

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



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

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Piedmont Lakes Middle School	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: David Magee	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Mrs. Rebekka Senzee	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

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

**Administrators**

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior common assessment data learning gains). The school may include AMO progress along with the associated school year.									
Principal	David Magee	BME – Bachelor Music Ed MME – Masters Music Ed/ Administrative Supervision  School Principal Music –Elem/Secondary	21 years  19 as Principal  2 as Assistant Principal	22 years	PLMS School Year	GR	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	% LG Math		
					11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75		
					10-11	B	66	57	90	42	62	65		
					09-10	A	68	63	88	44	66	71		
					08-09	A	67	62	89	48	65	72		
					07-08	A	70	65	94	45	64	75		
					06-07	A	68	63	88	39	62	72		
					05-06	A	66	59	83		67	68		
					AYP	White Rd/ Math	Black Rd/ Math	Hsp Rd/ Math	Econ Disadv Rd/ Math	SWD Rd/ Math	ELL Rd/Math			
					10-11	74/64	53/42	52/46	53/45	39/29	29/29			
09-10	72/72	44/44	55/55	53/55	44/42	38/38								
08-09	75/71	50/44	53/47	52/46	41/37	46/33								
<p>Mr. David Magee has been the Principal at Piedmont for 19 years. In 2011 – 2012 Piedmont Lakes Middle School’s grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 76% of students made learning gains in reading and 75% of students made learning gains in math. Students meeting high standards in each subject area included 56% in reading, 51% in math, and 80% in writing and 44% in science.</p>														

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

					<p>In 2010 – 2011 the school grade was a B. Indicated in the chart above 62% of students made learning gains in reading and 65% made learning gains in math. Sixty-six percent of students met high standards in reading, 57% of students met high standards in math, 90% of students met high standards in writing and 42% of students met high standards in science.</p> <p>In 2009 – 2010 the school grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 66% of students made learning gains in reading and 71% of students made learning gains in math. Sixty-eight percent of students met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 88% of students met high standards in writing and 44% of students met high standards in science during the 2009 – 2010 school year.</p> <p>The above chart also includes information on AYP data from 2008 through 2011 for each of the identified subgroups in both reading and math.</p>							
Assistant Principal of Instruction	Kelly Steinke	B.S. Elem Ed M.S. Elem Ed Ed.S. Ed Leadership  Ed Leadership Elem Ed Reading Endorsed ESOL Certified	1.6 years	1.6 yrs	PLMS School Year	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	% LG Math
					11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75
					<p>In 2011 – 2012 Kelly Steinke served as the Assistant Principal of Instruction at Piedmont Lakes Middle School. During this year Piedmont Lakes Middle School’s grade improved to an A. Indicated in the chart above 76% of students made learning gains in reading and 75% of students made learning gains in math. Students meeting high standards in each subject area included 56% in reading, 51% in math, 80% in writing and 44% in science.</p> <p>Prior to serving as AP-I at Piedmont, Mrs. Steinke was the Curriculum Resource Teacher and ELL Compliance Teacher at Lakeville</p>							

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

Elementary.

Lakeville Elem Years	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	% LG Math
10-11	A	77	76	88	39	64	69
09-10	A	75	69	80	55	63	71
08-09	B	75	71	89	33	69	63
07-08	B	80	67	71	33	68	65
06-07	A	77	65	74	41	77	69
05-06	B	78	71	66		60	67

  

AYP	White Rd/Math	Black Rd/Math	Hsp Rd/Math	Econ Disadv Rd/Math	SWD Rd/Math	ELL Rd/Math
10-11	78/81	62/64	75/75	67/67	38/52	63/65
09-10	80/73	59/54	69/69	63/57	41/49	49/46
08-09	77/76	62/59	68/65	62/58	52/51	48/45

The chart above indicates school grade information for Mrs. Steinke’s tenure at Lakeville Elementary. In 2010- 2011 Lakeville Elementary earned a grade of an A. Sixty-four percent of students made learning gains in reading and 69% of students made learning gains in math. Also, 77% of students met high standards in reading, 76% met high standards in math, 88% met high standards in writing and 39% met high standards in science.

In 2009 -2010 Lakeville earned a school grade of A. Sixty-three percent of students made learning gains in reading and 71% of students made learning gains in math at Lakeville. In addition, 75% of students met high standards in reading, 69% met high standards in math, 80% met high standards in writing and 55% met high

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

					standards in science.  In 2008 – 2009, 69% of students made learning in reading and 63% of students made learning gains in math. Additionally, 75% of students met high standards in reading, 71% met high standards in math, 89% met high standards in writing and 33% met high standards in science.  Included in the chart above are AYP performance percentages for each of the identified subgroups from 2008 – 2011.																																																																																												
Assistant Principal	Jeffrey Bartfield	BS – Business Admin. MS- Ed Leadership  Ed Leadership All Levels Mathematics Grades 5-9 School Principal / All Levels Social Science / Grades 6-12 Middle Grades / Endorsement	7 years	8 years	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PLMS Year</th> <th>Grade</th> <th>% High Stds Read</th> <th>% High Stds Math</th> <th>% High Stds Write</th> <th>% High Stds Sci</th> <th>% LG Read</th> <th>% LG Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>11-12</td> <td>A</td> <td>56</td> <td>51</td> <td>80</td> <td>44</td> <td>76</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10-11</td> <td>B</td> <td>66</td> <td>57</td> <td>90</td> <td>42</td> <td>62</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>09-10</td> <td>A</td> <td>68</td> <td>63</td> <td>88</td> <td>44</td> <td>66</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>08-09</td> <td>A</td> <td>67</td> <td>62</td> <td>89</td> <td>48</td> <td>65</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>07-08</td> <td>A</td> <td>70</td> <td>65</td> <td>94</td> <td>45</td> <td>64</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>06-07</td> <td>A</td> <td>68</td> <td>63</td> <td>88</td> <td>39</td> <td>62</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05-06</td> <td>A</td> <td>66</td> <td>59</td> <td>83</td> <td></td> <td>67</td> <td>68</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AYP</th> <th>White Rd/ Math</th> <th>Black Rd/ Math</th> <th>Hsp Rd/ Math</th> <th>Econ Disadv Rd/ Math</th> <th>SWD Rd/Math</th> <th>ELL Rd/ Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10-11</td> <td>74/64</td> <td>53/42</td> <td>52/46</td> <td>53/45</td> <td>39/29</td> <td>29/29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>09-10</td> <td>72/72</td> <td>44/44</td> <td>55/55</td> <td>53/55</td> <td>44/42</td> <td>38/38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>08-09</td> <td>75/71</td> <td>50/44</td> <td>53/47</td> <td>52/46</td> <td>41/37</td> <td>46/33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PLMS Year	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Sci	% LG Read	% LG Math	11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75	10-11	B	66	57	90	42	62	65	09-10	A	68	63	88	44	66	71	08-09	A	67	62	89	48	65	72	07-08	A	70	65	94	45	64	75	06-07	A	68	63	88	39	62	72	05-06	A	66	59	83		67	68	AYP	White Rd/ Math	Black Rd/ Math	Hsp Rd/ Math	Econ Disadv Rd/ Math	SWD Rd/Math	ELL Rd/ Math	10-11	74/64	53/42	52/46	53/45	39/29	29/29	09-10	72/72	44/44	55/55	53/55	44/42	38/38	08-09	75/71	50/44	53/47	52/46	41/37	46/33
PLMS Year	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Sci	% LG Read	% LG Math																																																																																										
11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75																																																																																										
10-11	B	66	57	90	42	62	65																																																																																										
09-10	A	68	63	88	44	66	71																																																																																										
08-09	A	67	62	89	48	65	72																																																																																										
07-08	A	70	65	94	45	64	75																																																																																										
06-07	A	68	63	88	39	62	72																																																																																										
05-06	A	66	59	83		67	68																																																																																										
AYP	White Rd/ Math	Black Rd/ Math	Hsp Rd/ Math	Econ Disadv Rd/ Math	SWD Rd/Math	ELL Rd/ Math																																																																																											
10-11	74/64	53/42	52/46	53/45	39/29	29/29																																																																																											
09-10	72/72	44/44	55/55	53/55	44/42	38/38																																																																																											
08-09	75/71	50/44	53/47	52/46	41/37	46/33																																																																																											

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

				<p>Jeffrey Bartfield has been the Assistant Principal at Piedmont Lakes Middle School for 7 years.</p> <p>In 2011 – 2012 Piedmont Lakes Middle School’s grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 76% of students made learning gains in reading and 75% of students made learning gains in math. Students meeting high standards in each subject area included 56% in reading, 51% in math, and 80% in writing and 44% in writing.</p> <p>In 2010 – 2011 the school grade was a B. Indicated in the chart above 62% of students made learning gains in reading and 65% made learning gains in math. Sixty-six percent of students met high standards in reading, 57% of students met high standards in math, 90% of students met high standards in writing and 42% of students met high standards in science.</p> <p>In 2009 – 2010 the school grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 66% of students made learning gains in reading and 71% of students made learning gains in math. Sixty-eight percent of students met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 88% of students met high standards in writing and 44% of students met high standards in science during the 2009 – 2010 school year.</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)							
					PLMS School Year	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	% LG Math
Reading	Amber Zaremskas (1/2 time Reading Coach)	BS – Elem Ed MS – Elem Ed Reading Endorsement – to be completed Fall 2012  Elem. Ed ESOL Certified	1.6	6 months	11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75
					During the 2011 – 2012 school year Mrs. Zaremskas served as an Intensive Reading teacher for grades 6 – 8. This was her first year at Piedmont Lakes Middle School. Her prior experience was from Lakeville Elementary where she served as an elementary teacher, Curriculum Resource Teacher and Instructional Coach. During the 2011 – 2012 school year Piedmont Lakes Middle School’s grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 76% of students made learning gains in reading and 75% of students made learning gains in math. Students meeting high standards in each subject area included 56% in reading, 51% in math, 80% in writing and 44% in science.							
					Lakeville Year	Grade	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Writing	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	
					10-11	A	77	76	88	39	64	
					Prior to her experience at Piedmont Lakes Middle School, Mrs. Zaremskas taught at Lakeville Elementary. During the 2010 – 2011 school year 64% of students made learning gains in reading. Additionally, 77% met high							

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

					standards in reading, 76% met high standards in math, 88% met high standards in writing and 39% met high standards in science.								
All	Joyce Kell (CRT)	BS – Music MS – Elem Ed  Music Ed Middle Grades Endorsement	21	6	PLMS Year	G R A D E	% High Stds Read	% High Stds Math	% High Stds Write	% High Stds Science	% LG Read	% LG Math	
					11-12	A	56	51	80	44	76	75	
					10-11	B	66	57	90	42	62	65	
					09-10	A	68	63	88	44	66	71	
					08-09	A	67	62	89	48	65	72	
					07-08	A	70	65	94	45	64	75	
					06-07	A	68	63	88	39	62	72	
					05-06	A	66	59	83		67	68	
					AYP	White Rd/ Math	Black Rd/ Math	Hispanic Rd/Math	Econ Disadv Rd/Math	SWD Rd/Math	ELL Rd/ Math		
					10-11	74/64	53/42	52/46	53/45	39/29	29/29		
					09-10	72/72	44/44	55/55	53/55	44/42	38/38		
					08-09	75/71	50/44	53/47	52/46	41/37	46/33		
					07-08	72/74	51/44	61/55	55/51	38/38	47/40		
					06-07	72/67	50/45	53/47	49/43	28/22	36/29		
										Ms. Joyce Kell has served as Curriculum Resource Teacher at Piedmont Lakes Middle School for 6 years. Prior to becoming CRT she was a Chorus teacher at Piedmont. In 2011 – 2012 Piedmont Lakes Middle School’s grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 76% of students made learning gains in reading and 75% of students made learning gains in math. Students			

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

				<p>meeting high standards in each subject area included 56% in reading, 51% in math, 80% in writing and 44% in science.</p> <p>In 2010 – 2011 the school grade was a B. Indicated in the chart above 62% of students made learning gains in reading and 65% made learning gains in math. Sixty –six percent of students met high standards in reading, 57% of students met high standards in math, 90% of students met high standards in writing and 42% of students met high standards in science.</p> <p>In 2009 – 2010 the school grade was an A. Indicated in the chart above 66% of students made learning gains in reading and 71% of students made learning gains in math. Sixty-eight percent of students met high standards in reading, 63% met high standards in math, 88% of students met high standards in writing and 44% of students met high standards in science during the 2009 – 2010 school year.</p> <p>The above chart also includes information on AYP data from 2008 through 2011 for each of the identified subgroups in both reading and math.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**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
<p>1. Mentor/Mentee Induction Program All beginning teachers and new teachers to the district are matched with a Teacher Mentor. The CRT meets monthly with both Mentor and Mentee to facilitate collaboration and support services. Our Induction Program has strong components with detailed follow-up so teachers are supported.</p>	Joyce Kell - CRT	June 2012

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

<p>2. Professional Learning Community/Team Collaboration Support          PLCs meet weekly to collaborate and share ideas. Additionally, teachers are part of a Department related to their content area, as well as a Grade Level Team. Teachers have many avenues for collaboration through a multi-layered system of support and Professional Development.</p>	<p>Kelly Steinke – API          Joyce Kell - CRT</p>	<p>August 2012 – June 2013</p>
<p>3. Interview Committee          Principal seeks the input of key stakeholders in the hiring process for highly qualified teachers. Committee members support administration in the interview process.</p>	<p>David Magee – Principal          Jeffrey Bartfield - AP</p>	<p>On-going          August 2012 – July 2013</p>

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

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
.01% (1)	Courses being offered through the district (ESOL Endorsement)

***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
75	1% (1)	12% (9)	49% (37)	38% (28)	41% (31)	100%	11% (8)	5% (4)	11% (8)

***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
Krista Kelly for ACP program	Krista Kelly for ACP program	Ms. Kelly is paired with Ms. Wesighan for basic classroom needs: routines/ procedures; classroom set-up; learning strategies, daily school operations,	Weekly Mentor/Mentee Chats Classroom Observations Monthly Mentor/Mentee meetings with CRT

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

		etc. Mr. Carter supports Ms. Wesighan with her content area instruction for mathematics.	
James Strickland Krista Kelly for ACP program	Neil Greiner	Mr. Strickland supports Mr. Greiner with subject area support as well as general support services – routines/procedures; daily school operations; best practices, etc.	Weekly Mentor/Mentee Chats Classroom Observations Monthly Mentor/Mentee meetings with CRT
Amy Kurimai for ACP program	Michael Myrga	Ms. Kurimai supports Michael Myrga with subject area support, as well as general support services – routines/procedures; daily school operations; best practices, etc.	Weekly Mentor/Mentee Chats Classroom Observations Monthly Mentor/Mentee meetings with CRT

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

**Additional Requirements**

***Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only* N/A**

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

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

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

Other  
N/A

DRAFT

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

**Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.** The School Based RtI Leadership Team includes the following individuals: Principal – David Magee; Assistant Principal of Instruction – Kelly Steinke; Assistant Principal – Jeffrey Bartfield; Curriculum Resource Teacher – Joyce Kell; Guidance Counselor per grade level – , Dr. Jennifer Morris, Esther Londono-Scott, Heather Coleman; ESE Administrator/Behavior Specialist – Ms. Parker-Jackson; Staffing Specialist – Collet Belzer; School Psychologist – Terri Gurley; Reading Coach – Amber Zaremskas

DRAFT

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

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

Grade level teams meet weekly to collaborate on students' academic performance. Student data is shared and student data sheets are completed prior to the weekly collaboration. Teachers focus on academic performance data, behavior needs, etc. During this collaboration, it is determined what will need to be progress monitored and what initial supports need to be in place for the student to begin to show success. The RtI team meets monthly to follow up on student academic performance. Student data sheets are reviewed, as well as progress monitoring data. The RtI Leadership Team provides the grade level teams with additional support services for the students needing additional services outside the core curriculum, i.e. – Staff Mentor/Mentee Programs; Morning/Afternoon Tutoring Services; ADDitions Tutoring; changes in daily schedule (intensive reading, intensive math), Home/School Connection. Each leadership team member is assigned to follow up and track student progress for those students brought to the table. The RtI team periodically reviews progress monitoring data to determine if rate of progress is adequate. If rate of progress is not adequate the RtI team meets again to determine if the problem/concern was identified correctly and interventions were appropriately matched. If needed, changes are made and progress monitoring continues until the student's rate of progress is adequate or student has met grade level expectations.

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

The RtI team is an integral part of the School Improvement Plan process. The RtI team meets to review and analyze school data. After analyzing and disaggregating the data the RtI team begins to brainstorm and put into place a plan of action. All stakeholders have a voice in this process including: faculty, staff, parents, students, community and School Advisory Members. Each of the ideas is taken into consideration and a plan is developed. Our School Improvement Plan is shared with the School Advisory Council and continues to be a work in progress throughout the year as new data is received and reviewed. Our School Improvement Plan is a statement of our work for the school year.

### MTSS Implementation

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

Edusoft Benchmark data (reading/math/science) is reviewed after students are assessed in reading, mathematics and science two times each year. Reports are generated to track student progress in subgroups, as well as strengths and weaknesses within benchmark strands, etc. Teachers use the Edusoft baseline assessment data and mid-point benchmark data to focus instruction. After re-teaching benchmarks within the identified weak areas; teachers then use the Edusoft Mini Assessments to progress monitor students' increased knowledge on those particular benchmark strands. Science is the only area where mini assessments are not available through Edusoft system, but Science Department develops mini formative assessments to progress monitor.

The FAIR assessment is also used to determine growth in reading. Teachers use the components of this assessment to direct instruction within the reading components of vocabulary, reading comprehension and fluency. Reading teachers also progress monitor students' fluency and comprehension monthly. Fluency assessments take place twice per month using probes from *Easycbm* and comprehension checks are completed once a month using probes from *Easycbm*, as well. Reading Plus a technology based reading curriculum which gives prescriptive lessons in literacy based on each

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

students' needs. Administrative and teacher reports are generated weekly to track student progress with this online component.

My Access is a computerized writing program which grades student writing and assigns a holistic score. Teachers use *My Access* to determine focus lessons in writing. The RtI team can generate reports to determine specific areas of need within each classroom and/or specific areas of the writing process. Teachers also track data for instructional decision making in each content area through their formative and summative assessments.

A log of the number of students assigned to In-School Suspension is reviewed each nine weeks. Additionally, Grade Level Administrators review behavior data (EDW) monthly and share results with the RtI Leadership Team. Behavior interventions are put into place as needed.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI process continues to be revisited through Professional Learning Communities. Beginning teachers will also learn about the RtI initiatives through the Induction program and monthly meetings. Additionally, our School Psychologist keeps the RtI team updated on learning community and district RtI information.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Monthly meetings are held with the RtI Leadership team to support the MTSS. Agenda is set by the AP and minutes are kept by the Staffing Coordinator. Through these meetings issues are addressed and plans are developed to support students.

### ***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Kelly Steinke-API; Joyce Kell – CRT; Amber Zaremskas – Reading Coach; Ginger Carter – Media Specialist Brian Branks – LA teacher; Tracey Fields – Intensive Reading Teacher; Shelia Adams – Intensive Reading Teacher; Krista Kelly – Gifted/Adv LA; Wendy Wing – Intensive Reading Teacher

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly (more often when events are upcoming). This team determines a vision and goals for the 2012-2013 school year. A timeline was developed for implementation of the initiatives along with the Lead LLT member for each particular goal. Agendas are set for each meeting by Kelly Steinke (API). Notes are kept during the meeting.

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

Morning Book Club – focusing on 8<sup>th</sup> grade FCAT Level 2/3 reluctant readers – students will be provided Nook e-reader and downloadable books; SSYRA program; Family Literacy Night; Celebrate Literacy Week; Accelerated Reader – develop common language and shared practices for implementing AR; Reading Accountability Partner (RAP) – FCAT Level 1 and 2 students pair with Staff Mentor

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

***Public School Choice N/A***

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

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

DRAFT

## 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.

N/A

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

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

It is the expectation all teachers will incorporate reading/literacy strategies across all content areas. The following schedule is utilized to incorporate reading/literacy weekly into these courses: Monday – Electives; Tuesday – Social Studies; Wednesday – LA/PE; Thursday – Electives; Friday – 6/7 Science. Students will complete AR reading/Content Reading for 20 minutes during *Content Area Literacy Day*. During this time teachers listen to students “whisper” read out loud to ensure they are reading an appropriate level book. Additionally, students will have a Word Study for a minimum of 10 minutes. During this time students are introduced to new vocabulary or previously taught vocabulary is reviewed. Elective teachers use the vocabulary from the 30 -15-10 Vocabulary list. Finally, students will be expected to write in a journal or write to a prompt for a minimum of 17 minutes each week. Teachers are encouraged to conference with students about what they are reading, as well as give verbal/written feedback on their writing weekly.

In addition to *Content Area Literacy Days* teachers are expected to teach vocabulary in each content area. Word Walls are displayed in each classroom so students have visual representations of vocabulary in each content area. All teachers have been trained in Thinking Maps and incorporate this strategy throughout all content areas.

### ***\*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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

***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

DRAFT

**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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1. The number of minutes students spend independently reading in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) outside of Reading/LA classroom.	1A.1. Require all teachers to incorporate a Literacy Day within their curriculum. Independent reading will take place for 20 minutes on the designated days for each content area.	1A.1. Principal AP API	1A.1. Classroom Observation Reading Logs – planner AR Reports	1A.1. FCAT Reports FAIR Reports AR Reports
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Our goal is to increase the number of students achieving FCAT level 3 proficiency by 3% from 31% to 34%	31% (356)	34% (404)					
			1A.2. Some students are reluctant readers	1A.2. Begin a Morning Book Club for students scoring a Level 3 on FCAT and provide Nook e-readers with downloadable books	1A.2. Media Specialist	1A.2. Sign-In sheets Individual AR tests	1A.2. FCAT Scores
			1A.3. Students need more strategic lessons to target weak benchmarks	1A.3. Support teachers through Unwrapping Standards and making instructional decisions through data analysis	1A.3. AP/API CRT Reading Coach Teachers	1A.3. PLC Notes Observation Lesson Plans	1A.3. FCAT Data
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>			1B.1. Students will need more individualized	1B.1. Support teachers with Differentiated	1B.1. API CRT	1B.1. PLC Book Study	1B.1. Lesson Plans FAA Data
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Our goal is to increase the number of students achieving FAA level 4, 5 or 6 from 47% to 50%.	47% (23)	50% (27)	support to reach achievement Levels 4, 5 and 6	Instructional Strategies (Marzano strategies)	Reading Coach	Model Lessons	
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Students need more opportunities to read quality literature with rich vocabulary and opportunities to discuss what they have read.	2A.1. – Implement SSYRA program which encourages students to read all 15 SSYRA books. LA teachers will individually conference with students on the books they have read to support students when they take AR comprehension tests.	2A.1. Media Specialist LA teachers	2A.1. Analyze SSYRA Data AR Reports Analyze Book Circulation Data	2A.1. AR Reports
<b>Reading Goal #2A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring at or above achievement level 4 from 22% to 25%.	22% (253)	25% (297)					
			2A.2. Understanding the level of rigor needed within daily lessons to increase student achievement	2A.2. Provide training in Rigor (SREB Module) for all teachers	2A.2. AP-I CRT	2A.2. Classroom Observations PLC Notes Lesson Plans	2A.2. FCAT Scores
			2A.3. Students will need more individualized support to reach FCAT achievement levels 4 or 5	2A.3. Support teachers with Differentiated Instructional Strategies (Marzano strategies)	2A.3. API CRT Reading Coach	2A.3. PLC Book Study	2A.3. Lesson Plans FAA Data
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1. Students will need more individualized support to reach FCAT achievement Level 7 and above	2B.1. Train teachers on PCI curriculum and implement curriculum in FAA classrooms to support differentiated	2B.1. CRT ESE Admin Dean	2B.1. PLC meetings PCI Training Lesson Plans	2B.1. FAA Scores
<b>Reading Goal #2B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
Our goal is to increase the	14% (7)	17% (9)					

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

number of students scoring a level 7 or above on the FAA from 14% to 17%.				instruction.			
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

DRAFT

## 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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	The amount of time students spend reading and the quality of literature which exposes them to rich vocabulary.	Implement Sunshine State Young Reader Award (SSYRA) reward program. Encourage students to read all 15 books this school year. Offer rewards and incentives for every 3 books read.	Media Specialist	SSYRA Data Analyze Book Circulation Data	AR Reports FCAT Scores
Our goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains in reading from 68% to 71%.	68% (782)	71% (844)					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			Students lack the knowledge to comprehend challenging vocabulary within text.	Implement 30-15-10 Vocabulary strategy in all Elective Classes	AP-I CRT Elective Teachers	Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	Edusoft Scores FCAT Scores
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
			Students lack motivation and encouragement to make reading a priority.	Establish Reading Accountability Partners with Level 1 and some Level 2 students (matching Staff mentor with each student for reading accountability).	API Reading Leadership Team Teachers	RAP Partner List AR Data	FCAT Scores
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Students lack foundational reading skills.	Students will use prescribed Reading Plus computerized lessons to target individualized areas of weakness within the 5	ESE Teachers ESE Admin. Dean CRT Reading Coach	Lesson Plans Reading Plus Data Report	Reading Plus Data
Our goal is to increase the number of	29% (14)	32% (17)					

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

students making learning gains on the FAA from 29% to 32%.				domains of reading.			
			3B.2. Students need more differentiated instruction to support their individualized reading needs.	3B.2. Provide teachers training in Differentiated Instruction and support implementation of DI strategies.	3B.2. Reading Coach	3B.2. Model Lessons Observation	3B.2. Lesson Plans Observation Feedback
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b>			4A.1. Students lack basic reading skills to comprehend grade level text.	4A.1. Schedule students who score a level 1 into a double block of reading with small group guided reading support.	4A.1. Principal API CRT Reading Coach	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Data will be analyzed monthly	4A.1. FAIR Fluency/ Comprehension Checks Student Schedule/Master Schedule
Reading Goal #4:  Our goal is to increase the number of students in our bottom 25% making learning gains in reading from 76% to 79%	<u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performan</u> <u>ce:*</u>	<u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level of</u> <u>Performan</u> <u>ce:*</u>					
	76% (874)	79% (940)					
			4A.2. Students lack foundational reading skills.	4A.2. Students will use prescribed Reading Plus computerized lessons to target individualized areas of weakness within the 5 domains of reading	4A.2. Reading Teachers Reading Coach AP-I	4A.2. Reading Plus Reports Classroom Observations	4A.2. FCAT Scores Edusoft Scores
		4A.3. Students need access to high interest non-fiction texts.	4A.3. Provide students with text (non-fiction) which are high interest and support benchmark skills: Scholastic Action Magazine AR Non Fiction books classroom library additions.	4A.3. CRT Teachers	4A.3. Classroom Observation Lesson Plans	4A.3. AR reports Benchmark Assessments	

**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										
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 34%	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>17%</b>										
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> Our goal is to decrease the percentage of students scoring a level 1 or 2 by 50% by 2016 -2017.																	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool											
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.											
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> Our goal is to increase student achievement by 3% in each of the following subgroups: White:64% (254) Black:41% (145) Hispanic:46% (173) Asian:61% (10)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 61%</td> <td>White:64% (254)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:38%</td> <td>Black:41% (145)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:43%</td> <td>Hispanic:46% (173)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:58%</td> <td>Asian:61% (10)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 61%	White:64% (254)	Black:38%	Black:41% (145)	Hispanic:43%	Hispanic:46% (173)	Asian:58%	Asian:61% (10)	Lack of motivation is an anticipated barrier for each sub group.	Implement Renaissance Reward program for all grade levels.  AVID Elective Teacher continues to support students within the AVID program on academic achievement.	7 <sup>th</sup> grade Admin Dean Renaissance Committee  AVID Teacher	Renaissance Participation Data	Student Grades Formative Assessment Data	
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																
White: 61%	White:64% (254)																
Black:38%	Black:41% (145)																
Hispanic:43%	Hispanic:46% (173)																
Asian:58%	Asian:61% (10)																
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.											

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

<b>The percentages noted are those students scoring 3 and above in each subgroup according to EDW.</b>		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

**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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. ELL students lack proficiency in English.	5C.1. Offer Developmental Language Arts courses for those students needing additional support with basic language/reading skills.	5C.1. Principal AP/AP-I CRT ELL Compliance Guidance Counselors	5C.1. Use prior year FACT scores as well as CELLA and IPT scores to determine placement.  Monitor student data for students scheduled in DLA courses	5C.1. FCAT Edusoft Benchmark Formative Assessments Reading Plus Data
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in reading from 28% to 31%	28% (54)	31% (60)					
<b>The percentages noted are those students scoring 3 and above in ELL Group according to EDW.</b>			5C.2. ELL students need additional support with basic language skills.	5C.2. Offer students access to Rosetta Stone software for language development.	5C.2. ELL Compliance Teacher DLA Teachers	5C.2. Classroom Observation Rosetta Stone Performance Data	5C.2. Fluency/ Comprehension Assessment Checks
			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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Students need additional one-on-one support to maintain adequate progress within core content courses.	5D.1. Students will be receiving additional support through one-on-one help with Support Facilitators scheduled within their	5D.1. Principal AP/API Support Facilitators Staffing Specialist	5D.1. Support Facilitators Schedule Professional Learning Community Collaborations Student Data Chats	5D.1. FCAT Data
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of SWD making	57% (80)	60% (84)					

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

satisfactory progress in reading from 57% to 60%				classrooms daily.			
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

## 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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Lack of resources for parents to help their children with reading beyond the school day.	5E.1. Host a Reading Night for parents in the Technology Lab. Parents and students will be informed of ways they can help their child. Additionally, we will share the Reading Plus program.	5E.1. AP-I CRT Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team	5E.1. Monitor attendance at Parent Nights  Monitor usage of Parent Computer Access	5E.1. Reading Plus Data FCAT Data
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  Our goal is to increase the number of ED students making satisfactory progress in reading from 45% to 48%.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 45% (420)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 48% (448)					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

### Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Strategies	6 - 8	API/CRT/ PLC Leads	School-wide	Weekly PLC meetings during planning	PLC Weekly Notes	AP-I/CRT
Unpacking the Standards	6 - 8	AP-I/CRT	School-wide	Weekly PLC meetings during planning/and Wed PD	Lesson Plans/PLC Weekly Notes	API/CRT
Rigor in the Classroom (SREB)	6 - 8	AP-I/Reading	School-wide	Wed. PD (Oct./Jan)	PLC Discussions/Classroom Observation	API/Reading Coach

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

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

Module)		Coach				
Digging Deeper into Data	6 - 8	Principal/ AP-I and AP	School-wide	Biweekly PLC Meetings	Observation/PLC Notes/Agendas/IMS Frequency	Principal/AP-I/AP/CRT
Differentiated Instruction	6 – 8 Intensive Reading Teachers	Reading Coach	Reading PLC	Biweekly PLC Meetings	Classroom Observation/Lesson Plans	Reading Coach/Principal/AP/AP-I

DRAFT

**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
William Sadlier Vocabulary Workbooks	Supplemental Vocab Curriculum	School Budget	\$2431.75
AR Non and Fiction books	AR books for students to check out	School Budget	\$1059.89
Theater/Drama books	Supplemental reading curriculum	School Budget	\$209.27
Scholastic "ACTION" Magazines	Supplemental magazine resource	School Budget	\$492.42
Classroom Nonfiction Books	Supplemental reading	Grant	\$494.00
Scholastic "SCOPE" Magazines	Supplemental magazine resource	School Budget	\$886.89
AVID Weekly	Current Event Non-Fiction reading	School Budget	\$525.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$6099.17</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reading Plus	Computer program for reading	N/A	Paid for last year
PCI Educational Program	Software for ESE students	School Budget	\$1949.54
Morning Book Club	Nooks and Books for students	Grant	\$5000.00
AR Enterprise	Upgraded AR software	School Budget	\$5582.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$12531.54</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Literacy Workshops	NCTE Convention Registration for 2 teachers	School Budget	\$480.00
Differentiated Instruction	Resource Books for teacher training	School Budget	\$905.26
RtI	Resource Books for teacher training	School Budget	\$59.90
Lesson Study	Unwrapping the Standards	Title II for substitutes	\$1000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$2445.16</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

SSYRA Program	Reward system for students reading	Fundraiser/PTSA	\$3000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$3000.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$24075.92</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

DRAFT

**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]).

<b>CELLA Goals</b>		<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>		1.1. ELL students need opportunities to practice using English and hearing fluent English speakers.	1.1. Immerse limited English speakers with native English speakers and provide Para Professional support in content classes to bridge communication.	1.1. Principal ESOL Compliance Teacher ESOL Paraprofessional	1.1. Master Schedule Para Schedule CELLA scores	1.1. CELLA Scores
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring proficient on listening and speaking on <b>CELLA</b> from 69% to 72%.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 69% (80 ELL students)					
		1.2. Teachers need support with providing ELL students with appropriate accommodations in listening and speaking.	1.2. Provide training through ESOL Compliance Teacher on best practices for ELL students.	1.2. ESOL Compliance Teacher	1.2. Training Dates Lesson Plans	1.2. CELLA Scores
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1. Some ELL students who score high enough not to be considered for Intensive Reading Class, but who still need daily support with reading and writing.	2.1. Schedule a Reading Support class for ELL students who score in the mid-range on CELLA .	2.1. Principal AP-I/CRT ELL Compliance Teacher	2.1. CELLA/FCAT DATA Review Master Schedule Formative Assessment Review	2.1. CELLA/FCAT Scores Fluency/Comprehension Checks AR Reports
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 10% (9 ELL students)					

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

proficient in reading on <b>CELLA</b> from 10% to 13%.		2.2. Teachers need support with providing ELL students with appropriate accommodations in reading.	2.2. Provide training through ESOL Compliance Teacher on best practices for ELL students.	2.2. ESOL Compliance Teacher	2.2. Training Dates Lesson Plans	2.2. CELLA Scores
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1. Some ELL students who score high enough not to be considered for Intensive Reading Class, but who still need daily support with reading and writing.	2.1. Schedule a Reading Support Class for ELL students who score in the mid-range on CELLA.	2.1. Principal AP-I/CRT ELL Compliance Teacher	2.1. CELLA/FCAT DATA Review Master Schedule Formative Assessment Review	2.1. CELLA/FCAT Scores Fluency/Comprehension Checks AR Reports
<b>CELLA Goal #3:</b> Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring proficient in writing from 34% to 37% on the <b>CELLA</b> assessment.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 34% (32 ELL students)	2.2. Teachers need support with providing ELL students with appropriate accommodations in writing.	2.2. Provide training through ESOL Compliance Teacher on best practices for ELL students.	2.2. ESOL Compliance Teacher	2.2. Training Dates Lesson Plans	2.2. CELLA Scores
		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
Scholastic Action Magazine	12 Biweekly Issues with high-interest, age-appropriate articles for students in grades 6-12, but written at a grades 3-5 reading level (Lexile 450-800, Guiding Reading Levels L-U).	Instructional Materials	Included in Reading Budget
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rosetta Stone	Language Software	District Title III	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
ESOL Course: Methods	ESOL Endorsement Course 3 focusing on Methods of teaching ELL Students	District	N/A
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
			<b>Total:0</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals N/A

\* 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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			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
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <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	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> Mathematics Goal #5A:  N/A	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>								
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		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> Mathematics Goal #5B:  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
				5B.3.	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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1. Share ELL sub group math data with all teachers. Share expectations for interactive word walls within each classroom Support teachers with word walls through Professional Learning Communities	5C.1. Classroom Observation Professional Learning Community Collaboration
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
			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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A							
			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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			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:							
N/A			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]).

<b>Middle School Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1. Students will need more individualized support and time to reach achievement level 3.	1A.1. Schedule level 1 and 2 students into Math Lab along with Core Math Course to provide additional time and support.	1A.1. Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors	1A.1. Master Schedule Student Schedules Edusoft Data Reports	1A.1. Edusoft Data FCAT Scores
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring a level 3 from 30% to 33%.	30% (345)	33% (392)					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1. Students need real-world math experiences to increase achievement.	1B.1. Provide a life skills centered classroom where students can use math skills to purchase items in a simulated store.	1B.1. Principal Admin Dean ESE	1B.1. Observation Lesson Plans	1B.1. FAA Math Data
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of FAA students scoring at levels 4, 5 and 6 from 53% to 56%.	53% (26)	56% (31)					
			1B.2. Students have difficulty recalling foundational math skills.	1B.2. Provide curriculum and training in Equals Math by AbleNet.	1B.2. Principal CRT	1B.2. Lesson Plans Observation	1B.2. FAA Data
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1. Students need access to more advanced curriculum and courses.	2A.1. Provide more advance courses (Alg I/Geometry) within the Master Schedule. Schedule more students into those courses. Offer morning and after school tutoring to support students with more rigorous curriculum.	2A.1. Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers	2A.1. Analyze FCAT data to determine which students need a more rigorous course load.  Build the Master Schedule to reflect those needs and Schedule students into those courses.  Schedule morning tutoring and communicate with parents and students about tutoring opportunities.  Follow up with Progress Monitoring (mini assessments) data to determine if students are making gains.	2A.1. Edusoft Data FCAT Data Progress Monitoring Data (Mini Assessments)
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring Level 4 or 5 in mathematics from 18% to 21%.	18% (207)	21% (250)					
			2A.2. Students lack the knowledge to solve non-routine problems with higher order	2A.2. During bell work expose students to more non-routine/higher order thinking	2A.2. CRT API Mathematics Teachers	2A.2. Review with staff Webb's Depth of Knowledge.	2A.2. Lesson Plans FCAT Scores

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

		thinking.	questions.  Provide students with differentiated support and practice during lessons with higher order thinking questions.  Use Webb's Depth of Knowledge questioning format to increase the rigor of the questions presented to students.	Support Facilitators	Train new teachers on Webb's DOK	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>		2B.1	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #2B:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	Students need more differentiated instruction to meet their individual mathematic needs.	CRT AP/API	PLC Lesson Plans	FFA Data
Our goal is to increase the number of FAA students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics from .02% to 3%.	.02% (1)	3% (2)				
		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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			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>	Students will need more individualized support and time to reach achievement level 3.	Provide students with a Math Lab to increase time and support for students in mathematics.  Provide before/after school tutoring for selected students.	Principal API/AP CRT Guidance Counselors Teachers	Student Schedules Master Schedule Edusoft Data Reports	Edusoft Data FCAT Data
Our goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains in mathematics from 67% to 70%.	67% (770)	70% (833)					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			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>	Students lack foundational math skills.	Use PCI picture math curriculum and differentiate instruction to meet student needs.	CRT ESE Admin Dean	Lesson Plans Observation	FAA Scores
Our goal is to increase the percentage of learning gains in mathematics on the FAA assessment from 37% to 40%.	37% (18)	40% (22)					
			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	
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1.	4A.1	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  Our goal is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% from 75% to 78%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  75% (862)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  78% (928)	Students lack mathematical fluency with basic math skills.	Provide students with an Intensive Math Course with focus on building mathematical fluency.  Provide tutoring before and after school targeting students' basic math skills.	Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Teachers	Analyze FCAT data to determine the number of students needing intensive mathematics.  Schedule students into the course.  Teachers will provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners within those courses.	Edusoft Data FCAT Data Student Schedules	
				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										
<b>5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b> 43%	<b>39.42%</b>	<b>35.84%</b>	<b>32.26%</b>	<b>28.68%</b>	<b>25.10%</b>	<b>21.5%</b>										
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> Our goal is to decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 in mathematics from 43% to 21.5% by 2016 -2017.																	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool											
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>	<b>5B.1.</b>											
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> Our goal is to increase the number of students making annual yearly progress in each of the following subgroups: White, Black and Hispanic by 3%. White: 58% (210) Black: 37% (131) Hispanic:39%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 53%</td> <td>White: 56% (210)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:34%</td> <td>Black: 37% (131)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:36%</td> <td>Hispanic:39% (136)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian: 52%</td> <td>Asian:55% (8)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 53%	White: 56% (210)	Black:34%	Black: 37% (131)	Hispanic:36%	Hispanic:39% (136)	Asian: 52%	Asian:55% (8)	Lack of motivation is anticipated barrier for each sub group.	Implement Renaissance Reward program for all grade levels and subgroups.	7 <sup>th</sup> grade Admin Dean Renaissance Committee	Renaissance Data Student Grades	FCAT Scores Student Grades	
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*																
White: 53%	White: 56% (210)																
Black:34%	Black: 37% (131)																
Hispanic:36%	Hispanic:39% (136)																
Asian: 52%	Asian:55% (8)																
		5B.2. Students lack mathematical fluency with basic math skills.	5B.2. Provide tutoring before and after school targeting students' basic math skills.	5B.2. Principal AP/API CRT	5B.2. Tutoring Attendance	5B.2. Edusoft Reports FCAT Math Data											

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

<p>(136) Asian: 55%(8)</p> <p><b>These scores are reflective of students scoring Level 3 and above as indicated on EDW.</b></p>		<p>5B.3. Students lack outside support for increased student achievement</p>	<p>5B.3. Establish Staff Mentor/Mentee Program (SOS – Save One Student).</p>	<p>Guidance Counselors Teachers</p> <p>5B.3. RtI Committee Teachers</p>	<p>5B.3. student grades Mentor/Mentee List</p>	<p>5B.3. FCAT Data student grades</p>
---	--	--	--	---	--	---

DRAFT

**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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1. ELL students lack math vocabulary knowledge.	5C.1. Implement Interactive vocabulary word walls in all math classes.	5C.1. Principal AP/API CRT Teachers ELL Compliance Teacher	5C.1. Share ELL sub group math data with all teachers. Share expectations for interactive word walls within each classroom Support teachers with word walls through Professional Learning Communities	5C.1. Classroom Observation Professional Learning Community Collaboration
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of ELL students making Annual Yearly Progress on the FCAT mathematics from 21% to 24%. <b>Based on the number of Level 3+ ELL Students indicated on EDW.</b>	21% (40)	24% (45)					
			5C.2. Students lack mathematical fluency with basic math skills.	5C.2. Provide tutoring before and after school targeting students' basic math skills.	5C.2. . Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Teachers	5C.2. Tutoring Attendance	5C.2. Edusoft Reports FCAT Math Data
			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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1. Students with Disabilities need more one-on-one support in each of their core math courses.	5D.1. Provide Support Facilitators for Math instruction.  Support students with a Learning Strategies course.	5D.1. Principal AP/API CRT Staffing Specialist Support Facilitators Guidance Counselors	5D.1. Support Facilitators will schedule themselves into classes where students need support.  Schedule Students	5D.1. FCAT Data Edusoft Data
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is increase the number of	13% (27)	16% (34)					

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

students with disabilities making learning gains in mathematics by 3% from 13% to 16%. <b>Based on number of Level 3+ SWD students indicated on EDW.</b>						with Disabilities into Learning Strategies Courses.	
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Lack of support in mathematics for students outside of the school day.	5E.1. Provide tutoring before and after school targeting students' basic math skills.	5E.1. Principal AP/API CRT Teachers	5E.1. Tutoring Attendance	5E.1. FCAT Data Edusoft Data
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress from 38% to 41%.	38% (357)	41% (383)					
			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** N/A

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

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

DRAFT

**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
<b>3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<b>Mathematics Goal #3:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.</b>			1.1. Students need additional time and support with Algebra skills.	1.1. Offer a Math Lab to give students an additional period to receive support with Algebra skills.	1.1.  Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers	1.1.  Master Schedule Student Schedules PLC	1.1.  Algebra EOC Data
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring a Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC from 56% to 59%	56% (62)	59% (117)					
			1.2. Core Algebra and Math Lab teachers need to have a clear understanding of scope and sequence of curriculum to support students with benchmark mastery.	1.2. Offer common planning time to teachers to foster collaboration on a daily basis.	1.2.  Principal API/AP CRT Math Teachers	1.2.  PLC Notes Classroom Observation Lesson Plans	1.2.  EOC Data
			1.3. More knowledge needed on Algebra benchmarks and deconstructed standards.	1.3. Teachers will attend district training to learn more about Algebra benchmarks and Algebra item specs.	1.3.  Principal Alg PLC Lead	1.3. Lesson Plans PLC Notes	1.3.  EOC Data
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.</b>			2.1. More knowledge	2.1. Teachers will attend	2.1.  Principal	2.1.  Lesson Plans	2.1.

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

Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			Alg PLC Lead Alg Teachers	PLC Notes	EOC Scores
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring in Levels 4 and 5 from 42% to 45%.	42% (47)	45% (89)	needed on Algebra benchmarks and how to differentiate for rigorous instruction.	district training to learn more about Algebra benchmarks as well as strategies to increase rigor.  Attend Rigor school-based training  Participate in Book Study			
		2.2. Students need opportunity for advanced course work.	2.2. Offer students Advanced Algebra Courses to increase rigor.	2.2. Principal API CRT Guidance Counselors	2.2. Student Schedules Lesson Plans	2.2. EOC Scores	
		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								
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>														
<p>Algebra 1 Goal #3A:</p> <p>Only 2 students did not pass the EOC during the 2011-2012 school year (these students did pass on the retake in July). This is less than 1% of our student population taking the Algebra EOC scoring below the performance target.</p> <p>Our goal is to increase the number of students taking Algebra each year while maintaining our proficiency target of 100% of students passing the EOC each year.</p>															
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool									
<p><b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b></p> <p>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:</p> <p>Our goal is to increase the number of students in each of the following subgroups making</p>		<p>3B.1.</p> <p>Some students need additional time and support with Algebra skills.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p> <p>Offer a Math Lab to give targeted students an additional period to receive support with Algebra skills.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p> <p>Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers</p>	<p>3B.1.</p> <p>Master Schedule Student Schedules PLC</p>	<p>3B.1.</p> <p>Algebra EOC Data</p>									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 100% (55)</td> <td>White: 100% (90)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 92% (23)</td> <td>Black: 95% (39)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 100% (26)</td> <td>Hispanic: 100% (57)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 100% (55)	White: 100% (90)	Black: 92% (23)	Black: 95% (39)	Hispanic: 100% (26)	Hispanic: 100% (57)						
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*														
White: 100% (55)	White: 100% (90)														
Black: 92% (23)	Black: 95% (39)														
Hispanic: 100% (26)	Hispanic: 100% (57)														

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

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

satisfactory progress by 3% and/or maintain 100% of students within the subgroup meeting expectation.	Asian:100% (2)	Asian:100% (5)					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

DRAFT

**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
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1. EOC Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3C:  All students in Algebra have been exited from the ELL program. Data not available.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Some students need additional time and support with Algebra skills	Offer a Math Lab so students have an additional period to receive support with Algebra skills	Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers	Lesson Plans Observation Student Schedules	
	N/A	N/A					
			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
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1. EOC Data
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:  Our goal is to maintain 100% of SWD making satisfactory progress in Algebra I.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Some students need additional time and support with Algebra skills.	Offer a Math Lab to give targeted students an additional period to receive support with Algebra skills.	Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers	Lesson Plans Observation Student Schedules	
	100% (1)	100% (12)					
			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
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</b>			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1. EOC Data
<b>Algebra 1 Goal #3E:</b>  Our goal for our ED students is to increase the number of students making satisfactory progress from 98% to 100%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 98% (50)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 100% (102)	Some students need additional time and support with Algebra skills.	Offer a Math Lab to give targeted students an additional period to receive support with Algebra skills.	Principal AP/API CRT Guidance Counselors Math Teachers	Lesson Plans Observation Student Schedules	
			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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</b>			1.1. Additional time to master difficult Geometry concepts.	1.1. Provide weekly after school tutoring.	1.1. Geometry teacher	1.1. Attendance in Tutoring	1.1. EOC Data Formative Assessment Data
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring Level 2 from 27% to 30%.	27% (7)	30% (11)					
<b>2011 – 2012 DOE Report indicates percentage in thirds 1 – 3.</b>			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</b>			2.1. More knowledge needed on Geometry benchmarks and how to differentiate for rigorous instruction.	2.1. Teachers will attend district training to learn more about Geometry benchmarks as well as strategies to increase rigor.  Attend Rigor school-	2.1. Geometry Teacher	2.1. PLC Notes Lesson Plans	2.1. EOC Data Formative Assessment Data
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring in the proficiency	73% (18)	76% (28)					

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

ranges from 73% to 76%. <b>2011 – 2012 DOE Report indicates percentage in thirds 1 – 3.</b>				based training			
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

**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										
<b>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>	<b>Baseline data 2011-2012</b>  <i>27%</i>	24.3	21.6	18.9	16.2	13.5%										
<b>Geometry Goal #3A:</b>  Our goal is to decrease the number of students scoring below proficiency standards by 50% by 2016 – 2017.																
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool										
<b>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>	<b>3B.1. Additional time to master difficult Geometry concepts.</b>	<b>3B.1. Offer after school tutoring</b>	<b>3B.1. Geometry teacher</b>	<b>3B.1. Tutoring Attendance Formative Assessments</b>	<b>3B.1. EOC Results Formative Assessment Results</b>											
<b>Geometry Goal #3B:</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White: 99% (7)</td> <td>White: 100% (20)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black: 85% (8)</td> <td>Black: 88% (8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic: 99% (7)</td> <td>Hispanic: 100% (9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian: 99% (2)</td> <td>Asian: 100% (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	White: 99% (7)	White: 100% (20)	Black: 85% (8)	Black: 88% (8)	Hispanic: 99% (7)	Hispanic: 100% (9)	Asian: 99% (2)	Asian: 100% (1)					
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*															
White: 99% (7)	White: 100% (20)															
Black: 85% (8)	Black: 88% (8)															
Hispanic: 99% (7)	Hispanic: 100% (9)															
Asian: 99% (2)	Asian: 100% (1)															
Our goal is to increase the number of students in each subgroup scoring satisfactory on the Geometry by 1% for White, Hispanic and Asian for 100% proficiency and 3% for Black subgroup.		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**

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

**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
<b>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3C:</b>  <b>N/A we do not have any ELL students who took Geometry – all had been exited from the program.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			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
<b>3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
<b>Geometry Goal #3D:</b>  <b>N/A We did not have any SWD taking Geometry in the 2011 – 2012 school year or 2012 – 2013.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			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
<b>3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.</b>			3E.1. Additional time to master difficult Geometry concepts	3E.1. Offer after school tutoring	3E.1. Geometry Teacher	3E.1. Tutoring Attendance Formative Assessments	3E.1. EOC Results Formative Assessment Results
Geometry Goal #3E:  Our goal is to <b>decrease</b> the number of FRL students not making satisfactory progress from 22% to 19%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	22% (6)	19% (5)					
			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 Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Strategies – Instructional Strategies	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	All Math Teachers	Weekly PLC – ongoing August through June 2013	PLC Collaboration	CRT/API
Differentiated Instruction for Mathematics	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	Select Math Teachers	Book Study – monthly meeting	Monthly Collaboration	API
Unwrapping Standards/Item	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	PLC Math Leads	District Led Training	PLC Collaboration/Lesson Plan Checks	Principal/API

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

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

Specifications						
Rigor in the Classroom	6 - 8	AP-I/AP	School-wide	Wed. PD (Oct./Jan)	PLC Discussions/Classroom Observation	AP/API
Digging Deeper into Data	6 - 8	Principal/AP/API	School-wide	Biweekly PLC Meetings	Observation/PLC Notes/Agendas/IMS Frequency	Principal/AP/API

DRAFT

**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
Explore Math	For ESE FAA students	School Budget	\$1640.10
			<b>Subtotal: \$1640.10</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Moby Math	Computer program for ESE students	School Budget	\$59.00
Doc Cameras	For math classes	School Budget	\$1500.00
LCD Projectors	For math classes	School Budget	\$5000.00
Doc Camera/IPAD	Special project for Intensive Math class	Science and Math Grant	\$2000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$8559.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study	Unwrapping the Standards	Title II for substitutes	\$1000.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$1000.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
			<b>Total: \$11199.10</b>

*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					
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>												
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b> Our goal is to increase the number of students achieving Level 3 proficiency on the FCAT from 32% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1A.1. Students lack prior knowledge with some basic science concepts.	1A.1. Science Department will implement “Flash Back Fridays” to review concepts students should already have mastered, but have not.	1A.1. Science Department Teachers Principal AP/API	1A.1. Science teachers will develop formative assessments which highlight key science concepts students should know. Depending on results Science Teachers will differentiate instruction to meet student needs and bring them up to mastery.	1A.1. Formative Assessment Data Edusoft Science Benchmark data					
	32%(112)	35% (139)						1A.2. Students need opportunities to apply Science Concepts to real world situations.	1A.2. Provide students with an opportunity to participate in a Science Fair presenting science projects.	1A.2. Science Lead Teacher	1A.2. Project rubric grades	1A.2. FCAT Scores Benchmark Data
								1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1. Our students lack real	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.					

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

Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	world experiences in science to apply science skills.	Incorporate CBI Field Trips for real world science experiences.	ESE Admin Dean Teachers	Lesson Plans	FAA Scores
Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring 4, 5 or 6 on FAA Science from 42% to 45%.	42% (6)	45% (7)	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

DRAFT

## 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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Students lack exposure to extended learning projects.	2A.1. Increase the number of opportunities students have for extended learning opportunities: FFA Elective/Club Nature Club STEM Science Club.	2A.1. Principal Science Department Teachers	2A.1. Participation Attendance	2A.1. FCAT Science Scores Edusoft Results
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b>  Our goal is to increase the number of students scoring level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science assessment from 10% to 13%.	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> 10% (35)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 13% (51)					
	2A.2. Students need more rigorous learning experiences.			2A.2. Work with students to become "experts" in Science to train other students – <i>Instant Einstein Program.</i>	2A.2. Science Department	2A.2. Select Students Train Students Observation Lesson Plans	2A.2. FCAT Data
	2A.3.			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1. Students lack exposure to extended learning projects.	2B.1. Increase the number of opportunities students have for extended learning opportunities: FFA Elective/Club Nature Club STEM Science Club.	2B.1. Teachers	2B.1. Lesson Plans	2B.1. FAA Results
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b>  Our goal is to increase the number of students who score a Level 7 in Science on the FAA from .07 to 3%	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> .07 (1)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> 3% (3)					
	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*

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

DRAFT

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

Florida Alternate Assessment **High School** Science Goals N/A

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

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

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

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

**Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals** N/A *(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]).

<b>Biology 1 EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Biology 1 Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Biology 1 Goal #2:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<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			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

DRAFT

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

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Marzano Strategies – Instructional Strategies	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	All Science Teachers	Weekly PLC – ongoing August through June 2013	PLC Collaboration	CRT/API
Differentiated Instruction	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	Select Science Teachers	Book Study – monthly meeting	Monthly Collaboration	API
Unwrapping Standards/Item Specifications	6 – 8	Kell/Steinke	PLC Leads	PLC Biweekly	PLC Collaboration/Lesson Plan Checks	Principal/API
Rigor in the Classroom	6 - 8	AP-I/AP	School-wide	Wed. PD (Oct./Jan)	PLC Discussions/Classroom Observation	AP/API/CRT
Digging Deeper into Data	6 – 8	Principal/AP /API	School-wide	Biweekly PLC Meetings	Observation/PLC Notes/Agendas/IMS Frequency	Principal/AP/API
STEM Conference	7 -8	FSU	Select Science Teachers	December 2012	Collaboration at PLC	Select Science Teachers

**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
Scholastic “SCIENCE WORLD” magazines	Supplemental magazine resource	School Budget	\$331.50
			<b>Subtotal: \$331.50</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>			
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Description of Resources</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Lesson Study	Unwrapping the Standards	Title II for substitutes	\$1000.00
STEM Conference	Conference Registration	Title II	\$375
			<b>Subtotal: \$1375.00</b>
<b>Other</b>			
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Description of Resources</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Science FAIR	County Program	Fundraiser	\$400.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$400.00</b>
			<b>Total: \$1731.50</b>

*End of Science Goals*

DRAFT

**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]).

<b>Writing Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1. Students lack authentic opportunities to practice writing skills in all curriculum areas.	1A.1. Require all teachers to incorporate a Literacy Day within their curriculum. Writing will take place for 17 minutes in each content area.  Social Studies Department will focus on grammar, punctuation, and mechanics.	1A.1. Principal AP/API	1A.1. Classroom Observations Lesson Plan Checks	1A.1. FCAT Writing Data My Access Data
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is to increase the number of students reaching level 3.0 or higher on the writing assessment by at least 3%.	81% (286) for 3.0 29% (99) for 4.0	84% (334) for 3.0 32% (127) for 4.0					
			1A.2. Students need extensive feedback and individual conferencing to improve their writing.	1A.2. Implement <i>My Access</i> Writing Software	1A.2. Principal AP/API CRT Language Arts Teachers	1A.2. Implement <i>My Access</i> in all Language Arts Classrooms  Monitor <i>My Access</i> Reports  Admin team reviews student samples  Language Arts teachers collaborate	1A.2. <i>My Access</i> Data Reports

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

					during Professional Learning Communities on efficient and effective writing feedback		
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1. FAA students need differentiated instruction in writing to meet their needs.	1B.1. Use Unique Learning to provide differentiated instruction	1B.1. FAA Teachers	1B.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	1B.1. FAA Data
<b>Writing Goal #1B:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
Our goal is increase the number of FAA students scoring Level 4 or higher on the FAA in writing from 64% to 67%.	64% (9)	67% (10)					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
Thinking Maps Refresher	6 – 8	CRT	Select Teachers	Oct. 2012 and Jan 2013	PLC Collaboration	CRT
Writing FCAT 2.0	8	District	8 <sup>th</sup> grade LA Teachers	December 2012	PLC Collaboration	CRT

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Thinking Maps Refresher	Training	School Budget	0.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
My Access	Computer Grading program	School Budget	\$3285.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$3285.00</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study	Unwrapping the Standards	Title II for substitutes	\$1000.00
Writing Workshop	NCTE Convention Registration – 2 teachers	School Budget	Included in reading budget
			<b>Subtotal: \$1000.00</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>

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

*End of Writing Goals*

DRAFT

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

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

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

<b>Civics EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Civics Goal #1:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 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.
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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Civics Goal #2:</b>  <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

**Civics Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
JR SCHOLASTIC magazines	Supplemental Resource materials	School Budget	\$311.61
Presidents Magazine	Supplemental Resource materials	School Budget	\$309.61
Classroom book set	Supplemental Resource materials	Grant	\$996.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$1617.22</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal: \$0</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:\$0</b>
			<b>Total: \$1617.22</b>

*End of Civics Goals*

DRAFT

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

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

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

<b>U.S. History EOC Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>U.S. History Goal #1:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <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
<b>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>U.S. History Goal #2:</b> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>  N/A	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <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**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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]).

<b>Attendance Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance</b>				
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
<b>1. Attendance</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<p><b>Attendance Goal #1:</b></p> <p>Our goal is to increase the average daily attendance rate from 93% to 96%.</p> <p>Our goal is to decrease the number of students having 10 or more absences from 36% to 33%.</p> <p>Our goal is to decrease the number of students who come to school tardy from .06 to</p>			<p>Students need additional support and motivation.</p>	<p>Implement Renaissance Reward Program for all grade levels which includes an attendance incentive.</p> <p>Seek counseling support for students which have 10 or more absences in 2011 – 2012.</p>	<p>7<sup>th</sup> grade Admin Dean Renaissance Committee Attendance Clerk Guidance Counselors</p>	<p>Attendance Reports Renaissance Data</p>	<p>Attendance Reports</p>
	<p>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</p> <p>93% (1069)</p> <p>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</p> <p>36% (414)</p> <p>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</p> <p>.06% (74)</p>	<p>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</p> <p>96% (1142)</p> <p>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</p> <p>33% (392)</p> <p>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</p> <p>.03% (35)</p>					
			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**

.03%.						
-------	--	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

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

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal is to reduce the number of suspensions from 14% to 11%.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Lack of supervision of student behavior at home and in the community which filters into the school setting.	Utilize the RtI process to educate staff on researched based behavior strategies.  Continually review rules and procedures.  Continue Character Education Initiative: Bucket Filling, Anti-Bully initiatives.  Offer Social Skills Lessons for select students.  Provide Anti-Bully Awareness through school assembly	RtI Leadership Team  Principal AP Admin Deans	Administrative Discipline Meetings  RtI team meetings	EDW Discipline Data
	22% (256)	19% (226)					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	14% (167)	11% (130)					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current number of students suspended out- of- school</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected number of students suspended out- of- school</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**

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
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

**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
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:0</b>

*End of Suspension Goals*

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

**Dropout Prevention Goal(s)**

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<b>1. Dropout Prevention</b>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
<b>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</b>  <i>We had one student drop out of school for the 2011 – 2012 school year. We would like to reduce to 0 students.</i>  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	Lack of motivation to remain in school.	Implement Mentor/Mentee Program Seek counseling services for those in need.	Admin Deans Guidance	Set guidelines for mentoring and follow up with Mentors to ensure mentoring is taking place.	Dropout prevention data	
	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*						
	1 student						0 students
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*						2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Dropout Prevention Professional Development**

**Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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

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

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

DRAFT

**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
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:</b>

*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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1. Parents lack the time to attend school functions.	1.1. Offer school functions at times where parents are more likely to be available.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Determine the number of parent participation	1.1. Sign-in sheets Parent Survey
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b> Our goal is to increase the number of parents participating in school functions from 30% to 33%.  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</b> 30% (345)	<b>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</b> 33% (392)					
			1.2. Parents do not receive communication regarding the event.	1.2. Send Connect Ed Messages weekly to inform parents; advertise functions on the school website; send information home in the school newsletter and student planner.	1.2. Principal Teachers	1.2. Determine the number of parent participation	1.2. Sign in sheets
			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

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

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


DRAFT

**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
			<b>Subtotal:0</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:0</b>

*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
<p><u>STEM Goal #1:</u> Our goal is to increase the number of STEM opportunities for students.</p>	1.1.  Students need additional STEM opportunities	1.1.Offer Real World STEM opportunities through Field Trips 1.2.Extended Learning through STEM Club 1.3.Train teachers on supporting STEM in all content areas	1.1. Principal CRT API AP	1.1. Observation Student Participation	1.1. FCAT Data
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**STEM Professional Development**

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

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

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

STEM Conference	7 -8	Selected Science Teachers	PLC Science	December 2012	PLC Collaboration	CRT/API

DRAFT

**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
STEM Conference	Conference	Title II	\$600
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>600.00 Total:</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

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

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>									
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					
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.					
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> Our goal is to maintain the level of support needed for our AVID students to maintain enrollment as well as increase college and career readiness.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> 12% (135 students enrolled)	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> 12% (150 students enrolled)	Lack of personnel to effectively implement program.	Recruit support from staff members for implementation.  Emphasize AVID is a school wide embedded culture.  Recruit community volunteers, Wekiva High School Students and ADDitions to support with mentoring.	AVID Teacher/Coordinator  API 8 <sup>th</sup> grade Guidance Counselor  Principal	Train staff on AVID components.  Create a school wide imbedded culture of support.  Maintain documentation in AVID notebook of implementation fidelity.	Classroom Observations AVID Documentation Notebook					
								1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
								1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>									
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					
<b>2. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.					

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

<u>Additional Goal #2:</u> Our goal is to increase the number of students enrolled in Advanced Programs by at least 3%.	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> 55 % (631 students)	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> 62% (742 students)	Additional personnel needed to increase enrollment in advanced programs.	Hire additional personnel.	Principal	Master Schedule, FCAT scores, teacher recommendations.	FCAT and grades.				
								1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
								1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>								
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				
<b>3. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.				
<u>Additional Goal #3:</u> Our goal is to increase the number of students enrolled, as well as the performance of students participating in High	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> 44% (259 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students)	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> 61.5 % (360 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students)	Additional personnel needed to increase enrollment in advanced programs.	Hire additional personnel.	Principal.	Master Schedule, FCAT scores, teacher recommendations.	FCAT and grades.				

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

<b>School Courses by at least 3%.</b>											
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.				
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.				
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>								
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				
<b>4. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.				
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b> <b>Our goal is to decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Subgroup by 10% by 2016.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> ESE – 30%, ELL – 38%, FRL – 29%, Black – 21%, Hispanic – 23%.	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> ESE – 27%, ELL – 35%, FRL – 26%, Black – 18%, Hispanic – 20%.	Lack of support outside of the school day.	Offer morning and afternoon tutoring and parent meetings to support the child’s academic success.	Principal, AP, API, teachers	Monitor data, tutoring attendance sheets, and parent participation	FCAT				
								1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
								1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>								

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

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					
<b>5. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.					
<b>Additional Goal #5:</b> <b>Our goal is to increase the number of students enrolled, as well as the performance of students participating in Fine Arts Program by 3% from 50% to 53%.</b>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u> 50% (573 students)	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u> 53% (630)	The number of students who are required to take additional math and reading remedial courses.	Support students in their academic areas of weakness so that they are not required to take the remedial courses.	Principal, AP, API, and teachers	Progress Monitoring data, monitor student schedules and grades	Edusoft, master schedule, teacher data					
								1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
								1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>									
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					

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

6. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #6:  <b>Our goal is to decrease the disproportionate classification in special education by 1%.</b>	<u>2012</u> <u>Current</u> <u>Level :*</u>	<u>2013</u> <u>Expected</u> <u>Level :*</u>	We are an ESE Center School and the numbers include our IND students.	Continue to use RtI strategies to decrease the disproportionate classification.	Principal, staffing specialist and API.	Progress Monitoring data, RtI leadership meetings.	Master schedule, teacher data, and FAA results.
	23% (258 students)	22% (265 students)					
			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
Reward System	Materials/Supplies for Rewards	School Budget	\$200
			<b>Subtotal:200</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total:200</b>

*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.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total:24075.92</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: Included in reading budget</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total:1640.10</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total:1731.50</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total:4285.00</b>
<b>Civics Budget</b>	<b>Total:1617.22</b>
<b>U.S. History Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total:3158.75</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total:767.88</b>
<b>Dropout Prevention Budget</b>	<b>Total:0</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total:3210.00</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total:2600.00</b>
<b>CTE Budget</b>	<b>Total:</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total:</b>
	<b>Grand Total:43086.37</b>

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

**Differentiated Accountability**

**School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance**

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

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

Are you reward school?  Yes       No

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

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes       No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Committee will develop and monitor school initiatives to increase student achievement for the 2012 -2013 school year. Additionally, the SAC will be an instrumental part of the 20 <sup>th</sup> year celebration of PLMS.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Initiatives to close the achievement gap – i.e. tutoring, teacher training, etc.	\$4460.00