

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: AZALEA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	District Name: ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Principal: IAN GESUNDHEIT	Superintendent: DR. BARBARA M. JENKINS
SAC Chair: JOANN VALENTIN	Date of School Board Approval: 01/29/2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Ian Gesundheit	<p>Degrees: B.A. Biology; M.S. Educational Leadership; 30 Post Graduate hours in Exceptional Education</p> <p>Certified: Science 6-12; Varying Exceptionalities K-12; Emotionally Handicapped K-12</p>	1	13	<p>Principal of Azalea Park Elementary from 2011- Present 2011-2012: Grade B, A, Reading Mastery – 52%; Math Mastery – 34%; Writing Mastery – 76%; Science Mastery – 49%. Principal of Lawton Chiles Elementary from 2004-2011 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 86%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 83%; Science Mastery – 64%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal. 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 86%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 83%; Science Mastery – 64%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal. 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 85%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 92%; Science Mastery – 54%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our reading or math goal. 2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 77%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 28%; and AYP – 97%. For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our math goal. 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 83%; Math Mastery – 70%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 39%; and AYP – 100%. 2005-2006: Grade B, Reading Mastery – 78%; Math Mastery – 63%; Writing Mastery – 73%; and AYP – 92%. For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged English Language Learner students did not make our math goal. 2004-2005: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 80%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 80%; and AYP – 97% and was met provisionally.</p>

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)
Assistant Principal	Sylvia Schaffer	Degrees: B.S. Business B.A. Early Childhood, M.S. Educational Leadership Certification: PreK-3, ESOL, Ed. Leadership	2	7	2012- Present Assistant Principal Curriculum Resource Teacher of Azalea Park Elementary from 2011- 11/2012 2011-2012: Grade B, A, Reading Mastery – 52%; Math Mastery – 34%; Writing Mastery – 76%; Science Mastery – 49%. Curriculum Resource Teacher of Lawton Chiles Elementary from 2004-2011 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 86%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 83%; Science Mastery – 64%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal. 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 86%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 83%; Science Mastery – 64%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal. 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 85%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 92%; Science Mastery – 54%; and AYP – 95%. For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our reading or math goal. 2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 77%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 28%; and AYP – 97%. For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our math goal.

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

					<p>2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 83%; Math Mastery – 70%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 39%; and AYP – 100%.</p> <p>2005-2006: Grade B, Reading Mastery – 78%; Math Mastery – 63%; Writing Mastery – 73%; and AYP – 92%.</p> <p>For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged English Language Learner students did not make our math goal.</p> <p>2004-2005: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 80%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 80%; and AYP – 97% and was met provisionally.</p>
Reading	Margaret Hyatt	<p>Degrees: B.S. Elementary Education</p> <p>Certification: K-5, Endorsements in ESOL and Reading</p>	1	8	<p>Reading Coach for Lawton Chiles Elementary from 2009-2011</p> <p>2011-2012: Grade B, A, Reading Mastery – 52%; Math Mastery – 34%; Writing Mastery – 76%; Science Mastery – 49%.</p> <p>For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal.</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 86%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 83%; Science Mastery – 64%; and AYP – 95%.</p> <p>For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged students did not make our math goal, and Students With Disabilities did not make our reading goal.</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 85%; Math Mastery – 77%; Writing Mastery – 92%; Science Mastery – 54%; and AYP – 95%.</p> <p>For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our reading or math goal.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 77%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 28%; and AYP – 97%.</p> <p>For AYP Students With Disabilities did not make our math goal.</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 83%; Math Mastery – 70%; Writing Mastery – 89%; Science Mastery – 39%; and AYP – 100%.</p> <p>2005-2006: Grade B, Reading Mastery – 78%; Math Mastery – 63%; Writing Mastery – 73%; and AYP – 92%.</p>

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

					For AYP our White students did not make our math goal, Economically Disadvantaged English Language Learner students did not make our math goal. 2004-2005: Grade A, Reading Mastery – 80%; Math Mastery – 69%; Writing Mastery – 80%; and AYP – 97% and was met provisionally.
CRT	Duong Tu-Hai Tran	Degrees: B.A. Digital Media Certification: K-6, ESOL	1	1	2011-2012: Grade B, A, Reading Mastery – 52%; Math Mastery – 34%; Writing Mastery – 76%; Science Mastery – 49%.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Network with other administrators and community members	Principal and all stakeholders	Ongoing
2. Consistently interact with UCF faculty, staff and community organizations	Principal and all stakeholders	Ongoing
3. Provide high quality, job embedded professional learning	Principal and all stakeholders	Ongoing
4. Provide opportunities for staff to attend professional conferences and expand their instructional repertoire	Principal and all stakeholders	Ongoing

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	Strategic professional development plan that is focused on teacher improvement. Specific coaching on targeted instructional strategies.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
50	4%[2]	14%[7]	40%[20]	46%[23]	46%[23]	100%[50]	20%[10]	0	72%[36]

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
Margaret Hyatt	Rebecca Rettinger	The Curriculum Resource Teacher has a broad range of experiences and background that will be used to support this mentoring pairing.	Coaching meeting, observations, and guidance through school system.
Margaret Hyatt	Rachel Luria	The Curriculum Resource Teacher has a broad range of experiences and background that will be used to support this mentoring	Coaching meeting, observations, and guidance through school system.

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

		pairing.	

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 Federal funds through Title One are used in conjunction with state funds to provide all students with instructional materials that meet all current requirements and to provide our highly qualified staff with appropriate staff development.
Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A
Title I, Part D N/A
Title II Professional Development for Faculty that supports the integrity of instruction to improve student achievement.
Title III Title III funds have been provided to purchase instructional materials and to provide additional after-school support for ESOL students.
Title X- Homeless At this time, there are 16 homeless students at Azalea Park, who receive targeted support at the school.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs The School Resource Office provides support to students in the intermediate grades that focus on prevention of gang involvement and drug involvement. The individual is a member of the Safety Committee and provides input and response training, as needed. The Healthy Schools representative interacts with the staff to ensure awareness of district initiatives.
Nutrition Programs OCPS Food and Nutrition Services implements the federal guidelines for free/reduced breakfast and lunch.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A

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

Other N/A

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.</p> <p>Ian Gesundheit – Principal: provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and ensures implementation of MTSS-with a focus on academic and behavioral support.</p> <p>Sylvia Schaffer – Assistant Principal: Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards and identifies existing scientifically based assessment and intervention approaches.</p> <p>Duong Hai Tran – Curriculum Resource Teacher: Identifies math strategies and intervening strategies for students not attaining proficiency in math.</p> <p>Jennifer Barth - Reading Resource: Identifies reading strategies and intervening strategies for students not attaining proficiency in reading. Provides guidance in K-12 reading plan.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>Currently, the MTSS team provides support and guidance for school-wide and tiered interventions. The team meets with teachers to address their concerns about students, working from general interventions with all students, progressing to focused interventions with selected students. The team discusses teacher concerns and then works with the teacher to implement interventions based upon collected data.</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?</p> <p>The MTSS Leadership Team provided input to the development of this plan. They will focus their meetings on the development of a problem-solving system to assist teachers in providing appropriate intervention strategies for students not achieving as proficiency.</p>
MTSS Implementation
<p>Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.</p> <p>As we continue the implementation of the process this year, this system is continuously being adapted to meet the needs of our students. It begins with the baseline data from the district's approved benchmark assessments for reading, math and science. In addition baseline data for reading will also include the FAIR assessment and DRA. Baseline data for Writing will come from the Write Score assessment. Baseline data for behavior comes from the districts Educational Data Warehouse. Our SAFE Resource teacher will keep track of student behavioral frequencies for tier implementation.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.</p> <p>The majority of the staff has been trained in the MTSS process. The MTSS team will provide training for new staff and ongoing training to further streamline the process and provide consistency for our implementation school wide.</p>
<p>Describe the plan to support MTSS.</p> <p>We will have bi-weekly data meetings. The MTSS process will be part of the discussion of these meetings. In these meetings we will review student data and the MTSS process. We will then make learning outcome and intervention plan determinations.</p>

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Ian Gesundheit - Principal Sylvia Schaffer – Assistant Principal Margaret Hyatt - Reading Resource Teacher Brandi Kesterson – Media Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).\ The LLT team meets quarterly as a team and with teachers to review student data and ensure the consistent implementation of Imagine It! The team also focuses on providing support to teachers for the successful implementation of small groups, differentiated instruction and the use of FCRR materials.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiative of the LLT this year will be to improve the proficiency levels of our AYP subgroups on the FCAT reading assessment and to integrate reading throughout all content areas. The LLT will focus on developing support plans for primary teachers who are implementing the CCSS.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

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

Students are exposed to school environment generalization. They are included in Kindergarten in house activities throughout the year. Year-end data is used to make placement decisions for Kindergarten so that the students receive appropriate support, based on their needs. Families are invited to participate in ongoing programs that focus on developmentally appropriate practices.

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

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

N/A

**High Schools Only*

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

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

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

N/A

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1. Students need more reading support that more specific to their reading gap needs.	1A.1. Implement Prescriptive Interventions to provide a more focused intervention that matches the student need.	1A.1. RTI Leadership Team	1A.1. Progress Monitoring Data/Meetings	1A.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June of 2013, 30% of all students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	In June of 2012, 27%[80] of all students scored at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	In June of 2013, 30% of all students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT Reading Assessment.					
			1A.2. Teachers are not as skilled or well trained in using reading interventions correctly.	1A.2. Provide more modeling and coaching for all teachers and monitor implementation.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, reading resource teacher and curriculum resource teacher	1A.2. Classroom observations during reading intervention	1A.2. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		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 in reading.			2A.1. Students who are above proficiency level often don't receive enough differentiation in instruction due to strong focus on students scoring below proficiency in reading.	2A.1. Students will be grouped for reading instruction to allow for more opportunities of differentiated instruction.	2A.1. Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teacher and Curriculum Compliance Teacher	2A.1. Progress Monitoring Data/Meetings	2A.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
Reading Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June, 2013 27% of students will score above proficiency in reading.	In June, 2012 24% [71] of students scored above proficiency in reading.	In June, 2013 27% of students will score above proficiency in reading.					
			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.
Reading Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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 reading.			3A.1. A significant number of students not making learning gains were at grade level proficiency and above.	3A.1. During data meetings, a clear and focused discussion on the progress of students on grade level will be done. From this discussion, strategies for instructional reach will be developed and implemented.	3A.1. RTI Leadership Team	3A.1. Progress Monitoring Data/Meetings	3A.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June of 2013, 62% of all students will make Reading Learning Gains.	In June of 2012 59% [172] of students made Reading Learning Gains.	In June of 2013, 62% of all students will make Reading Learning Gains.					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Our students in the lowest 25% come from backgrounds where they have a weak base in the process of reading. It is critical to identify those weaknesses and provide adequate interventions for them.	4A.1. The use of Prescriptive Interventions has made a positive impact on learning gains of the bottom 25%. We will continue to use a consistent framework of assessments at each grade level to provide accurate data. Continue to Implement Prescriptive Interventions to provide a more focused intervention that matches the student need.	4A.1. RTI Leadership Team	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Data/Meetings	4A.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 69% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains.	In June of 2012, 66% [196] of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains.	In June of 2013, 69% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains..					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
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. Reading Goal #5B: In June of 2013, 49% [105] of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} will not be proficient in reading.			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Many of our students come from backgrounds where they have a weak base in the process of reading. It is critical to identify those weaknesses and provide adequate interventions for them.	5B.1. The use of Prescriptive Interventions has made a positive impact on learning gains of the bottom 25%. We will continue to use a consistent framework of assessments at each grade level to provide accurate data. Continue to implement Prescriptive Interventions to provide a more focused intervention that matches the student need.	5B.1. RTI Leadership Team	5B.1. Progress Monitoring Data	5B.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment, SuccessMaker	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June of 2012, 54% [71] of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} were not proficient in reading. White:N/A Black: N/A Hispanic:46 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June of 2013, 49% of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} will not be proficient in reading. White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic:46 Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

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
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Significant numbers of English Language students have limited English Language skills and have limited vocabulary.	5C.1. We will utilize Sheltered English model of instruction and use Imagine Learning Software as a supplemental tool to increase student vocabulary and accelerate their momentum.	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teacher and Curriculum Compliance Teacher	5C.1. Progress Monitoring Data	5C.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment, SuccessMaker
Reading Goal #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 46% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2012, 43% [62] of ELL students made satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2013, 46% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading.					
			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 have a severe gap of success in reading proficiency when compared to regular education students. Their gap is so significant that it will take years to bring them up to speed, if matters with the disability allow.	5D.1. The majority of our SWD will group for reading intervention instruction, they will continue to receive reading intervention with researched based curriculum and will receive academic core in the regular classroom.	5D.1. Classroom teacher and ESE Resource teacher	5D.1. Progress Monitoring Data	5D.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment, SuccessMaker
Reading Goal #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 27% of our SWD subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2012, 24% [10] of our SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2013, 27% of our SWD subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.					
			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 reading.			5E.1. Our ED subgroup has a significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, academic/behavioral disabilities, and/or limited exposure/proficiency in critical readiness skills.	5E.1. Use a consistent framework of assessments at each grade level to provide accurate data which will enable teachers to make informed instructional decisions. This data will also be used to identify "at risk" students.	5E.1. RTI Leadership Team	5E.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5E.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment, SuccessMaker
<u>Reading Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 51% of our ED subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2012, 48% [128] of our ED subgroup made satisfactory progress in reading.	In June of 2013, 51% of our ED subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.					
			5E.2. Our ED subgroup has a significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, academic/behavioral disabilities, and/or limited exposure/proficiency in critical readiness skills.	5E.2. Ongoing implementation of the Imagine It! reading program in Kindergarten through 5th grades. This will include modeling and coaching for all teachers and will ensure that all grade levels are using consistent materials for reading instruction.	5E.2. Classroom teacher and Resource teachers	5E.2. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5E.2. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment, SuccessMaker
			5E.3. .	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

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

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teaching Reading Explicitly	K-5	Marilyn Hefferin	All reading teachers	TBD	Coaching	Principal, Assistant Principal and Curriculum Resource Teacher

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
Implement research based interventions	Reading Mastery, EIR, Cars/Stars, REWARDS	School Improvement Funds, School Budget	\$ 16,000
			Subtotal:\$ 16,000
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implement research based software	STAR, SuccessMaker, Imagine Learning	School Improvement Funds, School Budget	\$ 15,000
			Subtotal:\$ 15,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Leaders attend 90/90/90 Summit Institute	The Leadership and Learning Center	Title 1	6,000
			Subtotal:\$ 6,000
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Review classroom practices	Kathy Lathrup	School Improvement Funds, School Budget, Title 1	
			Subtotal:\$ 10,000
			Total:\$ 47,000

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. CELLA Goal #1: In June of 2013, grade level proficiency levels in listening/speaking on CELLA will be as follows: K: 28% 1: 14% 2: 75% 3: 14% 4: 44% 5: 66%	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u> In June of 2012, grade level proficiency levels on CELLA in listening and speaking were as follows: K: 25%[13] 1: 11%[6] 2: 72%[41] 3: 11%[4] 4: 41%[15] 5: 63%[20]	1.1. Research shows that students who are learning a new language take 5-7years to learn the language. Our current state model pushes our students to move faster despite research findings.	1.1. Implement curriculum and software that helps accelerate English Language Learners in their language acquisition.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Curriculum Compliance Teacher, classroom teacher	1.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	1.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment
		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

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. Research shows that students who are learning a new language take 5-7 years to learn the language. Our current state model pushes our students to move faster despite research findings.	2.1. Implement curriculum and software that helps accelerate English Language Learners in their language acquisition.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Curriculum Compliance Teacher, classroom teacher	2.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	2.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment
CELLA Goal #2: In June of 2013, grade level proficiency levels in reading based on CELLA will be as follows: K: 7% 1: 14% 2: 52% 3: 19% 4: 44% 5: 74%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: In June of 2012, grade level proficiency levels on CELLA in reading were be follows: K: 4%[2] 1: 11%[6] 2: 49%[28] 3: 16%[6] 4: 41%[14] 5: 71%[22]					
		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. Research shows that students who are learning a new language take 5-7years to learn the language. Our current state model pushes our students to move faster despite research findings.	2.1. Implement curriculum and software that helps accelerate English Language Learners in their language acquisition.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Curriculum Compliance Teacher, classroom teacher	2.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	2.1. FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments, Imagine Learning Assessment
CELLA Goal #3: In June of 2013, grade level proficiency levels in writing based on CELLA will be as follows: K: 7% 1: 18% 2: 50% 3: 34% 4: 56% 5: 67%	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : In June of 2012, grade level proficiency levels on CELLA in writing were be follows: K: 4%[2] 1: 15%[8] 2: 47%[27] 3: 31%[12] 4: 53%[18] 5: 64%[20]					
		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
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Implement software program that helps increase vocabulary acquisition.	Imagine Learning, SuccessMaker	Title 1, General Fund	10,000
			Subtotal:\$ 10,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PD on Imagine Learning	Imagine Learning	Multilingual Services	0
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Purchase paraprofessional for sheltered classrooms with a non-English speaking teacher	Another adult in the classroom	General Fund	
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$ 10,000

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. Significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, economically disadvantaged and learning/behavioral disabilities.	1A.1. Implement intervention system with guidance of STAR Math intervention program and math coach.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher and classroom teacher	1A.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	1A.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 24% of students will achieve proficiency standards on FCAT Math assessment.	In June of 2012, 21%[62] of students achieved proficiency standards on FCAT Math assessment.	In June of 2013, 24% of students will achieve proficiency standards on FCAT Math assessment.					
			1A.2. Teachers in need of more support to maintain and differentiate in math.	1A.2. Imbed our math coach more in the classroom.	1A.2. Principal and Curriculum Resource Teacher	1A.2. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	1A.2. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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

		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. Students who are above proficiency level often don't receive enough differentiation in instruction because of the numbers of students scoring below proficiency.	2A.1. Provide access to higher level math to above level students and give them access to software that promotes higher achievement.	2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, math coach and classroom teacher	2A.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	2A.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June 2013, 15% of students will score above proficiency in FCAT math.	In June 2012, 12%[37] of students scored above proficiency in FCAT math.	In June 2013, 15% of students will score above proficiency in FCAT math.					
			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.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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. Significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, economically disadvantaged and learning/behavioral disabilities.	3A.1. Implement intervention system with guidance of STAR Math intervention program and math coach.	3A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, math coach and classroom teacher	3A.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	3A.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June 2012, 54% of students will make learning gains in math.	In June 2012, 51%[152] of students made learning gains in math.	In June 2013, 54% of students will make learning gains in math.					
			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.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #3B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, economically disadvantaged and learning/behavioral disabilities.	4A.1. Implement intervention system with guidance of STAR Math intervention program and Curriculum Resource Teacher.	4A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, math coach and classroom teacher	4A.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	4A.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
Mathematics Goal #4:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June, 2013 64% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains in math.	In June, 2012 61%[45] of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains in math.	In June, 2013 64% of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains in math.					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: In June of 2013, 33% of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} were not proficient in math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In June of 2013, 78% [89] of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} were not proficient in math.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In June of 2013, 33% of Hispanic students {when compared to proficient Hispanics} were not proficient in math.	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, economically disadvantaged and learning/behavioral disabilities.	5B.1. Implement intervention system with guidance of STAR Math intervention program and math coach.	5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, math coach and classroom teacher	5B.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5B.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments	
				5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.

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

		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. High number of students who are English Language Learners who do not dominate the English language proficiently.	5C.1. Use Imagine Learning Software as a supplemental tool to increase student vocabulary.	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Curriculum Compliance Teacher and classroom teacher	5C.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5C.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 67% of our English Language Learners will not make satisfactory progress in math.	In June of 2013, 74% [100] of our English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress in math.	In June of 2013, 67% of our English Language Learners will not make satisfactory progress in math.					
			5C.2. High number of students who are English Language Learners who do not dominate the English language proficiently.	5C.2. Use a variety of math interventions that will help students continue to grow in math despite their language challenges.	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Curriculum Compliance Teacher and classroom teacher	5C.2. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5C.2. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
			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. Significant number of our SWD have limited access to the regular core curriculum due to the severity of their disability.	5D.1. Increase the number of SWD to access to the core curriculum regardless of their disability.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Staffing Coordinator and classroom teacher.	5D.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings.	5D.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In June of 2013, 79% of our SWD subgroup will not make satisfactory progress in math.	In June of 2013, 88% [39] of our SWD did not make satisfactory progress in math.	In June of 2013, 79% of our SWD will not make satisfactory progress in math.					

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

		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. Significant numbers of students that are economically disadvantaged are English Language Learners as well.	5E.1. Use a variety of math/reading interventions that will help students continue to grow in math/reading despite their language challenges.	5E.1. RTI Leadership Team	5E.1. Bi-weekly data/progress monitoring meetings	5E.1. Edusoft, FCAT, STAR, Intervention assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E: In June of 2013, 62% of our ED will not make satisfactory progress in math.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In June of 2012, 69% of our ED did not make satisfactory progress in math.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> In June of 2013, 62% of our ED will not make satisfactory progress in math.					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

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]).

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E:	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
N/A			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 Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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%. Algebra 1 Goal #3A: N/A	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. Algebra 1 Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

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

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

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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Interventions	K-5	Kelly Tran	School-Wide	Quarterly	Bi-Weekly DATA/Progress monitoring meetings	RTI Leadership Team

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
STAR Renaissance	Math Intervention/monitoring program	Title 1 and General Budget	\$ 4,000
			Subtotal:\$ 4,000
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$ 4,000

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. Students have weak exposure to the sciences.	1A.1. Departmentalize grades 3-5 and provide an effective science teacher that will incorporate highly motivated lessons.	1A.1. Principal	1A.1. Review assessment results and CWT	1A.1. FCAT Explorer, Edusoft Mini-Assessments
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June 2013, 29% of students will achieve proficiency in science.	In June 2012, 26%[25] of students achieved proficiency in science.	In June 2013, 29% of students will achieve proficiency in science.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

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. Students have weak exposure/maintenance to the sciences.	2A.1. Departmentalize grades 3-5 and provide an effective science teacher that will incorporate highly motivated lessons.	2A.1. Principal	2A.1. Review assessment results and CWT	2A.1. Explorer, Edusoft Mini-Assessments
Science Goal #2A: In June, 2013, 26% of students will score above proficiency in science.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In June, 2012, 23% [23] of students scored above proficiency in science.	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> In June, 2013, 26% of students will score above proficiency in science.					
			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: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Science Professional Development

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

Science 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
Have Science nights or activities.	Orlando Science Center	Title 1 or general budget.	\$ 5,000
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$ 5,000

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. Significant number of students with additional needs, such as second language acquisition, economically disadvantaged and learning/behavioral disabilities.	1A.1. Purchase Write Score assessment to review student writing and provide teachers with detailed feedback on student writing. This will drive the instruction.	1A.1. RTI Leadership Team	1A.1. Review Assessment	1A.1. Write Score
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In June 2013, 80% of students will achieve level 3 or higher in FCAT writing.	In June 2012, 77% [87] of students achieved level 3 or higher in FCAT writing.	In June 2013, 80% of students will achieve level 3 or higher in FCAT writing.					
			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:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

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

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

Writing Professional Development

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

Writing 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
Collins Writing Program	Cross Curriculum Writing Program	Title 1 and General Budget	\$ 6,000
			Subtotal: \$ 6,000
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: \$ 6,000

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Maintenance of attendance trend.	1.1. Continue to educate parents on the importance of student daily attendance and reinforce the behavior.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Review of monthly attendance reports	1.1. Data from attendance reports
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
In 2012-2013, there will be an average daily attendance rate of 94% or higher.	According to EDW, there was an average daily attendance rate of 93.79% in 2011-2012.	In 2012-2013, there will be an average daily attendance rate of 94% or higher.					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	315	285					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	150	135					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

		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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Persistent population of students who have infrequent highly intense behaviors.	1.1. Provide continual behavioral support and intervene as needed.	1.1. Principal and SAFE Resource Teacher	1.1. Total number of referrals	1.1. Referral data
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
In 2012-2013, there will be an average drop in suspensions by 25%.	17	13					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	13	10					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	56 offenses	42					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School					
	34	26					
			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
Functional Analysis	K-5	Principal/Designee	School-wide	Quarterly	Data Meetings	Principal/Designee

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
Positive Practices in Behavioral Support	Individual modules	Title 1 and General Budget	5,000
			Subtotal:\$ 5,000
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:\$ 5,000

End of Suspension Goals

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		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 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

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (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

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: In the 2012-2013 school year a STEM PLC will be initiated to guide future planning.	1.1. Limited teacher knowledge in selected areas.	1.1. Provide support for using technology for math interventions.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, math coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher	1.1. Data from survey (pre and post)	1.1. Teacher survey
	1.2. Limited teacher knowledge in selected areas.	1.2. Incorporate more technology into the science curriculum.	1.2. Principal, math coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher	1.2. Data from survey (pre and post)	1.2. Teacher survey
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal - Increase the Percent of VPK Students Who Will enter Elementary School Ready Based on FLKRS Data			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal – Increase Students Who Read on Grade Level by Age 9			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #2: This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – See Reading goals 1A and 2A.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Additional Goal(s)							
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal – Increase Students Who Become Fluent in Math Operations			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #3: This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – see Math Goals 1A, 3A, 4A and 5B.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal – Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #4: This goal was addressed in previous section of School Improvement Plan – see Reading Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E and Math Goals 5B, 5C, 5D, & 5E.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5. Additional Goal – Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #5: <i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
6. Additional Goal – Increase College and Career Awareness			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
7. Additional Goal – Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level :*					
	2013 Expected Level :*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>					
		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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

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

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
To involve business and family community involvement in the review and development of the School Improvement Plan.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
To help fund Prescriptive Interventions for struggling reading.	\$ 4,950.00