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: To initiate a STEM PLC to guide further planning.	1.1. Lack of teacher interest and time to pursue further knowledge of STEM activities and instruction.	1.1. To develop a PLC to investigate better implementation of STEM activities.	1.1. Principal STEM PLC	1.1. PLC Meeting Notes	1.1. STEM Implementation Plan
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM PLC	K-5	PLC Team	K-5 Classroom Teachers	Monthly Meetings	The development of implementation plan	PLC Chairperson

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

STEM Budget - None

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: None

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)-N/A

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

CTE Professional Development – N/A

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

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

CTE Budget – N/A

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal – Increase the Percent of VPK Students Who Will enter Elementary School Ready Based on FLKRS Data			1.1. – N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: This goal is not applicable to Brookshire due to the school not having a VPK program.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	n/a	n/a					

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal – Increase Students Who Read on Grade Level by Age 9			2.1. See Reading Goals 1A, 3A, & 4A	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – see Reading Goals 1A, 3A, and 4A.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal – Increase Students Who Become Fluent in Math Operations			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Additional Goal #3: This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – see Math Goals 1A, 3A, & 4A.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	See Math Goals 1A, 3A, & 4A				
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal – Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Additional Goal #4: This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – see Reading Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E and Math Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	See Reading Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E and Math Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E.				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.

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

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5. Additional Goal – Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage			5.1. Potential lack of funding to maintain current personnel to continue with the program.	5.1. To maintain a clear understanding of the budget process to be able to keep current program in place. To continue to observe in classrooms to maintain the quality of the program.	5.1. Principal	5.1. Balanced Budget Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Check	5.1. Schedule Observation Data
Additional Goal #5: To continue to offer a quality fine arts program for the students of Brookshire.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*					
	100% (533) participation	100% participation					
			5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
6. Additional Goal – Increase College and Career Awareness			6.1. Students not being prepared for the prerequisite skills necessary for post-secondary education or career.	6.1. Implementation of Destination College with fidelity. Explicit teaching organizational skills to students. Explicit teaching of goal setting skills to students.	6.1. CRT Classroom Teachers	6.1. Classroom Observation Team Meeting Agendas/Discussions	6.1. FCAT
Additional Goal #6: To increase college and career readiness through the implementation of Destination College.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :*	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :*					
	100% (9) Upper grade teachers trained in Destination College	100% Upper grade teachers trained in Destination College					
			6.2.	6.2.	6.2.	6.2.	6.2.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
7. Additional Goal – Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education			7.1. Teachers lack of training in identifying the Gifted learner.	7.1. Provide staff development on identifying the gifted learner. Put on the monthly data meeting agenda to discuss the identification of the gifted students.	7.1. Principal Staffing Specialist School Psychologist	7.1. Gifted Screening and Testing Lists	7.1. Number of Students Identified for Gifted Program
Additional Goal #7: Twenty-five percent (25%) of the students at Brookshire are classified as Gifted. Of those students, only 2% (3) are Black. The Black population of Brookshire is 9% (45). The goal is to increase the number of Black students in the Gifted program.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*	7.2. Students not possessing the knowledge to qualify for the Gifted program.	7.2. Early identification of the potential Gifted student. Placement in the highest group possible in the classroom or grade level. Provide extra help if warranted.	7.2. Principal Classroom Teachers	7.2. Data Meeting Discussions Classroom Observations	7.2. Number of Students Identified for Gifted Program
	2% (3) Black Gifted Students	5% Black Gifted Students					

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Destination College	4 – 5	Team Leaders	Grades 4 and 5 Teachers	Training as needed	Weekly Team Meetings	CRT Team Leaders
Gifted Student Identification	Gifted Education	Principal School Psychologist	Classroom teachers	October Training	Monthly Data Meetings	Principal

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

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget - None

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: None

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$22,942
CELLA Budget	Total: \$1,006
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$8,290
Science Budget	Total: \$3,500
Writing Budget	Total: \$ 3,814
Civics Budget	Total: n/a
U.S. History Budget	Total: n/a
Attendance Budget	Total: \$1,000
Suspension Budget	Total: None
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: None
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: None
STEM Budget	Total: None
CTE Budget	Total: n/a
Additional Goals	Total: None
	Grand Total: \$40,552

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

Are you reward school? Yes No

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
School Advisory Council will closely examine and continue to develop strategies to close the achievement gap of our Black students and our Students With Disabilities.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
No funds are allocated to SAC.	