FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

<div align="center">

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

</div>

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Ridgewood Park Elementary	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: Vanessa C. Morrow	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Corine Lewis	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.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Assistant Principal	Vanessa C. Morrow	Master's Degree in Educational Leadership	3	5	**2011-2012 B Ridgewood Park Elementary** 42% of students reading at or above grade level 82% of students made reading gains for low 25% 46% of students at or above grade level in math

					79% of students made math gains for low 25% 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 31% of students at or above grade level in science. **2010-2011 D Ridgewood Park Elementary** 52% of students reading at or above grade level 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 57% of students at or above grade level in math 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 66% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 33% of students at or above grade level in science. **2009-2010 C Ridgewood Park Elementary** 56% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students at or above grade level in math 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 73% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 24% of students at or above grade level in science.
Assistant Principal	Sidney Moss	Master's Degree in Educational Leadership	Less than a year	Less than a year	**2011-2012 A Teague Middle School** 79.5% of students reading at or above grade level 72% of students made reading gains for low 25% 79% of students at or above grade level in math 71% of students made math gains for low 25% 94% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 60.7% of students at or above grade level in science.

					2010-2011 B Milwee Middle School 74% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 69% of students at or above grade level in math 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 83% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 47% of students at or above grade level in science. **2009-2010 A Milwee Middle Schol** 72% of students reading at or above grade level 64% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 60% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 66% of students at or above grade level in math 67% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 63% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 93% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 49% of students at or above grade level in science.

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Melissa Moser	Master's Degree in Educational Leadership	3	5	**2011-2012 B Ridgewood Park Elementary** 42% of students reading at or above grade level 82% of students made reading gains for low 25% 46% of students at or above grade level in math 79% of students made math gains for low 25% 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 31% of students at or above grade level in science. **2010-2011 D Ridgewood Park Elementary** 52% of students reading at or above grade level 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 57% of students at or above grade level in math 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 66% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 33% of students at or above grade level in science. **2009-2010 C Ridgewood Park Elementary** 56% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading

					64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 59% of students at or above grade level in math 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 73% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 24% of students at or above grade level in science.
Math	Mrs. Wanakee Miller	B.A. in Elem. Ed.	7	4	**2011-2012 B Ridgewood Park Elementary** 42% of students reading at or above grade level 82% of students made reading gains for low 25% 46% of students at or above grade level in math 79% of students made math gains for low 25% 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 31% of students at or above grade level in science. **2010-2011 D Ridgewood Park Elementary** 52% of students reading at or above grade level 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 57% of students at or above grade level in math 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 66% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 33% of students at or above grade level in science. **2009-2010 C Ridgewood Park Elementary** 56% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of

					progress in reading 59% of students at or above grade level in math 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 73% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 24% of students at or above grade level in science.
Academic	Dr. Angela Kennedy	Doctorate Organizational Leadership/ Early Childhood/ ESOL	8	4	**2011-2012 B Ridgewood Park Elementary** 42% of students reading at or above grade level 82% of students made reading gains for low 25% 46% of students at or above grade level in math 79% of students made math gains for low 25% 78% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 31% of students at or above grade level in science. **2010-2011 D Ridgewood Park Elementary** 52% of students reading at or above grade level 54% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading 57% of students at or above grade level in math 50% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 53% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 66% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 33% of students at or above grade level in science. **2009-2010 C Ridgewood Park Elementary** 56% of students reading at or above grade level 63% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading 64% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading

					59% of students at or above grade level in math 59% of students making a year's worth of progress in math 72% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math 73% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 24% of students at or above grade level in science.

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Follow the district's process of hiring of highly qualified candidates.	J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Pratt, Secretary	6/2013
2. Coaching, mentoring, and providing professional learning opportunities along with constructive feedback.	J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach W. Miller, Math Coach A. Vazquez, CRT A. Kennedy, Academic Coach	6/2013
3. Classroom visits with immediate feedback	J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach W. Miller, Math Coach A. Vazquez, CRT A. Kennedy, Academic Coach	6/2013
4. Sending teachers to various local and national conferences	J. Thompson, Principal A. Kennedy, Academic Coach	6/2013

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
22% (12)	Professional Development with Marzano, coaching and modeling in all subject areas. Mentor relationships and look for feedback from leadership team and coaches.

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
56	16%	27%	32%	21%	45%	96%	16%	2%	66%

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
Sintra Manbodh	Norey Rivera	Grade Team Member/Experience	Weekly Mtg. Logs, Monthly Group Mtg., Coaching, Team

			Building/Content Area instructional support
Kalila Foy	Stephanie Xenias	Grade Team Member/Experience	Weekly Mtg. Logs, Monthly Group Mtg., Coaching, Team Building/ Content Area instructional support
Shalonda Griffin	LaRissa Walker	Grade Team Member/Experience	Weekly Mtg. Logs, Monthly Group Mtg., Coaching, Team Building/ Content Area instructional support
Anne Slee	LaTaniah Smith	Personality/Desire	Weekly Mtg. Logs, Monthly Group Mtg., Coaching, Team Building/ Content Area instructional support
Robyn Hill	Natalie Havens	Team Member/Experience	Weekly Mtg. Logs, Monthly Group Mtg., Coaching, Team Building/ Content Area instructional support

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

Additional Requirements

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

Title I, Part A
Ridgewood Park Elementary qualifies as a Title I school with approximately ninety-five percent of our students receiving free or reduced lunch. The need for a nutritional breakfast and lunch program is evident. The additional dollars Title I brings to our school budget allows us to supplement the district budget in the areas of personnel, supplies, and staff development.

Title I, Part C- Migrant
n/a

Title I, Part D
n/a

Title II
Ridgewood Park Elementary also receives Title II funds, which assists with professional development during the 2012-2013 school year. These funds will help us to continue with a focus on enhancing the needs of all students. We will also maintain high accountability for staff and students as we strive to continue our upward academic movement.

Title III
-Develop and implement specialized training on best practices for ELL
-Mentor and coach teachers of ELL on implementing research-based practices proven to be effective
-Assist with the implementation of all district initiatives for the educational betterment of Ell in the school district
-Provide supplemental services to ELL
-Develop training for parents of ELL

Title X- Homeless
Services and resources provided to our homeless population are coordinated through the OCPS McKinney-Vento Program. Student residency questionnaires are completed by the parent/guardian, and are processed by the Homeless Coordinator. The homeless population is defined as one who lacks an adequate and regular nighttime residence. Services include transportation and assistance to ensure that the student has equal access to a "free and appropriate public education".

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Ridgewood Park Elementary will provide tutoring services to our lowest 30% (SES) and all 3rd, 4th, and 5th (Saturday School). We will offer tutoring 3 times a week in reading and math. We will incorporate learning through the use of manipulatives for math and the Smart 7 testing strategies for reading.

Violence Prevention Programs
Services are partially provided through the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant through Orange County Public Schools. The purpose of the grant is to create safe

learning environments for OCPS students. The services include classroom guidance (Too Good for Violence), small group counseling (Why Try), and assistance with the implementation of bully prevention best practices.

Nutrition Programs
Ridgewood Park Elementary qualifies for universal lunch which allows all the students to receive free or reduced breakfast, lunch, and snacks. The need for a nutritional breakfast and lunch programs is evident.

Housing Programs
n/a

Head Start
n/a

Adult Education
n/a

Career and Technical Education
n/a

Job Training
n/a

Other n/a

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. J. Thompson, Principal , V. Morrow, AP , M. Moser, Reading Coach , W. Miller, Math Coach , A., Vazquez, CRT, A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, N. Havens, Staffing Specialist, R. Hill, CCT, School Psychologist, Classroom Teachers
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? **Principal/ Assistant Principal:** provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI and is the core of the grade level PLC, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI consistently across grade levels and school, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. **Guidance Counselor/ RtI Representative**: coordinates the RtI process with all team members, is the liaison between the school and the parents. **General Education Teachers**: provides information about core instruction and student's unique deficiencies, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and provides ongoing documentation of all RtI implementations and results. **Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers:** participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and assists gen ed. teachers to ensure that the appropriate strategies and accommodations are embedded in their presentation of instruction. **Instructional Coaches:** provides guidance on district/ school plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities, assists in data analysis, helps provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, supports implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3. **Curriculum Resource Teacher:** coordinates grade level assessments, helps break down data and assists teachers with understanding of data, assists teachers in understanding/ implementing effective data-based decisions, provides insight to RtI administration team regarding individual students/ class data. **Discipline Team**: monitors school-wide management plan, monitors classroom management plans, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and provides ongoing documentation of all RtI implementations and results. **School Psychologist:** participates in data analysis and interpretations, adds insight into the social/ emotional/ mental challenges of the student provides support and assists in the development of intervention plans, provides training for data analysis, data based decision-making, and the art of reflection.
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 Leadership Team, in collaboration with classrooms teachers' role, is to identify students within each TIER and conduct on-going collaborative meetings to assure student needs are being meet and documentation is completed. This process aids in meeting the specific needs of all students. The RtI team will work together to continually develop, re-evaluate, and make appropriate changes to the school's RtI process which is illustrated by the school improvement plan.

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

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. Reading-FAIR, Common and Formative Assessments, FCAT, Benchmark Assessments, Imagine Learning, FCAT Test Maker, IMS, EDW Math-Common and Formative Assessments, FCAT, Benchmark Assessments, FCAT Test Maker, IMS, EDW Science-Common Assessments, FCAT, Benchmark Assessments, FCAT Test Maker, IMS, EDW Writing- School-wide Prompts, FCAT Test Maker, IMS, EDW Behavior-RPE behavior plan, CHAMPS, Discipline Referrals, IMS, EDW, Behavior Leadership Academy
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The majority of the staff was trained. The team will provide training for the new teachers. The RtI representative will attend district meetings and share information with the staff.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. Address Concerns (Academic or Social/emotional) Utilize differentiated instruction Pull small groups in the classroom Assess often Reteach deficient skill as needed Collect data Contact Parent for a conference Notify the Staffing Specialist Based on the outcome of the meeting, Staffing Specialist or teacher would contact the appropriate coach (math, reading, or behavior etc.) **Coaches** Provide appropriate research based intervention for teacher concerning student needs. Look at the core instruction (differentiated instruction). Obtain data to support decisions Based on the data gathered from the coach, teacher and counselor, the team will determine what level of support is needed. Reteach the benchmark/state standards Retest students using mini benchmarks weekly (core curriculum assessments, teacher made assessment).

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). E. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach G. Dry, Science L. Van, K teacher Z. Graybill, 3rd grade teacher M. Bisceglia, 3rd grade teacher N. Drayton, 4th grade teacher H. Augustin, 4th grade teacher A. Slee, 4th grade teacher L. Smith, 5th grade teacher M. Soubasis, 5th grade teacher
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Meetings will be held every 3rd Thursday in the Media Center. The leadership team is going to focus on increasing student engagement in reading throughout the day. There will be activities organized to reward successful reading achievement through assessments, i.e. Accelerated Reader, Benchmarks, and FAIR. The team will also focus on the following: Strengthening Literacy Development Across the Content Areas; Literacy Interventions for Struggling Readers and Writers; School Policies, Structures, and Culture for Supporting Literacy; Building Leadership Capacity; and Supporting Teachers to Improve Instruction.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? An initiative of the leadership team this school year is to get students, parents, and communities involved in the school's literacy activities and promote student achievement in reading.

Public School Choice

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

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.
Pre-K teacher collaborates with Kindergarten teachers to discuss Kindergarten curriculum. Pre-K parents are also invited to family fun nights where student expectations are discussed. Pre-K students will attend Art and Music classes for Specials. The parents were invited to school to take a tour and the parents were given information at that program.

*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2) (b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

n/a

*High Schools Only
Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

n/a

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

n/a

Postsecondary Transition
Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

n/a

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1A: The number of students scoring at achievement level 3 in reading will increase by 15%	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* 25% (95)	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* 40% (144)	1A.1. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels.	1A.1. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards using the test item specifications and the resources that are available.	1A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, W. Miller, Math Coach Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Classroom-Walkthroughs PLC monitoring	1A.1. Administration checking lesson plans Mini Assessments, common assessments, benchmark
			1A.2. Lack of implementation of effective differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Teachers will implement small-groups, based on student needs determined by the data.	1A.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom teachers	1A.2. Classroom-Walkthroughs Coaching Cycle	1A.2. Walkthrough checklist
			1A.3 High percentage of students below grade-level.	1A.3. Students below grade-level attend a specific intervention daily for 40	1A.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading	1A.3. Students will be assessed weekly within intervention and	1A.3. Built-In intervention assessments, ORF, mini-assessments,

			minutes.	Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, W. Miller, Math Coach Instructional Personnel and Classified Personnel	classroom.	lesson assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1. Quality Enrichment Activities	2A.1. Lesson Planning within PLC's and students above grade-level attend enrichment for 40 minutes.	2A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Teachers: Graybill, Griffin, K. Kennedy, Smith	2A.1. Classroom-walkthroughs	2A.1. Teacher- made assessments, benchmark
Reading Goal #2A: The students scoring at or above an achievement level 4 in reading will increase by 15%	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* 17% (65)	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* 32% (116)					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					

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

	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	n/a	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
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Achievement Gap	3A.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved programs and best practices (attends daily for 40 minutes).	3A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, W. Miller, Math Coach Instructional Personnel and Classified Personnel	3A.1. Students will be monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats.	3A.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments
Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 15%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 69% (265)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 84% (323)					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Reading Goal #3B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* n/a					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. **FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**			4A.1. Achievement Gap	4A.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved programs and best practices (attends daily for 40 minutes).	4A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, W. Miller, Math Coach Instructional Personnel and Classified Personnel	4A.1. Students will be monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats.	4A.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments
Reading Goal #4: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32% (123)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47% (180)					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years							
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 33%	42%	44%	50%	55%	61%	67%
Reading Goal #5A: For 2012-2013, the number of students making satisfactory progress will increase by 2%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1. Black: Achievement Gap	5B.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved programs and best practices (attends daily for 40 minutes).	5B.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach Classroom teachers	5B.1. Students will be monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats.	5B.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments	
Reading Goal #5B: The student subgroups by ethnicity (Black and Hispanic) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 15 %.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: Black: 58% (164) Hispanic: 60% (50) Asian: American	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: Black:43% (121) Hispanic:45 % (38) Asian: American					

	Indian:	Indian:					
			5B.2. Hispanic: Limited number of paraprofessionals A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels.	5B.2. Strategic schedule for paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards and the ELL strategies/resources that are available.	5B.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	5B.2. Classroom - Walkthroughs	5B.2. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Limited number of paraprofessionals	5C.1. Strategic schedule for paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students.	5C.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	5C.1. Classroom - walkthroughs	5C.1. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 15%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 62% (45)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 47% (34)					
			5C.2. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels.	5C.2. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards and the ELL strategies/resources that are available.	5C.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	5C.2. Classroom - walkthroughs	5C.2. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
			5C.3. Vocabulary, Listening and Speaking Skills	5C.3. Students will use the Imagine Learning computer-based program a minimum of 90 minutes per week.	5C.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom teachers	5C.3. CCT will monitor	5C.3. Imagine Learning assessments

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
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Achievement Gap	5D.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved programs and best practices (attends daily for 40 minutes).	5D.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach Classroom teachers	5D.1. Students will be monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats	5D.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments
Reading Goal #5D: Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 94% (19)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 79% (16)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Achievement Gap	5E.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved programs and best practices (attends daily for 40 minutes).	5E.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach Classroom teachers	5E.1. Students will be monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats	5E.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments
Reading Goal #5E: / 2012 Current Level of Performance:* / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* The economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 15%. / 59% (227) / 44% (169)					
	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

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

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
IMS	K-5	Moser/Miller	School-Wide	August 28, 2012	PLC meetings	Leadership Team
Reading Mastery	K-5	Anderer/Moser	Intervention teachers	On-going 1x/month	Look-fors/management sheets	Anderer, Thompson, Morrow, Moser

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
Reading Mastery	Textbooks, consumables	Title 1	
Reading Success	Consumables	SAI	$30,000
Supplemental Reading			30,000 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy n/a	Description of Resources		
			0 Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Consultant	Consultant	Consultant	Consultant
			8,500 Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy n/a	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			0 Subtotal:
			38,500 Total:

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

End of Reading Goals

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

<u>Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals</u>

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1: **Increase the number of students proficient in listening and speaking.**	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 37% (85)	1.1. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels	1.1. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards and the ELL strategies/resources that are available.	1.1 J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	1.1. Classroom-walkthroughs	1.1 Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
		1.2. Limited number of paraprofessionals	1.2. Strategic schedule for paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students.	1.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	1.2. Classroom - walkthroughs	1.2. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
		1.3. Vocabulary, Listening and Speaking Skills	1.3. Students will use the Imagine Learning computer-based program a minimum of 90 minutes	1.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach	1.3. CCT will monitor	1.3. Imagine Learning assessments

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

			per week.	Hill, CCT Classroom teachers		
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: Increase the number of students proficient in reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 35% (77)	2.1. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels	2.1. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards and the ELL strategies/resources that are available.	2.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	2.1. Classroom-walkthroughs	2.1. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
		2.2. Limited number of paraprofessionals	2.2. Strategic schedule for paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students.	2.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	2.2. Classroom-walkthroughs	2.2. Benchmark, CELLA, common assessments, FAIR
		2.3. Vocabulary, Listening and Speaking Skills	2.3. Students will use the Imagine Learning computer-based program a minimum of 90 minutes per week.	2.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach R. Hill, CCT Classroom teachers	2.3. CCT will monitor	2.3. Imagine Learning assessments

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: Our goal is to have all students proficient in writing.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : 35% (81)	2.1. Rigor of new rubric	2.1. Continuously updating knowledge of expectations of new grading.	2.1. Write Track Consultant 4th grade teachers Administration Intensive Writing Teachers R. Hill, CCT	2.1. Results from five writing prompts to drive instruction	2.1. Writing Rubrics
		2.2. Lack of vocabulary language (ELL)	2.2. Increased vocabulary, print rich environment, writer handbooks for each students which includes A-Z lists, idioms, substitutions, etc.	2.2. 4th Grade teachers R. Hill, CCT	2.2. Increased score on prompt responses	2.2. Writing Rubrics
		2.3. Lowest 30% of students are not proficient in writing	2.3. Intensive writing teacher	2.3. Write Track Consultant 4th grade teachers Administration Intensive Writing Teacher R. Hill, CCT	2.3. Increased scores on prompt responses	2.3. Writing Rubrics

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
n/a			0
			0 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Imagine Learning	Computer-based program	Title 1	15,000
			15,000 Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training	Professional Developments, using program and reading the data reports	See above (included)	0
			0 Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students	Ed. Paraprofessional, Haitian-Creole Ed. Paraprofessional, Spanish	ESOL budget	34,800
			34,800 Subtotal:
			49,800 Total:

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1A: The number of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 28% (109)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 43% (155)	1A.1. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels	1A.1. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards using the test item specifications and the resources that are available. Program implementation overview	1A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	1A.1. Core Benchmarks, Quick Checks, Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, and Common Assessments
			1A.2. Lack of implementation of effective differentiated instruction.	1A.2. Teachers will implement small-groups, based on student needs determined by the data.	1A.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	1A.2. Walkthrough checklist
			1A.3. High percentage of students unable to read and process word	1A.3. Students below grade-level receive intervention during small-group.	1A.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach	1A.3. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-	1A.3. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/

					A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
		problems at grade-level.					
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:*						
	n/a						
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	n/a						
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Quality Enrichment Activities	2A.1. Lesson Planning within PLC's. Differentiated Assignments	2A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	2A.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #2A: The number of students scoring at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* 15% (58)	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* 30% (108)					
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* n/a					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Achievement Gap/ Unconnected Experiences	3A.1. Differentiated Instruction Connect Experiences ("Attention Getters") PLC Collaboration	3A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	3A.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	3A.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 75% (244)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 90% (319)					
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 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
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Achievement Gap	4A.1. Differentiated Instruction	4A.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	4A.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	4A.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #4: The percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47% (170)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 62% (239)					

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 37%	46%	48%	53%	58%	63%	69%
Mathematics Goal #5A: For 2012-2013, the number of students making satisfactory progress will increase by 2%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Black/Hispanic Achievement Gap/Unconnected Experiences	5B.1. Differentiated Instruction Connect Experiences ("Attention Getters") PLC Collaboration	5B.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5B.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist	

Mathematics Goal #5B:

The student subgroups by ethnicity (Black and Hispanic) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 15%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
White:50% (6)	White:35% (3)
Black:56% (161)	Black:41% (109)
Hispanic:56% (47)	Hispanic:41% (35)

			5B.2. Black/Hispanic A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels	5B.2. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards using the test item specifications and the resources that are available. Program implementation overview	5B.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5B.2. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5B.2. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist)
			5B.3. Black/Hispanic High percentage of students unable to read and process word problems at grade-level.	5B.3. Students below grade-level receive intervention during small-group.	5B.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5B.3. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5B.3. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Limited number of paraprofessionals	5C.1. Strategic schedule for paraprofessionals to meet the needs of all ELL students.	5C.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5C.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5C.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments; Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #5C: The percentage of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 63% (79)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 48% (41)					
			5C.2. Procedural Skills	5C.2. Continuous Modeling of Word Problems	5C.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5C.2. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5C.2. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
			5C.3. Achievement Gap/Unconnected Experiences	5C.3. Differentiated Instruction with sufficient practice Connect Experiences ("Attention Getters") PLC Collaboration	5C.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, R. Hill, CCT Classroom Teachers	5C.3. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle,	5C.3. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments,

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
						on-going collaboration, standard driven	Walkthrough checklist
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. A shift in teacher assignments to different grade levels.	5D.1. Provide IMS professional development that drills down standards using the test item specifications and the resources that are available.	5D.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom teachers	5D.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5D.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress s in mathematics will decrease by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 95% (24)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 80% (23)					
			5D.2. Achievement Gap/Unconnected Experiences	5D.2. Differentiated Instruction with sufficient practice Connect Experiences ("Attention Getters") PLC Collaboration	5D.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5D.2. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5D.2. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
			5D.3. Procedural Skills	5D.3. Continuous Modeling of Word Problems	5D.3. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach,	5D.3. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data,	5D.3. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark

				Classroom Teachers	PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1. High percentage of students unable to read and process word problems at grade-level.	5E.1. Students below grade-level receive intervention during small-group.	5E.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5E.1. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments; Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
Mathematics Goal #5E: The percentage of Students who are Economically Disadvantaged not making satisfactory progress s in mathematics will increase by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 57% (218)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 72% (255)					
			5E.2. Achievement Gap/Unconnected Experiences	5E.2. Differentiated Instruction with sufficient practice Connect Experiences ("Attention Getters") PLC Collaboration	5E.2. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Pre/Post conference and reflection, classroom-walkthroughs, student data, PLC monitoring, coaching cycle, on-going collaboration, standard driven	5E.2. Formative Assessments Benchmark/Quick Checks/ Mini Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Common Assessments, Walkthrough checklist
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012 46%	2012-2013 48%	2013-2014 53%	2014-2015 58%	2015-2016 63%	2016-2017 69%
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 37%						
Mathematics Goal #5A: For 2012-2013, the number of students making satisfactory progress will increase by 2%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**		5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #5B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance.* n/a / 2013 Expected Level of Performance.* n/a						

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

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

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance.* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance.* 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

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

Algebra Goal #2: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	n/a	n/a					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: n/a							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: n/**a**	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* n/a						

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

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

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

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

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]).

<table>
<tr>
<th colspan="2">Geometry EOC Goals</th>
<th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Goal #1:
n/a</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*

n/a | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Goal #2:
n/a</td>
<td>2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

	n/a	n/a					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**					
Geometry Goal #3A: n/a						

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Geometry Goal #3B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:* n/a 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* n/a					

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

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

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

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

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

Geometry Goal #3E: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
	n/a	n/a

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
IMS	K-5	Moser/Miller	School-Wide	August 28, 2012	PLC meetings	Leadership Team

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			0 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
St Math	Computer based program used to increase math skills (software and license, updated manuals, refresher training)	Title 1	3,325.00
			0 Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			0 Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			0 Subtotal:
			0 Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. New Science Textbooks(FUSION) and Curriculum	1A.1. FUSION orientation and training workshops Science Lead (G. Dry) guidance and support OCPS CIA Blueprints for Science Instruction	1A.1. J. Thompson, Principal A. Morrow, AP A. Kennedy-Academic Coach G. Dry-Science W. Miller-Math Classroom Teachers N. Havens-Counselor R. Hill-CT	1A.1. Leadership team and coaches will frequently visit classrooms and provide coaching as needed.	1A.1. Walk-through checklist, iObservation (Marzano), Benchmark and mini-assessments
Science Goal #1A: All areas in science are in need of improvement. Our goal is to have an increase of students proficient in all areas of science.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012 29% (35) of our students scored at level 3 or above.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* We expect 44% (53) of our students to score at level 3 or above.					
			1A.2. Language barrier for our ELL students	1A.2. Essential Labs Intensive focus groups	1A.2. G. Dry-Science	1A.2. Review data bi-weekly and differentiating groups based on data.	1A.2. Benchmark and mini-assessments
			1A.3. Lack of Parent Involvement	1A.3. Provide training and "make and takes" for parents to use with their children at home.	1A.3. J. Thompson, Principal A. Morrow, AP A. Kennedy-Academic Coach B. Powdar-Writing	1A.3. We will use sign-in sheets to determine percentage of participation at parent's nights	1A.3. Needs Assessments, Parent Surveys and sign-in sheets.

			G. Dry-Science W. Miller-Math N. Havens-Counselor R. Hill-CT Classroom teachers		
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* 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
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Lack of Enrichment resources being used	2A.1. Provide Professional development in using higher level thinking for teachers and implementing Marzano's book," The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction" for all students	2A.1. J. Thompson, Principal A. Morrow. AP A. Kennedy- Academic Coach B. Powdar-Writing G. Dry-Science W. Miller-Math R. Hill-CT Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Leadership Team and Coaches will frequently visit classroom and provide coaching as needed	2A.1. Walk-through checklists, iObservation (Marzano), Benchmark mini-assessments
Science Goal #2A: Our goal is to have an increase of students achieving above proficiency in science through progress monitoring and essential labs.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 8% (10) of our students scored a Level 4 or 5.	We expect 20% (24) of students will score a Level 4 or 5.					
			2A.2. Lack of Parent Involvement	2A.2. Provide training and "make and takes" for parents to use with their children at home.	2A.2. J. Thompson, Principal A. Morrow, AP A. Kennedy-Academic Coach B. Powdar-Writing G. Dry-Science W. Miller-Math N. Havens-Counselor R. Hill-CT Classroom teachers	2A.2. We will use sign-in sheets to determine percentage of participation at parent's nights.	2A.2. Needs Assessments, Parent Surveys and sign-in sheets.
			2A.3. Language barrier for our	2A.3. Essential Labs	2A.3. G. Dry-Science	2A.3. Review data bi-weekly	2A.3. Benchmark and mini-

		ELL students	Intensive focus groups		and differentiating groups based on data.	assessments
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**		2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance:* n/a	2013Expected Level of Performance:* n/a				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

	e:*						
	n/a	n/a					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals
Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)

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

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

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review Task Analysis, Item Specifications, Reporting Categories, NGSSS, CIA Blueprints, FCIM and FUSION	K-5/Science	G. Dry	K-5 Grade PLC/Science	Bi-weekly Early Release	Monthly Data Meetings	G. Dry
PLC to analyze data to drive instruction	5th grade teachers	G. Dry	5th Grade Teachers	Bi-weekly Early Release	Classroom Walk-throughs	G. Dry
Science Boot Camp	5th	Consultant G. Dry	5th Grade Teachers	September 5, 2012	Classroom Walk-throughs	G. Dry

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
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Subtotal:

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

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

End of Science Goals

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

<u>**Writing Goals**</u>

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. <u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> Our goal is to have all students obtain a 4.0 or higher.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 78% (73) scored a 3.0 or higher	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 78% (90) or higher to score a Level 4.0 or higher	1A.1. Rigor of new rubric	1A.1. Continuously updating knowledge of expectations of new grading.	1A.1. Write Track Consultant 4th grade teachers Administration Intensive Writing Teachers	1A.1. Results from five writing prompts to drive instruction	1A.1. Writing Rubrics
			1A.2. Lack of vocabulary Language (ELL)	1A.2. Increased vocabulary Print rich environment Writer handbooks for each student which includes A-Z lists, idioms, substitutions, etc.	1A.2. 4th Grade teachers R. Hill CT Compliance	1A.2. Increased score on prompt responses	1A.2. Writing Rubrics

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

Increased scores on prompt responses

		1A.3. Lowest 30% of students are not proficient in writing	1A.3. Hire Intensive Writing Teacher	1A.3. Write Track 4th grade teachers Administration Intensive Writing Teacher	1A.3.	1A.3. Writing Rubrics
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.**		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performance.* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performance.* 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

Writing Professional Development

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
Write Track Training for new teachers	K-3	Write Track Consultant	Writing K-3 teachers	June/ 2013	Consultant planning with grade levels, modeling lessons, classroom observations	E. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP N. Drayton, Teacher A. Vazquez, CRT
PLC to develop writing plan	K-5th	Write Track Consultant	Writing K-5 teachers	June/2013	Data Review after each school-wide prompt	E. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP N. Drayton, Teacher A. Vazquez, CRT

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.

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
Write Track Program	Easy Writers, Editing Resource Books	Title I	
			1806 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			0 Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write Track Consultant	Training and Consulting	Title 1	Write Track Consultant

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

			0 Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			0 Subtotal:
			1806 Total:

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

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

Civics Goal #2: n/a	2012 Current Level of Performanc e:* n/a	2013 Expected Level of Performanc e:* n/a					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	n/a	n/a					
			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

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
n/a						

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of U.S. History Goals

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: Our goal is to maintain an average daily attendance of 95% or higher and reduce the number of excessive absences and tardies by half.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 96% 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 183 2012 Current Number of	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 96% 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) 91 2013 Expected Number of	Parents getting students to school on time.	Through ETI, the counselor, teacher, administrator, registrar, social worker and parent meet to discuss a plan of action after student has been absent more than 5 days.	Registrar and Counselor	Monitoring attendance record	Check EDW

	Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	222	111					
			Parents getting students to school on time	Give students Perfect Attendance certificates for those students who do not have any absences.	Teacher and CRT	Monitoring attendance record	SMS
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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

End of Attendance Goals

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

<u>Suspension Goal(s)</u>

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			Lack of Consistency	Establishing and monitoring a common school wide behavior plan (rules and consequences, procedures, expectations) Practicing procedures as a grade level 4 times a year and as needed Implement CHAMPS Provide positive behavior incentives such as Tiger Bills, pencils, certificates, Tiger Paws, and Tiger Pride Paw bracelets.	Leadership Team Staff	Decrease in suspensions	SMS, EDW
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> Ridgewood Park Elementary has 719 students. An RTI plan has been put in place to reduce the number of behavior barriers. We anticipate that our suspension numbers should decrease by almost half.	<u>2012 Total Number of In – School Suspensions</u> 333	<u>2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</u> 166					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u> 32	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</u> 16					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> 208	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u> 104					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</u> 113	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</u> 67					

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

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Behavioral Leadership Academy	K-5	V. Morrow, AP	V. Morrow, AP B. Gray, Dean M. Powell, ESE B. Dawkins, ESE N. Havens, Counselor N. Drayton, Teacher D. Williamson, Teacher A. Kennedy, Instructional Coach Classroom Teachers	Biweekly	Referrals	V. Morrow, AP B. Gray, Dean M. Powell, ESE B. Dawkins, ESE N. Havens, Counselor N. Drayton, Teacher D. Williamson, Teacher A. Kennedy, Instructional Coach

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
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

n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Reward positive behavior	Certificates, bracelets, pencils	General Fund	300.00
			300.00 Subtotal:
			Total: 300.00

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: The goal is to decrease the current dropout rate by almost half.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* Based on 2012 retention data for students in grades 3-5, 29 students were retained.	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* By June 2013, the number of students retained will be decreased by 5% (2).	1.1. Achievement Gap	1.1. Differentiated Instruction Intervention Groups with approved, direct instruction programs (Attends daily for 40 minutes).	1.1. J.Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A. Kennedy, Academic Coach, Classroom teachers	1.1 Students monitored weekly and progress discussed biweekly through grade level data chats.	1.1. Mini-assessments, ORF, intervention reports, common assessments
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:* Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:* Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)
Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.
* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: To increase parent involvement by 50%	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: * Average of 138 parents attended school functions.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: * Average of 207 or more will attend school functions	1.1. Language communications present a barrier for parents attending various school functions.	1.1. Strategy to increase parent involvement is to increase translations of all invitations for school events and activities. PLC Parent Meetings and recruitment of committee representatives. Invite language translations in Creole and Spanish. Flyers, events calendar and activities will be translated in Creole and Spanish.	1.1. J. Thompson, Principal A. Morrow, AP M. Moser, Reading Coach A.Kennedy, Academic Coach G. Dry, Science Coach W. Miller, Math Coach Classroom Teachers N. Havens-Counselor R. Hill-CT PTA SAC	1.1 Event Feedback Evaluations Title I Sign-In Sheets	1.1. Event Feedback Evaluations Title I Parent Sign-In Sheets Title I Needs Assessment Survey
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Family Fun Nights PLC	K-5th	M. Moser, Reading W. Miller, Math J. Calderon, Technology N. Drayton, Writing G. Dry, Science Multicultural Night, A. Vazquez	School-wide	Science Night (Dry)- October 9 Reading Night (Moser)- November 13 Writing Night (Graybill)- January 8 Math Night (Miller)- February 12 Technology Night (Calderon) – March 12 Multicultural Night (Vazquez) – May 14	Event Feedback Evaluations Title I Sign-In Sheets	J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP R. Hill, CCT

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Incentives	Parent of the Month bags and bumper stickers	Fund 249	547.59
Literacy Bags	Parents can check out literacy bags.	Title 1	2500
			1047.00 Subtotal:
			1047.00 Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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
n/a						

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

<u>Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)</u>

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

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
n/a						

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
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal Additional Goal #1: Increase by to 5%-The percent of VPK Students Who Will Enter Elementary School Ready Based on FLKRS Data (score 70% and above)	2012 Current Level :* 85% (131)	2013 Expected Level :* 100% (140)	1.1. Students who do not participate in VPK	1.1. Open House for area Day Cares and providers	1.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP A. Jackson- Pre-K Teacher	1.1. Follow up by evaluating the sign-in sheets and parents surveys	1.1. Sign-In Sheets Surveys
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Additional Goal #2: Increase by 3 to 5%- Students Who Read on Grade Level by Age 9 -Address reading progress monitoring for K-2 in action plan	**2012 Current Level :*** See below Reference Reading Goal 1-A Reading Goal 2-A	**2013 Expected Level :*** See below					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	1.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal **Additional Goal #3:** Increase by 3 to 5% Students Who Become Fluent in Math Operations.	**2012 Current Level :*** 63% (243) in FCAT Number Sense	**2013 Expected Level :*** 79% (280) in FCAT Number Sense	3.1. Students not able to manipulate numbers and their relationships.	3.1. Students will practice their math operations through different resources such as enVision and Triple S Review CD focusing on computation.	3.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP W. Miller, Math Coach Teachers	3.1. Monitor data from weekly assessments.	3.1. enVision and Triple S Review assessments (FCAT Practice)
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Additional Goal #4: Decrease the Achievement Gap for Each Identified Subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016.	2012 Current Level :* See below	2013 Expected Level :* See below					
	See Reading and Math Goal 5-A		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5. Additional Goal Additional Goal #5: Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage	2012 Current Level :* 100% (766)	2013 Expected Level :* 100% (790)	5.1. Frequency of student visits to the fine arts class.	5.1. Students will have additional fine arts through 21st Century after school program.	5.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP	5.1. Pre-Post Conference	5.1. Classroom-walkthrough checklist
			5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.
			5.3.	5.3.	5.3.	5.3.	5.3.

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
6. Additional Goal			6.1. Scheduling of responses	6.1. Starting early with the assistance of the Partner In Education Coordinator	6.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP A. Kennedy	6.1. Send out follow-up letters during pre-planning	6.1. Scheduling of Teach-In
Additional Goal #6: Increase College and Career Awareness	**2012 Current Level :*** 100%	**2013 Expected Level :*** 100%					
			6.2.	**6.2.**	**6.2.**	**6.2.**	**6.2.**
			6.3.	**6.3.**	**6.3.**	**6.3.**	**6.3.**

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
7. Additional Goal **Additional Goal #7:** Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education	**2012 Current Level :*** 5.2% (40)	**2013 Expected Level :*** 5.7% (45)	7.1. General education teachers not being trained for inclusion	7.1. In-service training	7.1. J. Thompson, Principal V. Morrow, AP Teachers	7.1. Monitor data from weekly assessments.	7.1. RTi
			7.2.	**7.2.**	**7.2.**	**7.2.**	**7.2.**
			7.3.	**7.3.**	**7.3.**	**7.3.**	**7.3.**

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

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
n/a						

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
Triple S Review	Review of numeration	n/a	0
			0 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
n/a			
			Subtotal:
			0 Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	38,500 Total:
CELLA Budget	
	49,800 Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	0 Total:
Science Budget	
	0 Total:
Writing Budget	
	1,806 Total:
Civics Budget	
	0 Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	0Total:
Attendance Budget	
	0 Total:
Suspension Budget	
	300 Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	0 Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	1,047 Total:
STEM Budget	
	0 Total:
CTE Budget	
	0 Total:
Additional Goals	
	0 Total:
	91,453 Grand Total:

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

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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.
Continue inviting parents, teachers, and business partners through flyers and phone calls.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The council will discuss and monitor the implementation of reading, math, writing, and science programs to improve student learning. The committee will evaluate student academic growth in the areas of reading and math, and work collaboratively with school administrators to support learning activities and school-wide goals.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Additional resources to support student learning in reading, math, writing, and science	700.00