Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: George Washington Carver Elementary #158	District Name: Duval County
Principal: Timothy T. Warren	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Frankie Parsons	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)

		Bachelor of Science in Music Education, Master of Science in Educational Leadership	5	10	Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. Reading gains were 68%, math gains were 91%, reading low 25% was 82%, and math low 25% was 95%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. Reading gains were 54%, math gains were 66%, reading low 25% was 47%, and math low 25% was 70%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
Principal	Timothy T. Warren				Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT 2.0 Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing

					proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT 2.0 Grade: A Reading proficiency was 73%, math proficiency was 76%, writing proficiency was 73%, and science was 44%. 100% of the criteria were met by all applicable NCLB subgroups. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2006-2007 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 66%, math proficiency was 65%, writing proficiency was 75%, and science was 41%. Economically Disadvantaged and SWDs did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not make AYP in math. All other NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2005-2006 FCAT 2.0 Grade: A Reading proficiency was 80%, math proficiency was 57%, and writing proficiency was 63%. Blacks, SWDs, and Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math. All other Reading proficiency
Assistant Principal					

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

Reading	Annett Tobler	K-6 Elementary Ed	5	5	Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT 2.0 Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP

Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary
2007-2008
 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D
Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 43%, writing proficiency 61%, and Science proficiency 19%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or math.

Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary
2006-2007
 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D
Reading proficiency was 36%, math proficiency 39%, writing proficiency 78%, and Science proficiency 6%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or math.</td></tr>
</table>

| Math | Tyra Forcine-Mobley | K-6 Elementary Ed | 5 | 5 | Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012
 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B
Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP

Math Coach
2010-2011
FCAT 2.0 Grade: D
Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP

Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009
 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B
Math proficiency 55%, reading proficiency was 44%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
Math Coach: Norwood Elementary
2007-2008
 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B
No data available-school closed |
| | | | | | |

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Weekly teacher meetings with Academic Coaches	Tara Jackson, Instructional Coach, Annett Tobler, Reading Coach Tyra Mobley, Math Coach	5/13
2. Mentoring and Induction of Novice Teachers (MINT)	Annett Tobler, Professional Development Facilitator (PDF)	5/13
3. Initial Screening Observation meetings	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	11/12
4.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

2 teachers or 7%	• Alternative Certification/Teacher Induction Program/Must pass the FTCE

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
27	22% (6)	22% (6)	25% (7)	29% (8)	40% (11)	93% (25)	7% (2)	0% (0)	25% (7)

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

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

Nailah Abdul-Rahman	Tomia Hodge	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Joseph Brown	Renee Williams	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the FCAT grades	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing FCAT and District Benchmark Data
Caitlin Hinrichs	Winifred Sherill	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Brittney Holmes	Tyra Forcine-Mobley	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the all grades	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Khanya Johnson	Carol Smith	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the FCAT grades to students considered "at risk"	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing FCAT and District Benchmark Data
Erica Krause	Tara Jackson	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Holtie Murphy	Tara Jackson	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Tracy Nwokoh	Frankie Parsons	Experienced teacher proficient in teaching ELA	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D District provides Drop-out prevention programs to meet the various educational student needs, increase the promotion rate, and decrease the drop-out rate of all students, but especially black males.
Title II The district provides additional funding for educational services, materials, and supplies for educational software, hardware and additional technology supplies
Title III Support services and supplemental resources are provided through the district to improve the learning of ELLs.
Title X- Homeless The district has social workers and counselors that work with parents/guardians of homeless children to ensure that students have acceptable housing, clothing, food, school supplies, and medical services
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds are used specifically to provide FCAT 2.0 Level 1 and 2 in reading and math with additional support through Saturday School, before/after school tutoring, in-school tutoring, as well as pertinent materials and curriculum.
Violence Prevention Programs The district provides funding for various research-based programs (CHAMPS and Foundations) that reduce violence, and that improves school culture
Nutrition Programs At the beginning of each school day, students are offered the opportunity to eat breakfast in the classroom (BIC). The benefit of Breakfast in the Classroom is students are more attentive and ready to learn from the nutritious breakfast they are receiving, as well as to encourage and provide students with the consumption of healthy foods.
Housing Programs NA
Head Start The district uses the VPK and Title I Pre-K program to make certain all students receive an adequate educational foundation to ensure success in school
Adult Education NA

Career and Technical Education NA
Job Training NA
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. ● Timothy T. Warren, Principal ● Sariah Deligar-Howard, Guidance Counselor ● Tyra Mobley, Math/Science Coach ● Annett Tobler, Reading Coach ● Donnell Sampson, ESE Site Coach ● Robert Poole, School Psychologist ● Shivonne Troy, Behavioral Interventionist

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

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?

- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school to facilitate a cohesive and comprehensive battery of district assessments.
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading and math classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 80% and above on each assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.
- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly (Kindergarten monthly) using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website
- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between assessments
- Guidance Counselor/MTSS/RTI Site Coach uses an excel spreadsheet to manage all MTSS/RTI progress monitoring information
- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Provides a common vision for the use of data-based analysis and instruction
- Ensures the school-based MTSS/RtI Team is implementing and monitoring MTSS/RtI
- Develops assessments and provides documentation which ensures implementation of intervention support
- Collaborates in the design and delivery of professional development
- Communicates with parents and the community regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction
- Implement intense interventions for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students
- Serves as Site Coach between teachers, students, and parents
- Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators
- Encourages students to take an active role in their learning

Identifies and monitors student progress using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies regarding the effectiveness of MTSS/RtI.

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS/RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?   The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team analyzes FCAT 2.0 reading, writing, math, and science data to determine areas of growth and deficiency. Recommendations based on the analysis of FCAT 2.0 data are utilized to create a comprehensive plan that will meet students instructional needs, improve teacher pedagogy, determine the most effective curriculum, and that will identify environmental factors that result in improved student achievement. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team members assist with monitoring the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through formal/informal observation, review of lesson plans for differentiated instruction, and by analyzing student/classroom performance data to determine acceptable growth between pre-test and post-test.
MTSS Implementation
Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.   The school uses data from FCAT 2.0, FAIR, district benchmark assessments, PMAs, DRA, and curriculum based assessments as sources for student academic performance data. Academic data for reading, math, science, and writing are managed in the district's management system called Limelight. Data regarding absenteeism, referrals, and suspensions are managed from the district Student Information Management System (SIMS)/Genesis. The MTSS/RtI data management system consist of an excel spreadsheet which includes the following information: teacher name, student name, assessment scores (pre/post), causation factors (teacher, students, curriculum, environment), interventions (re-teach class, guided group, SES, before school/lunch/after school tutoring, Team-Up, administrative/coach support), progress monitoring (score, exit, tier, and TARGET).Color-coded cells are used to identify acceptable and insufficient growth. Net changes in each student's score will be calculated and charted for reporting. The school-based data management system also manages K-5th reading, math, writing, science performances. Additional data are collected and monitored using Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests, Selection Tests, and Benchmark Tests; Soar to Success; SRA; Open Court; and DRAs
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.   The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team utilizes training materials provided by the District MTSS/RtI Team to train teachers. A specific plan for delivering this training, including dates, trainers, topics, and materials are indicated on the school Professional Development Plan, which indicates the training on Early Release Days. During weekly morning teacher meetings, teachers will also discuss the MTSS/RtI process as a means of differentiating instruction and providing rigorous instruction.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.   The MTSS/RtI will receive support for additional professional development and instructional materials deemed necessary to adequately address student deficiencies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
- Timothy T. Warren, Principal
- Annett Tobler, Reading Coach
- Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist
- Tomia Hodge, 5th Grade Reading Teacher
- Frankie Parsons, 4th Grade Reading teacher
- Gerald Veasey, 3rd Grade Reading Teacher
- Lynn Dewolf, 2nd Grade Teacher
- Inger Pride, 1st Grade Teacher
- Holtie Murphy, Kindergarten Teacher

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
- Literacy Leadership Team meets bi-weekly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 80% and above on each FCIM mini assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.
- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website, SuccessMaker, and Destination Success
- The Literacy Leadership Team reviews progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between reading assessments
- The Literacy Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Utilizes triangulated data from F.A.I.R, DRAs, theme tests, and curriculum-based benchmark to determine
- Recommend professional development
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction
Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
- Establish a culture of collaboration within the faculty through Professional Learning Communities (faculty meeting breakout, teacher meetings am/pm, grade level planning, early release days, and data digs)
- Identify, develop and support teacher leaders
- Continue DRA and FAIR miscue and comprehension analyses
- Develop deeper understanding of Guided Reading
- Develop deeper understanding of Explicit Instruction
- Develop deeper understanding of teaching by Benchmark
- Building contextual vocabulary (reading, math, science)
- Building teacher knowledge to use authentic text to teach State Benchmarks
- Identify, review, and integrate Common Core Standards in daily lessons and FCIM calendar

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

George Washington Carver Elementary Offers four Title 1 Pre-K programs, which includes a blended Pre-K (inclusion). The Pre-Kindergarten Criterion Referenced Test is administrated to all preschoolers as an initial diagnostic, a middle of the year update and a final assessment tool as they prepare to transition to kindergarten. Low-performing students are targeted early. Once identified, certified teachers and assistants work with low-performing students to build these basic skills. Funding to support academic materials and field trips is provided through the Title I office. Staff provides parents with packets of kindergarten activities, registration materials and workshops to train parents to assist their children at home. George Washington Carver Elementary provides all students with a packet of materials to use throughout the school year to assist students with making a smooth transition to kindergarten.

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

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

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?

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?

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.

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	

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Number of students reading 1 or more years below grade level Teachers not teaching by benchmark. Teachers not providing explicit instruction	1A.1. Use Guided Reading to increase student reading level Teach by benchmark that will be covered on the FCAT 2.0 Provide school-based and district level explicit instruction training Provide school-based and district level teaching by benchmark training	1A.1. All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	1A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 80% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.1. DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)		
Reading Goal #1A: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students with a level 3 reading proficiency will increase 3% from 33% to 36%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21/172 students or 33% proficient	*54 /151students or 36%*					

		1A.2. Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) School Wide monitoring was monitored by reading theme test instead of by benchmark	1A.2 . Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary) Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets (before/after school/ lunch tutoring/ SAI tutors/ and Team-Up) for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction	1A.2. All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	1A.2. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.2. DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

Reading Goal #1B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	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		

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	2A.1. Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan (board configuration) Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: (Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary) Provide explicit benchmark-	2A.1. Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	2A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly) Review the number of students scoring 75% and above on their District Benchmark	2A.1. Classroom visitation log CAST DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly) Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessments	

		focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction					
Reading Goal #2A: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students with a level 3 reading proficiency will increase 3% from 9% to 12%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	15/172 students or 9%	*18/151 students or 12%*				
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	

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

Reading Goal #2B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	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		

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

| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. | 3A.1.

Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) | 3A.1.

Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training

Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan

Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0

Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: (Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary)

Provide explicit benchmark- | 3A.1.

Principal

Reading Coach

Reading Interventionist

Grade level chairperson | 3A.1.

Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on theme tests

Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30)

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)

Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark | 3A.1.

Classroom visitation log

Teacher Assessment Instrument

DRAs

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessments | | |

		focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s				
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u> *The number of 3rd-5th grade students making learning gains will increase 3% from 68% to 71%.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	117/172 students or 68%	*107/151students or 71%*				
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Reading Goal #3B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

| 4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | 4A.1.

Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) | 4A.1.

Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training

Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan

Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0

Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary)

Provide explicit benchmark- | 4A.1.

Principal

Reading Coach

Reading Interventionist

Grade level chairperson | 4A.1.

Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on theme tests

Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30)

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)

Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark | 4A.1.

Classroom visitation log

Teacher Assessment Instrument

DRAs

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment | | |

		focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1s and 2s				
Reading Goal #4A: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students in the lowest 25% will increase 3% from 82%% to 85%.* .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	141/172 students or 82%	*128/151 students or 85%*				
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.

		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Reading Goal #4B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	29%	35%	42%	48%	55%	61%
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> *The number of 3rd-5th grade students reading proficiently will increase 6-7% each year from 33% to 61% by 2017*							
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. White: None enrolled 3rd-5th Black: Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Hispanic: None enrolled 3rd-5th Asian: None enrolled 3rd-5th American Indian: None enrolled 3rd-5th	5B.1. Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary) Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s	5B.1. Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	5B.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly) Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	5B.1. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, bi-monthly) Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

| Reading Goal #5B:

The number of 3rd-5th grade students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease3% from 32% to 29%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: NA Black: 117/172 students or 68% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: NA Black: 107/151 or 71% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA		
Reading Goal #5C: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. SWD students are 2 years below grade level on average SWD students are used to comprehension accommodations that cannot be used on the FCAT 2.0	5D.1. Mainstream as many SWD students as possible to expose them to more rigorous instruction Use Direct Instruction and Guided Reading daily to increase student reading ability Transition SWD students to the type of accommodations permitted o the FCAT 2.0 Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan	5D.1. Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist RtI Facilitator ESE Site Coach Inclusion and EBD Teachers	5D.1. Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the number of SWD students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of SWD Students scoring 80% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	5D.1. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Reading Mastery Kit Soar To Success Kit		

		Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary) Provide explicit instruction focused on benchmark during Reading Mastery lesson Provide explicit instruction focused on benchmark during Soar To Success lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction				

		Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level				
Reading Goal #5D: *The number of 3rd-5th grade Students With Disabilities not making learning gains in reading was 25%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	6/8 students or 75%	*8/10 students or 80%*				

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

		5D.2. Significant discipline issue with EBD	5D.2. Implement Behavioral Tools curriculum to improve classroom management	5D.2 Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist RtI Facilitator ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	5D.2. Review discipline referrals Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the number of SWD students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of SWD Students scoring 80% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	5D.2. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly) Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Reading Mastery Kit Soar To Success Kit	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Number of students reading 1 or more years below grade level	5E.1. Use Guided Reading to increase student reading level Provide explicit instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction	5E.1. All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	5E.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the number of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	5E.1. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The number of 3rd-5th Economically Disadvantaged students not making learning gains will decrease 3% from 32% to 29%.						
	55/172 students or 32%	43/151students or 29%				
		5E.2. Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity | 5E.2. Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting categories: Reading Application , Literary Analysis, and Vocabulary)	5E.2. All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	5E.2. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the number of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	5E.2. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level (H-M-L)	Principal Leadership Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal Leadership Team
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide		Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population with reading deficiencies	Principal PDF

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

FAIR Analysis	All	Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist Annett Tobler, Reading Coach	School-wide		Review of DRA for appropriate reading levels Review of Lesson Plans for differentiated instruction based on reading level miscues Review of DRA class profile sheet	Principal Leadership Team School-based RtI Facilitator
Teaching Reading and Math by Benchmark	All	Annett Tobler, Reading Coach Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team
Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, Reading Coach Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team

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
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Reading Reporting Category benchmarks within the reading series.	Houghton Mifflin	NA	NA
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Reading Reporting Category benchmarks within authentic text.	Various authentic and high-interests text	Donors from www.donorschoose.org Volunteers from Hands on Jacksonville	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the amount of SuccessMaker usage for students identified in the reading low 25%	Additional SuccessMaker licenses	District Technology/Academic Services Leadership Jacksonville Members	NA
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide "Explicit Instruction" training to teachers	School-based Academic Coaches District trainers	NA	NA
Provide "Teaching by Benchmark" training to teachers	School-based Academic Coaches District trainers	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

Total:			

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

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

CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
NA						
	NA					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

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

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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.

Number of students not reading on grade level

Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity | 1A.1.

Use small instructional groups to differentiate student

Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0

Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories

Provide explicit instruction during math launch

Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 | 1A.1.

All K-5 grade teachers

Math Coach

Leadership Team

RtI Team | 1A.1.

Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments

Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark | 1A.1.

Envisions assessments

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Classroom visitation log

Teacher Assessment Instrument

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The number of 3rd-5th grade students with a level 3 math proficiency will increase 3% from 56% to 59%.						
	96/172 students or 56%	*101/151 students or 59%*				
		1A.2. New teachers not familiar with math curriculum	1A.2. Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	1A.2 .All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	1A.2. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Number of students not reading on grade level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	1A.1. Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	1A.1. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	1A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The number of 3ʳᵈ-5ᵗʰ grade students with a level 3 math proficiency will increase 3% from 56% to 59%.							
	96/172 students or 56%	*101/151 students or 59%*					
	1A.2.	1A.2. New teachers not familiar with math curriculum	1A.2 Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	1A.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	1A.2. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	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. Number of students not reading on grade level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	2A.1. Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	2A.1. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	2A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 75% and above on their District Benchmark	2A.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The number of 3rd-5th grade students with a level 4 or higher math proficiency will increase 3% from 22% to 25%.						
	37/172 students or 22%	*37/151 students or 25%*				
		2A.2. New math curriculum	2A.2. Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	2A.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	2A.2. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	2A.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	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. Number of students not reading on grade level	3A.1. Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Provide training during weekly teacher meetings to review new math curriculum	3A.1. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	3A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	3A.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The number of 3rd-5th grade students making learning gains will increase 1% from 91% to 92%.							
	156/172 students or 91%	138/151 students or 92%					
		3A.2. Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	3A.2. Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	3A.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	3A.2. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	3A.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

		3A.3. New math curriculum	3A.3. Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	3A.3. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	3A.3. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	3A.3. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #3B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	NA	*NA*				

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Number of students not reading on grade level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks and math standards at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	4A.1. Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	4A.1. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	4A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	4A.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #4A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The number of 3rd-5th grade students in the lowest 25% will increase 1% from 95%% to 96%.						
	163/172 students or 95%	*144/151 students or 96%*				
		4A.2. New math curriculum	4A.2. Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	4A.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	4A.2. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	4A.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4B: _NA_	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	_NA_	_NA_					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	**46%**	**51%**	**56%**	**61%**	**66%**	**71%**
Mathematics Goal #5A: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students math proficiently will increase 6-7% each year from 46% to 71% by 2017*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | 5B.1.

White: None enrolled

Black: Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity

New math curriculum

Hispanic: None enrolled

Asian: None enrolled

American Indian: None enrolled : | 5B.1.

Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training

Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan

Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0

Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories

Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch

Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3

Differentiate instruction

Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)

Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s | 5B.1.

All K-5 grade teachers

Math Coach

Leadership Team

RtI Team

Grade level chairperson | 5B.1.

Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives

Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments

Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark | 5B.1.

Envisions assessments

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Classroom visitation log

Teacher Assessment Instrument

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment | | |

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students making learning gains will increase 1% from 91% to 92%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: NA Black: 156/172 students or 91% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Na Black: 138/151 students or 92% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA				

		5B.2. New math curriculum	5B.2. Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	5B.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	5B.2. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	5B.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

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

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | 5D.1.

Instruction is based on IEP goals and not grade level standards which are assessed on FCAT 2.0

SWD students are 2 years below grade level on average

SWD students are used to comprehension accommodations that cannot be used on the FCAT 2.0 | 5D.1.

Mainstream as many SWD students as possible to expose them to more rigorous instruction

Use Explicit Instruction and Small group differentiated instruction to increase student computation ability

Transition SWD students to the type of accommodations permitted o the FCAT 2.0

Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training

Require teachers to include the level of complexity within their Board Configuration and Lesson Plan

Use FCIM math focus calendars to | 5D.1
.
All K-5 grade teachers

Math Coach

Leadership Team

RtI Team

ESE Liaison

Inclusion and EBD Teachers | 5D.1.

Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on theme tests

Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50)

Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark

Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on Math mini assessments

Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments | 5D.1.

Envisions assessments

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Classroom visitation log

Teacher Assessment Instrument

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment | | |

	identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0	
	Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch	
	Provide additional math lesson support via SuccessMaker and Destination Success	
	Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	
	Differentiate instruction	
	Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)	
	Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level	

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

Mathematics Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
The number of 3rd-5th grade Students With Disabilities not making learning gains in math was 25%.						
	6/8 students or 75%	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		5D.2. Significant discipline issues with EBD students	5D.2. Implement Behavioral Tools curriculum to improve classroom management Implement Second Step Train ESE teachers in PCM	5D.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	5D.2. Review the number of discipline referrals Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of SWD Students scoring 80% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	5D.2. Discipline referrals Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

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

		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
		New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review the number of discipline referrals Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on math assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

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		

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Number of students not Performing math tasks on a moderate and high level of complexity level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	5E.1. Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-	5E.1. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	5E.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	5E.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

		school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s				
Mathematics Goal #5E: *The number of 3rd-5th grade students not making learning gains will decrease 1% from 9%% to 8%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	6/8 students or 25%	*5/8 students or 24%*				
		5E.2. Teachers new to math curriculum	5E.2. Provide teacher training on the Envision Math curriculum	5E.2. All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	5E.2. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	5E.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3	
		Students not exposed to tasks and math benchmarks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	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.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #4B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

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.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
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		

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

4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: _Enter narrative for the goal in this box._	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	_Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box._					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

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		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

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

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
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level (H-M-L)	Principal Leadership Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal Leadership Team
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide		Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population with reading deficiencies	Principal PDF
Teaching Math by Benchmark	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team

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

Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team

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

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Math Reporting Category benchmarks within the math curriculum resources	Envision Math, Investigations Math, SuccessMaker, destination Success	NA	NA
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Math Reporting Category benchmarks utilizing authentic materials	Various authentic and high-interests resources	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the amount of SuccessMaker usage for students identified in the math low 25%	Additional SuccessMaker licenses	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	Webb's Depth of Knowledge chart	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Total:			

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		

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Number of students not performing tasks with moderate and high levels of complexity	1A.1. Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/ essential question or in their lesson plan Differentiate instruction	1A.1. All 5th grade teachers Math/Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal RtI Team	1A.1. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	1A.1. District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		
Science Goal #1A: *The number of 5th grade students achieving proficiency will increase 3% from 12% to 16%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	5/61 students or 12% proficient	*7/48 students or 16%proficient*					

		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards	Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during science engage lesson Provide science safety nets for students scoring below 60% on the district science benchmark Require all reading FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch	Science teacher Math/Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal RtI Team	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *NA*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *NA*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	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 science.	2A.1. Number of students not performing task with moderate and high levels of complexity Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards K-4	2A.1. Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during science engage lesson Provide science safety nets for students scoring below 60% on the district science benchmark Require all reading FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)	2A.1. Science teacher Math/Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal RtI Team	2A.1. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 75% and above on their District Benchmark	2A.1. District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Science Goal #2A: *The number of 5th grade students achieving level 4 and above increase 3% from 0% to 3%*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	0/61 students or 0%.	*1/48 students or 1%*				
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	
Science Goal #2B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	NA	*NA*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem**					

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

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

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

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

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

Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level (H-M-L)	Principal Leadership Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal Leadership Team
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide		Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population	Principal PDF
Teaching Science by Benchmark	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team
Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Science Goals

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. Number of students not exposed to authentic texts writing on grade level	1A.1. Review the sunshine state Standards for writing Expose students to authentic texts Teach students author's crafts Have students review the FCAT 2.0 writing rubric to score their paper	1A.1. All K-5 teachers Instructional Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	1A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review monthly writing assessments Review weekly writing assignments Review district writing assessments	1A.1. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Writing Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment		

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

Writing Goal #1A: *The number of 4th grade students with a writing score of 3.0 will increase 3% from 80% to 83%.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48/61 students or 80%	*50/61 students or 83%*				
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	
Writing Goal #1B: *NA*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	*NA*				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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
Using Rubrics to teach writing	K-5	Principal	K-5	Monthly after school 3:15pm-4:0pm	Review monthly writing prompt classroom profiles	Principal, Leadership Team

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

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

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

1. Attendance	1.1. Family mobility Lack of reliable transportation	1.1. Recommend carpooling Identify early attendance problem patterns and schedule AIT meetings Increase referrals to Truancy Officer Use School Messenger automated messages to notify parents of absences	1.1. Teachers Guidance Counselor Assistant Principal Principal	1.1. Student sign-in log OnCourse attendance Genesis	1.1. District Attendance Report AIT meetings OnCourse Genesis		
Attendance Goal #1: *Increase the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate 3% from 70585 days students were present at school compared to 77034students were enrolled.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	91%	*94%*					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	161/430 students or 40%	*151/360 students or 37%*					

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

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	69/460 students or 16%	*46/360 students or 13%*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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
Using OnCourse to take attendance	School-wide	Tomia Hodge	School-wide	Grade level meetings	Monitor student attendance through OnCourse and Genesis	Teachers

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
Use the School Messenger automated call system to notify parents of their child's daily attendance	District	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Use the School Messenger automated call system to notify parents of their child's daily attendance	District	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Suspension	1.1. High crime area Bullying on the way to/from school Bullying at the bus stop Poor teacher-student relationships Large population of experienced teachers	1.1. Implement Character Education Implement Second Step Anti-bullying Implementation of Foundations and CHAMPs Train teachers on building healthy relationships with students Notify the community officer and school transportation to closely monitor school bus stops Have teachers use classroom Class I referrals prior to Class II Increase the number of male students being mentored from 4 to 6 Increase the number of female students being counseled by "Girl Matters" intervention counseling	1.1. All teachers Guidance Counselor Assistant Principal Principal	1.1. Decrease in the number of students sent to the office on Class II discipline referral Decrease in the number of students suspended for fighting or bullying Increase in the number of female students successfully exited from Girl Matters	1.1. Student discipline referrals School Discipline Report form Genesis Girl Matters attendance and exit log		

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

Suspension Goal #1: *Reduce the school suspension count 3% from 305 days suspended to 296.*	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	0	*0*				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	0	*0*				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	305	*296*				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	110	*107*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Foundations	Training, books, CDs	District	One representative (K-5)	Sept. 20th	Student discipline referrals	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Principal
CHAMPS	Training, books, CDs	District	One representative (K-5)	Jan. 16th and 24th	Student discipline referrals	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Continue to refer female students in the Girl Matters counseling program	City of Jacksonville	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a					

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
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 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. Parent apathy towards education No loyalty to school due to high mobility	1.1. Provide engaging activities for parents and their child to be involved in Use SchoolMessenger to notify parents of school-based activities	1.1. Principal SAC Chairperson PTA President	1.1. Increased participation with Parent Involvement activities Better coordinated parent Involvement activities	1.1. Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings SchoolMessenger logs		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *The average number of parents participating in Parent Involvement activities will increase 3% from 6 parent s per training session to 7parents pertaining session.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

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

	6 parents	*7 parents*				
		1.2. SAC and PTA meetings conflict with parent work schedules	1.2. Direct parents to the SAC and PTA meetings as they pick up their child during Team Up and SES Tutoring Schedule the SAC and PTA meetings back-to-back Experiment with shortening the SAC and PTA meetings from 60 minutes for each meeting to30 minutes for each meeting	1.2. Principal Parent Volunteer Liaison SAC Chairperson PTA Chairperson	1.2. Increased attendance at SAC and PTA meetings	1.2. Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings
		1.3. Parent do not receive "person and direct" communication from teachers regarding activities	1.3. Have teachers personally contact parents by phone regarding upcoming Parent Involvement activities Use the SchoolMessenger notification system	1.3. All K-5 teachers Principal	1.3. Increased attendance at SAC and PTA meetings Increased participation with Parent Involvement activities Better coordinated parent Involvement activities	1.3. Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings SchoolMessenger logs

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						

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

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Reading Strategies	K-5	Principal and Reading Coach	Provide parents with training and resources	October 25th	Sign in log	Principal
Effective Writing Strategies	K-5	Principal and Reading Coach	Provide parents with training and resources	November 29th	Sign in log	Principal
How to help your child in Math at Home	K-5	Principal and Math Coach	Provide parents with training and resources	December 20th	Sign in log	Principal
Explore science with Your Child	K-5	Principal and Science Lead Teacher	Provide parents with training and resources	January 24th	Sign in log	Principal
FCAT 2.0 Night	3rd-5th		Provide parents with training and resources	February 21st	Sign in log	Principal

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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						

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a					

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
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	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:

	Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	▢Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

▢ Yes   ▢ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
- Promote the benefits of students wearing school uniforms and present all stakeholders with a comprehensive and democratic process for potentially transitioning the school to school uniforms.   - Provide the principal with a business/news channel mentorship for 4th and 5th grade students to further develop the TV production lab and consider TV production as a viable career.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

Purchase student planners to increase parent involvement and to notify parents of their child's academic and social progress, along with keeping parents informed about school/district events.	$440.51