



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Jackson Heights Middle School

41 ACADEMY AVE

Oviedo, FL 32765

407-320-4550

[http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/
schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0291](http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0291)

School Demographics

School Type
Middle School

Title I
No

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
30%

Alternative/ESE Center
No

Charter School
No

Minority Rate
31%

School Grades History

2013-14
A

2012-13
A

2011-12
A

2010-11
A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| Differentiated Accountability | 5 |
| Part I: Current School Status | 6 |
| Part II: Expected Improvements | 14 |
| Goals Summary | 19 |
| Goals Detail | 19 |
| Action Plan for Improvement | 21 |
| Part III: Coordination and Integration | 23 |
| Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals | 24 |
| Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

| DA Category | Region | RED |
|-------------|--------|-----|
| Not in DA | N/A | N/A |

| Former F | Post-Priority Planning | Planning | Implementing TOP |
|----------|------------------------|----------|------------------|
| No | No | No | No |

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Jackson Heights Middle School

Principal

Winston Bailey

School Advisory Council chair

Leslie KleeB

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

| Name | Title |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Brandon Hanshaw | Assistant Principal |
| Timothy Hurd | Assistant Principal |
| Cynthia Woods | Assistant Principal |
| Siobhan Pitters | Dean |
| Kimberly Menard | Reading Coach |

District-Level Information

District

Seminole

Superintendent

Dr. Walt Griffin

Date of school board approval of SIP

11/11/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Administrative Member: Winston Bailey

Administrative Member: Siobhan Pitters

Chairperson: Leslie KleeB

Faculty Member:

Barb Lloyd

Jacob Falk

Sonja Moore

Non-Instructional:

Chris Lebl

Parent/community members:

Kristi Borrazzo

Amy Gipson

Tammi Kingsland

Leslie Kleeb
 Kristen Denny
 Christine Wydra
 Johnetta Jarrett
 Julie Clark

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC was invited to give input and suggestions regarding goals and targets for 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan. SAC also had input on our Professional Development Plan for 2013-2014.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

SAC will be providing input on numerous items including but not limited to: After-school Tutorial, SIP, PD plan, A+ monies and any other items they bring to the table.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

After-school tutorial bus - \$4800.
 Substitutes for Professional Development or staff with students during contract hours - \$400
 Magazine subscriptions for non-proficient readers - \$500
 * SAC has opted to place additional funds in line items as needed at a future date.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

4

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Winston Bailey

| | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Principal | Years as Administrator: 25 | Years at Current School: 11 |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Credentials | M.Sc. Dip. Ed. certification in Math K-12 plus Administration and Supervision |
|--------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Performance Record | Principal In charge of all School Grade A |
|---------------------------|---|

| Cynthia Woods | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Asst Principal | Years as Administrator: 4 | Years at Current School: 0 |
| Credentials | MS Educational Leadership BS Exceptional Student Education with Varying Exceptionalities | |
| Performance Record | Reading Language Arts Social Studies School Grade A | |

| Timothy Hurd | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Asst Principal | Years as Administrator: 15 | Years at Current School: 1 |
| Credentials | MS in Educational Leadership | |
| Performance Record | In charge of ESE, Facilities, Electives School Grade A | |

| Brandon Hanshaw | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Asst Principal | Years as Administrator: 0 | Years at Current School: 0 |
| Credentials | M. Ed. Educational Leadership | |
| Performance Record | Curriculum, Professional Development, Math and Science Departments and Testing Coordination. School Grade A | |

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches
2

receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

| Kimberly Menard | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Full-time / School-based | Years as Coach: 3 | Years at Current School: 3 |
| Areas | Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS, Other | |
| Credentials | BS Elementary Education MS in Reading Education | |
| Performance Record | Support the Reading program in any and every way possible. Promote school wide literacy, especially in the content areas. | |

| Barbra Lloyd | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Part-time / School-based | Years as Coach: 4 | Years at Current School: 9 |
| Areas | Mathematics | |
| Credentials | BS in Social Studies, certification 6-12; certification Math 5-8 and Middle Grades Endorsement. Currently seeking Gifted Endorsement. | |
| Performance Record | As a Math Coach I was in charge of the Math Department, trainer for Skyward, working with Math teachers regarding data, assisting AP to plan, organize and schedule the EOC for Algebra, Geometry and Biology. Tested students when make-ups were needed for ePAT and EOC. While at JHMS it has been an A school. | |

Classroom Teachers

| | |
|---|---------|
| # of classroom teachers | 66 |
| # receiving effective rating or higher | 0% |
| # Highly Qualified Teachers | 98% |
| # certified in-field | 62, 94% |
| # ESOL endorsed | 13, 20% |
| # reading endorsed | 13, 20% |
| # with advanced degrees | 34, 52% |
| # National Board Certified | , 0% |
| # first-year teachers | 7, 11% |
| # with 1-5 years of experience | 11, 17% |
| # with 6-14 years of experience | 25, 38% |
| # with 15 or more years of experience | 23, 35% |

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

12

Highly Qualified

12, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

4

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Seminole County Public Schools is always looking for highly qualified, certified teachers to teach our students. The method of recruitment is defined based on the need. Seminole County Public Schools reputation of being an "A" school district brings to us thousands of highly qualified applicants. One of our recruitment strategies is our partnership with State and private colleges and universities. We welcome university and college interns and field study students to our district not only from the State of Florida university system but also out of State. Annually our district participates in many university job fairs and minority and veteran job fairs. This year we have gone out of the United States and are bringing on board a few teachers from Spain to teach the dual language classes.

The district supports all teachers but especially new teachers with mentoring programs. We also provide in-services and workshops. New teachers with zero years of experience are assigned a one on one mentor. This support is provided beyond the first year.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Our school has a school-wide mentor who works with administration to coordinate all mentoring activities on our campus. This school-wide mentor was trained by our county's new teacher facilitator and given materials and agendas to support the new teachers during this calendar year. Before school began, our new teachers spent a day with our school-wide mentor and were given a campus tour and oriented to important procedures and policies that will affect them as they begin the school year. Once school begins, these new teachers meet regularly with the mentor(s) who best fits their needs and follow an agenda of recommended topics that are appropriate for each teacher's given situation. Whether the new teacher is working with a school-wide mentor, peer teacher, or alternative certification mentor, he or she is working with an individual who has been trained by our county to support the teacher's various needs. Each of these mentor roles are fine-tuned each year based on the feedback from our new teachers the year before.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The school has a core Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) problem solving team, comprised of members with expertise in academic and behavioral domains. The MTSS team utilizes the continuous problem solving process to identify students who are at-risk in academics and/or behavior and determines why the problem is occurring. The MTSS team designs and implements research-based interventions and regularly monitors student progress/response to interventions. The school utilizes the online MTSS module to document all interventions, meetings, and parent involvement in the process.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The school-based leadership team is responsible for making sure every child has the opportunity experience academic success.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

FCAT
DE data

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Skyward
EdInsight

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

The MTSS team meets monthly (or more often as needed) to go over DE data, individual students and grades to determine if student needs are being met or if additional resources need to be put in place.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year:

JHMS is currently identifying students to participate in an after school tutorial program that will be structured and review multiple reading and math strategies with 60 of our most critical students that fit multiple subgroups such as ESE, lowest quartile in Math and Reading, and black males.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

FCAT
Discovery Education

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Reading Coach
Assistant Principal

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

| Name | Title |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Kimberly Menard | Reading Coach |
| Sonja Moore | Reading Teacher |
| Rachele Fox | Reading Teacher |
| Lymaris Santana | Reading Teacher |
| Kristine Tully | Reading Teacher |
| Caitlin Clancy | Reading Teacher |
| Elizabeth Walters | Language Arts Teacher |
| Laura McKown | Language Arts Teacher |
| Brad Garner | Language Arts Teacher |
| Jennifer Disanto | Language Arts Teacher |
| Valeria Olkhovska | Language Arts Teacher |
| Stephanie Radcliff | Language Arts Teacher |
| Melissa Fyfe-Brown | Language Arts Teacher |
| Connie O'Hanlon | Parent Volunteer |
| Cynthia Woods | Assistant Principal |

How the school-based LLT functions

The team meets to organize events that will take place to promote literacy throughout the school and community.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Literacy Week

Literacy Night

Community Service Project

Bobcat Bistro

Reading Mentors

12-13 activities included:

Dress up as your favorite book character.

School Wide Scavenger Hunt

Book swaps for students.

Dance routine choreographed to a reading strategy song.

Literacy throughout Oviedo was the community service project - books were donated to Oviedo Citizens in Action, Boys Town and Oviedo Crisis Pregnancy Center, to name a few.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Reciprocal teaching issued in the content area classes when reading information texts. Teachers use DE assessment results to guide their instruction. Skills and strategies are taught based on these results. Reading, writing, listening and speaking are incorporated into all classes. Learning goals and objectives are set with literacy as a primary focus. Teachers collaborate during PLC's to incorporate literary strategies into daily lessons. Administration monitors literacy throughout the content areas through PLC's, lesson plans and walkthroughs/observation.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

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

We incorporate the standards into daily lessons. Instruction is based on those standards.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

epathways

Guidance counselors

Articulation between Elementary, Middle and High Schools.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

Articulation between Middle and High Schools.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 81% | 81% | Yes | 83% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | 88% | 88% | Yes | 89% |
| Black/African American | 58% | 60% | Yes | 63% |
| Hispanic | 68% | 71% | Yes | 71% |
| White | 85% | 85% | Yes | 87% |
| English language learners | 29% | 58% | Yes | 36% |
| Students with disabilities | 53% | 49% | No | 58% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 63% | 66% | Yes | 66% |

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 330 | 30% | 33% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 558 | 51% | 54% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 39% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 30% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA) | 729 | 69% | 72% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0) | 125 | 66% | 69% |

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 13 | 50% | 53% |
| Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 10 | 39% | 42% |
| Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students) | 10 | 39% | 42% |

Area 2: Writing

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5 | 245 | 66% | 69% |
| Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4 | <i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i> | | 100% |

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

| Group | 2013 Target % | 2013 Actual % | Target Met? | 2014 Target % |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| All Students | 82% | 79% | No | 84% |
| American Indian | | | | |
| Asian | 83% | 88% | Yes | 85% |
| Black/African American | 58% | 48% | No | 62% |
| Hispanic | 69% | 67% | No | 72% |
| White | 88% | 84% | No | 89% |
| English language learners | 49% | 53% | Yes | 54% |
| Students with disabilities | 59% | 47% | No | 63% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 63% | 62% | No | 67% |

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 313 | 29% | 32% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 539 | 49% | 52% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 75% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 10% |

Learning Gains

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Learning Gains | 779 | 73% | 76% |
| Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC) | 123 | 55% | 58% |

Middle School Acceleration

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications | 328 | 89% | 92% |
| Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications | 320 | 98% | 99% |

Area 4: Science

Middle School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 | 78 | 21% | 23% |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 | 172 | 46% | 49% |

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 100% |
| Students scoring at or above Level 7 | [data excluded for privacy reasons] | | 10% |

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target |
|--|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| # of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs) | 4 | | 5 |
| Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students | 665 | 54% | 57% |

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses | 15 | 1% | 2% |
| Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses | | | |
| Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses | | | |
| Students taking CTE industry certification exams | | | |
| Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams | | | |
| CTE program concentrators | | | |
| CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications | | | |

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Middle School Indicators

| | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time | 48 | 4% | 2% |
| Students who fail a mathematics course | 30 | 3% | 2% |
| Students who fail an English Language Arts course | 2 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who fail two or more courses in any subject | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Students who receive two or more behavior referrals | 60 | 5% | 3% |
| Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S. | 21 | 2% | 1% |

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Parent logged into Skyward Parent Portal at least once during school year

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Parent Skyward Portal | 610 | 60% | 70% |

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

| Target | 2013 Actual # | 2013 Actual % | 2014 Target % |
|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|

Goals Summary

- G1.** Teachers in all content areas will implement effective instructional strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Model for reading, math and writing Common Core and NGSS Standards.

Goals Detail

G1. Teachers in all content areas will implement effective instructional strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Model for reading, math and writing Common Core and NGSS Standards.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- Science - Middle School
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Reading coach will continue to model, observe and provide feedback for all teachers in all subject areas.
- Students will set individual academic goals.
- Department of Teaching and Learning
- Peer Coaching (Lesson Study)
- PLC's
- Common Planning
- After school Tutorial (extended and differentiated instruction)

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- After school transportation

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Instructional strategies in all content areas.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Curriculum Leaders

Target Dates or Schedule:

On-going

Evidence of Completion:

Data, observation

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Teachers in all content areas will implement effective instructional strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Model for reading, math and writing Common Core and NGSS Standards.

G1.B2 After school transportation

G1.B2.S1 Ask SAC to cover cost of transportation for after school program for students.

Action Step 1

Ask SAC to fund bus transportation for after school tutorial

Person or Persons Responsible

Assistant principal in charge of after school tutorial

Target Dates or Schedule

September SAC meeting

Evidence of Completion

SAC minutes

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Tutorial Transportation

Person or Persons Responsible

Assistant Principal and /or Lead Teacher

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Data

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Transportation

Person or Persons Responsible

Assistant Principal and/or Lead Teacher

Target Dates or Schedule

On going

Evidence of Completion

Attendance

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Jackson Heights Middle School will coordinate Supplemental Academic Instruction and Exceptional Student Education funds to provide additional academic tutorial and/or intervention time for students in need of remediation. These funding sources are coordinated to maximize the number of students and the amount of services available for academic interventions. In addition, the school district coordinates IDEA funds to provide our school additional paraprofessionals that facilitate small group instruction during the school day. The coordination and integration of these funds and services ensure students are provided the time and support needed to master the standards and improve academic achievement

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

| Goal | Description | Total |
|-------|--|---------|
| G1. | Teachers in all content areas will implement effective instructional strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Model for reading, math and writing Common Core and NGSS Standards. | \$4,800 |
| Total | | \$4,800 |

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

| Funding Source | Evidence-Based Program | Total |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------|
| School Advisory Counsel (SAC) | \$4,800 | \$4,800 |
| Total | \$4,800 | \$4,800 |

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Teachers in all content areas will implement effective instructional strategies aligned to the Marzano Instructional Model for reading, math and writing Common Core and NGSS Standards.

G1.B2 After school transportation

G1.B2.S1 Ask SAC to cover cost of transportation for after school program for students.

Action Step 1

Ask SAC to fund bus transportation for after school tutorial

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Provide transportation for students living over the 2-mile limit so they can attend program after school for academic support.

Funding Source

School Advisory Counsel (SAC)

Amount Needed

\$4,800