Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Somerset Academy Charter School	District Name: Miami-Dade County
Principal: Suzette Ruiz	Superintendent: Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho
SAC Chair: Lisa Alamo	Date of School Board Approval: Pending

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

Principal	Suzette E. Ruiz	Bachelors in Elementary Education, Masters in	8 yrs	8 yrs		'12	' 11	'10	'09	'08
		Reading, Certificate in Educational Leadership	Somerset	Somerset	School Grade	A	A	<u>A</u>	В	<u>A</u>
		•	Academy Charter School	Academy Charter School	High Standards Rdg.	80	89	85	86	82
		Certifications:			High Standards Math	83	86	88	87	86
		Educational Leadership K-12, Elementary Education 1-6,			Lrng Gains-Rdg.	77	79	<u>75</u>	80	76
		·			Lrng Gains-Math	76	62	67	63	74
		ESOL K-12 and Reading K-12			Gains-Rdg-25%	66	75	<u>78</u>	76	71
					Gains-Math-25%	69	70	80	49	78
Assistant Principal	Sandra M. Grau	Bachelors in Elementary Education,	8 yrs	8 yrs		'12	'11	'10	'09	'08
		M · Pl		Somerset	School Grade	Α	A	<u>A</u>	В	<u>A</u>
		Masters in Elementary Education,		Academy Charter School	High Standards Rdg.	80	89	<u>85</u>	86	82
		Certifications:			High Standards Math	83	86	88	87	86
		ESOL K-12			Lrng Gains-Rdg.	77	79	<u>75</u>	80	76
		Elementary Education K-			Lrng Gains-Math	76	62	67	63	74
		6			Gains-Rdg-25%	66	75	78	76	71
					Gains-Math-25%	69	70	80	49	78

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)		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade High Standards Rdg. High Standards Math Lrng Gains-Rdg. Lrng Gains-Math Gains-Rdg-25% Gains-Math-25%		

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.	Partnering new teachers with experienced teachers.	Assistant Principal	June 2013
2.	Meeting with new teachers with principal, assistant principal and grade level chairs	Principal	June 2013
3.	Job Fairs	Assistant Principal	May 2013
4.	Referrals from current employees	Principal	June 2013

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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
effective rating (instructional staff only).	
N/A	N/A

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]).

То	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
tal	of	of	of	of	of	of	of	of	of
	fir	tea	tea	tea	tea	tea	Re	Na	ES
nu	st-	ch	ch	ch	ch	ch	adi	tio	OL
m	ye	ers	ers	ers	ers	ers	ng	nal	En
ь	ar	wi	wit	wi	wi	W	En	В	dor
er	tea	th	h 6-	th	th	ith	dor	oa	sed
of	ch	1-5	14	15+	Ad	an	sed	rd	
In	ers	ye	ye	ye	va		Te	Ce	Tea
str		ars	ars	ars	nc	Ef	ac	rtif	che
uc		of	of	of	ed	fe	her	ied	rs
tio		exp	exp	exp	De	cti	S	Te	
nal		erie	erie	erie	gre	ve		ac	
St		nce	nce	nce	es	ra		he	
aff						ti		rs	
						ng			
						or			
						hi			

						gh er			
26	0%	27 % (7)	65 % (17)	8% (2)	38 % (10)	10 0%	0%	0 %	69 % (18)

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	Mentee	Rationale for	Planned
Name	Assigned	Pairing	Mentoring
			Activities
Hilda Varela	All Elementary Teachers	Lead teacher is paired with all elementary teachers because she has extensive knowledge in the core subject areas.	Activities The mentor and mentees are meeting weekly to discuss monthly best practices and evidence-based strategies for each
			domain. Time is given for the feedback, coaching and planning.

2012-2013 S	chool Impro	vement Plan	(SIP)-Form	ı SIP-1
Additional	<u>Reguireme</u> i	nts		ı

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
N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
N/A
Title I, Part D
N/A
Title II
N/A
Title III
N/A
Title X- Homeless
N/A
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
N/A
Violence Prevention Programs
N/A
Nutrition Programs
N/A

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

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: The Principal fosters a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI, skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI, implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI, plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Kindergarten through Fifth Grade Chairpersons will provide information about core instruction to corresponding grade level teachers, participates in student data collection for the school, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. The above mentioned team members were selected based on their knowledge and commitment to the core subject areas in which they teach. In addition, they have attended professional development workshops and shared the fundamental material learned within their grade groups.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: The SPED coordinator for Somerset Academy Charter School will participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as bi-weekly lesson planning and consultations to review accommodations on the students' IEP.

Instructional Coach(es) Reading/Math/Science:

The Reading Liaison develops, leads, and evaluates school Reading standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum for all students' achievement levels.

The Math and Science Coach develops, leads, and evaluates Mathematics and Science standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum for all students' achievement levels.

The Assistant Principal identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist: The Reading Liaison provides guidance on K-5 reading plans; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: The School Psychologist facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Technology Specialist: The Technology Specialist develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Speech Language Pathologist: The Speech Language Pathologist educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for

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

appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel: The Student Services Personnel provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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?

The Leadership team meetings will focus on monitoring and analyzing student data to maintain a problem solving system that brings out the best in our school, teachers, and our students.

The team meets bi-weekly to engage in the following activities:

Participates in evaluating data and correlating it to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students and their academic levels. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development to enhance students' achievement levels. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new programs and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team met with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) and principal to help develop the School Improvement Plan. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction; facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching; and aligned processes and procedures.

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.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Edusoft, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) scores from the previous school year, FCAT Pre Test, and Interim Assessment Test, STAR Reading Test, and STAR Math Test.

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FAIR, FCAT Practice Tests, Interim Assessment Test, STAR Reading Test, STAR Math Test, and Student grades.

End of year: PMRN, FCAT, FCAT Post Test, Interim Assessment Test, STAR Reading Test, STAR Math Test, and Student Grades.

Frequency of Data Days: The MTSS/RTl Leadership team conducts bi-weekly meeting for data analysis.

Behavior: Student Case Management System, Detentions, Suspensions/expulsions, Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context, Office referrals per day per month, Team climate surveys, Attendance, and Referrals to special education programs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development and support will include training for all of the MTSS/RtI, Leadership team in the MTSS/RtI, problem solving and data analysis process and provide support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI, principles and procedures. In addition, the MTSS/RtI Leadership team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times, weekly grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. Furthermore, teachers will be provided with added professional development to correspond with the subject area being taught.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The leadership team will implement workshops and mentoring sessions to educate all staff members of the MTSS/RtI system. Grade level chairs will monitor to insure successful implementation of all regulations.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) consists of Lisa Alamo, Reading Liaison, Suzette Ruiz, Principal and Sandra Grau, Assistant Principal.

The Literacy Leadership Team will provide professional development through best practices during common teacher planning times, weekly grade level meetings, and monthly faculty meetings. For instance, the LLT will support and provide ongoing professional development to teachers on the major reading components based on student performance data, administration and data interpretation of instructional assessments, and differentiated instruction techniques.

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

The purpose of the LLT is to generate instructional tools and interventions to gain reading knowledge within the school. In order to increase student's knowledge in this area the main focus is to build literacy skills in all content areas throughout the school.

Reading Liaison: Lisa Alamo provides guidance on elementary grades reading plans; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; and supports the implementation of intervention plans.

Principal: Suzette Ruiz will promote the LLT as an integral part of the school literacy reform to promote a culture of reading by offering professional growth opportunities for team members, create a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning of ideas, developing a school wide organizational model that supports literacy instruction in all classes, and encourage the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement.

Assistant Principal: Sandra Grau identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss the implementation of the different intervention plans that were placed throughout the school year. During these meetings the LLT will also evaluate and modify areas that are stagnant in order to improve the intervention plans to benefit the needs students.

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

The initiative for the LLT this year is to model effective instructional strategies for teachers, facilitate study groups, train teachers in interpreting data charts, meet with teachers to ensure that research based reading programs and strategies are implemented. In addition, the LLT will help to increase instructional density to meet the needs of all students, increase teachers' knowledge base in best practices in reading instruction and intervention strategies.

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.

*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.
*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?
*High Schools Only
Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?
How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personal meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011



PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	174.11.	IA.I.	
Students scoring at						
Achievement Level 3						
in reading.	Based on	G . 1 .	Leadership Team		Formative:	
	1 4	Students	Leadership Team	Collauct bi-weekly	l ormative.	
	1	will utilize	MTSS/RtI Team	assessments and review	Teacher-made tests,	
		grade level		data to ensure progress and	Baseline Assessment,	
	the area of deficiency as	appropriate	Daniel de la Charle	adjust curriculum focus		
	deficiency as	texts that	Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	noted on the	include			FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
	2011 - 2012	identifying	Reading Liaison			
	administ	methods of				
	ration of	development		Provide during grade level		
	the FCA I	and words		meetings to share best	Summative:	
	Reading	that signal	1	practices and reflect on	L	
	lest was	relationship		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
	Reporting	s, reducing		data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and	
	Category	textual		performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	
	3-Literary	information			Assessment.	
		to key				
		points,				
		using poetry				
		to study				
		figurative				
		language,				
		reading				
		closely to				
		identify				
		key details				
		through				
		the use of				
		graphic	1			
		organizers				
		and concept				
		maps.				
			1			
			1			

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of			
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicated that 32% of		Performance:*			
the students achieved proficiency. (Level 3).					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 2% percentage points to 34%.					
	32% (87)	34% (93)			

	i	11.4.2	h o	1.4.0	1 4 2	1.4.0
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		Dagad an	Ct., dontoilltilino ono do	I aa damahin Taam	Conduct hi	Earne ations
		Based on	Students will utilize grade	Leadership Team	_	Formative:
		our data	level appropriate texts that	A FEEGG / D. I. F.	assessments and review	
		analysis,	include building strong	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress	Teacher-made tests,
			arguments to support			Baseline Assessment,
		deficiency		Department Chair	focus based on data	Interim Assessment,
		in fifth as	of meaning, using reciprocal		reports.	FAIR, and FCAT 2.0
		noted on the	teaching and question-	Reading Liaison		
			answer relationships,	_		
		administ	questioning the author, and			
		ration of	summarizing.		Provide during grade level	Summative:
		the FCAT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		meetings to share best	
		Reading				Results from Interim
		Test was			additional needs based on	
						2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading
		Reporting			performance.	Assessment.
		Category 4-			performance.	Assessment.
		Information				
		al Text and				
		Research				
		Process.				
			1			
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	
	10.1.	10.1.	15.1.	10.1.	15.1.	
Alternate						
Assessment:						
Students scoring at						
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in						
reading.						

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	IB.3.	1B.3.	1B.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		

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
Students scoring						
at or above						
Achievement Levels						
4 in reading.	Based on	Providing	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
i in reading.	our data	enrichment		assessments and review		
	analysis		MTSS/RtI Team	1 0	Teacher-made tests,	
		activities		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	the area of	that include	Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	deficiency as	identifying			FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
	Inoted on the	incurous or	Reading Liaison			
	2011 - 2012	development		L		
	administ	and words		Provide during grade level		
		that signal		meetings to share best	Summative:	
	the FCAT	relationship		practices and reflect on	D 1: 0 T :	
	Reading	s, reducing		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
	Test was	textual		data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and	
	Reporting	information		performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	
	Category	to key			Assessment.	
	3-Literary	points,				
		using poetry				
		to study figurative				
		language,				
		reading				
		closely to				
		identify				
		key details				
		through				
		the use of				
		graphic				
		organizers				
		and concept				
		maps.			1	

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicated that 47% of the students achieved proficiency. (Level 4 and 5).					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 4 and 5) by 1% percentage points to 48%.					
	47% (129)	48% (131)			

	1	han	h a a	h	h 4 2	h. a
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
		Based on	Draviding annichment	Landarshin Tann	Conduct hi washiy	Formative:
			Providing enrichment	Leadership Team	_	Formative:
		our data	instructional activities that	METCO /D /I T	assessments and review	
		analysis,	ε	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress	Teacher-made tests,
			arguments to support		and adjust curriculum	Baseline Assessment,
				Department Chair	focus based on data	Interim Assessment,
			of meaning, using reciprocal		reports.	FAIR, and FCAT 2.0
				Reading Liaison		
			answer relationships,			
		administ	questioning the author, and			
		ration of	summarizing.		Provide during grade level	Summative:
		the FCAT			meetings to share best	
		Reading			practices and reflect on	Results from Interim
		Test was			additional needs based on	Assessments, FAIR, and
		Reporting				2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading
		Category 4-			performance.	Assessment.
		Information				
		al Text and				
		Research				
		Process.				
		1100033.				
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
		2,1.3.			L. 1	
ab. Piorida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	
Alternate						
Assessment:						
Students scoring at						
or above Level 7 in						
reading.						

<u> </u>	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	convinuince.						
	N/A	N/A					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
improvement for the							

Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Based on our data enrichment analysis, the area of deficiency in fifth as noted on the 2011 -2012 administ aration of the FCAT relationship	1	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A. FCAT 2.0:
learning gains in reading. Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency in fifth as intended on the administ and minist and words ration of that signal Based on our data enrichment instructional analysis, the area of activities deficiency that include in fifth as identifying noted on the administ and words ration of that signal Based on Providing enrichment administ and words reading Leadership Team Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Department Chair based on data reports. Formative: Teacher-made tests, Baseline Assessment, Interim Assessment, FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Reading Liaison Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:							Percentage of
learning gains in reading. Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency in fifth as noted on the administ and minist ration of that signal Based on our data enrichment instructional analysis, the area of activities deficiency that include in fifth as noted on the administ and words ration of that signal Based on Providing enrichment instructional activities and words ration of that signal Leadership Team Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Interim Assessment, Interim Assessment, FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:							students making
our data enrichment analysis, instructional the area of deficiency in fifth as noted on the administ and words ration of that signal our data enrichment instructional the area of activities that include identifying noted on the administ and words ration of that signal our data enrichment instructional data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Department Chair based on data reports. FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:				r 1 1' m	D : 1:	D 1	learning gains in
analysis, instructional the area of the area of activities that include in fifth as noted on the administ and words ration of that signal the area of activities that include activities that include activities and words that include activities that include activities and words activities and words activities and words that include activities adjust curriculum focus adjust curriculum focus adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:		Formative:		Leadership Leam			reading.
the area of activities that include in fifth as noted on the administ and words ration of that signal the area of activities that include identifying adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Department Chair based on data reports. Baseline Assessment, Interim Assessment, FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:	,			MTDGG/D-I-T			
deficiency in fifth as identifying noted on the administ and words ration of that signal that include identifying noted on the at a methods of that signal that include identifying noted on the administ and words that signal that include identifying based on data reports. Department Chair based on data reports. FAIR, and FCAT 2.0 Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:				MTSS/Rti Team			
in fifth as identifying noted on the noted on the 2011 -2012 administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administ and words ration of that signal identifying methods of development administration of the signal identifying methods of development administration of the signal identifying methods of development administration of the signal identifying methods of the signal identifying methods of the signal identification of the signal identifica				D			
noted on the methods of development administ and words ration of that signal Reading Liaison Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:			based on data reports.	Department Chair			
2011 -2012 development administ and words administ that signal Provide during grade level meetings to share best Summative:	.1 2.0	FAIR, and FCA1 2.0		D 1: T::			
administ and words Provide during grade level ration of that signal meetings to share best Summative:							
ration of that signal meetings to share best Summative:							
the FCAT relationship practices and reflect on		Summative:					
		D 1: C I :	μ				
Reading s, reducing additional needs based on Results from Interim						_	
Test was textual data reports and student Assessments, FAIR, and							
Reporting information performance. 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	Reading		performance.				
Category 4- to key Assessment.		Assessment.					
Information points,							
al Text and using poetry							
Research to study							
Process. figurative					_		
language,							
reading							
closely to							
identify							
key details							
through the use of							
graphic							
organizers and concept							
and concept maps.							

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 77% of the students made learning gains.					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5% percentage points to 82%					
	77% (132)	82% (141)			

	1	i	la	la	h	la	
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		Based on	Providing enrichment	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
		our data	instructional activities that		assessments and review		
		analysis,	\mathcal{E}	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress	Teacher-made tests,	
			arguments to support	L	and adjust curriculum	Baseline Assessment,	
				Department Chair	focus based on data	Interim Assessment,	
			of meaning, using reciprocal		reports.	FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
		2011 -2012	teaching and question- answer relationships,	Reading Liaison			
		administ	questioning the author, and				
		ration of	summarizing.		Provide during grade level	Summative:	
		the FCAT			meetings to share best		
		Reading			practices and reflect on	Results from Interim	
		Test was			additional needs based on		
		Reporting				2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	
		Category 4-			performance.	Assessment.	
		Information					
		al Text and Research					
		Process.					
		1100055.					
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
reading.	1	I .					

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of		'			
	Performance:*	Performance:*	1	1	1	1	[]
N/A	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	1	1		1	1		
	1	1		1	1		
	1	1	1	1	'	'	[
	N/A	N/A			<u> </u>		
	1	1	!	1	'	'	
	$\overline{}$	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	'	<u> </u>					
	$\overline{}$	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
	!	<u> </u>	!	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	,	
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	,	1	
define areas in need of	1	1	1		,	1	
improvement for the	1 '	1	1		1	1	

4. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
Percentage of						
students in lowest						
25% making						
learning gains in		Providing	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
reading.		enrichment		assessments and review		
J 8.			MTSS/RtI Team	1 5	Teacher-made tests,	
		activities		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	deficiency as		Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	noted on the		L		FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
	2011 - 2012		Reading Liaison			
		development				
		and words		Provide during grade level	g	
		that signal		meetings to share best practices and reflect on	Summative:	
	Reading Test was	relationship		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
		s, reducing textual		data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and	
		information		performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	
		to key		performance.	Assessment.	
		points,			Assessment.	
	-	using poetry				
		to study				
		figurative				
		language,				
		reading				
		closely to				
		identify				
		key details				
		through				
		the use of				
		graphic				
		organizers				
		and concept				
		maps.				

<u> </u>	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 66% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains.					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5% percentage points to 71%.					
	66% (24)	71% (26)			

4.4	A.2.	4A.2.	4A2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
ou an th de in no 20 ad ra th Ro Ca In al	ur data nalysis, ne area of eficiency n fifth as oted on the 011 -2012 dminist	arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal	MTSS/RtI Team Department Chair Reading Liaison	assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide during grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
4A	A.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	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	80%	82%	84%	85%	87%	89%
Reading Goal #5A: Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.	78%						
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	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
subgroups by						
centificate y () intro,	White: 85% (17)					
Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	reducing textual information to key points, using poetry to study figurative language,	MTSS/RtI Team Department Chair Reading Liaison	assessments and review data to ensure progress	Formative: Teacher-made tests, Baseline Assessment, Interim Assessment, FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
		key details through the use of graphic organizers and		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of			
Reading Goal #3D.	Performance:*	Performance:*			
TE1 1, C					
The results of					
the 2011-2012					
FCAT 2.0 Reading					
assessment indicated					
that 80% of our					
subgroups are not					
meeting standards.					
Our goal for the					
2012-2013 FCAT					
2.0 Reading is					
to increase the					
to increase the					
percentage of					
students meeting					
standards by 3					
percentage points to 83%					
83%					
•					
	White: 84% (17)	White: 85%(27)			
	Black: 91% (10)	Black: 92%(10)			
	Hispanic: 79% (182)	Hispanic: 82%(187)			
	Asian: N/A	Asian: N/A			
1					

		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency in fifth as noted on the 2011 -2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4-Informational Text and Research Process.	Providing enrichment instructional activities that include building strong arguments to support answers, exploring shades of meaning, using reciprocal teaching and questionanswer relationships, questioning the author, and summarizing.	Leadership Team MTSS/RtI Team Department Chair	Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus based on data reports. Provide during grade leve meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs based on data reports and student performance.	Formative: Teacher- made tests, Baseline Assessment, Interim Assessment, FAIR, and IFCAT 2.0
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Barrier	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5C English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	
5C. English	50.1.	DC.11.	JC.1.	JC.1.	JC.1.	
Language Learners						
(ELL) not making						
satisfactory progress in reading.	Based on	Providing	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
in reading.	our data	enrichment	_F	assessments and review		
			MTSS/RtI Team		Teacher-made tests,	
		activities		1 5	Baseline Assessment,	
	deficiency as		Department Chair		Interim Assessment,	
	noted on the				FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	
	2011 - 2012		Reading Liaison		,	
		development				
		and words		Provide during grade level		
		that signal			Summative:	
		relationship		practices and reflect on		
	Test was	s, reducing		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
	Reporting	textual		data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and	
	Category	information		performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	
		to key			Assessment.	
	Analysis.	points,				
		using poetry				
		to study				
		figurative				
		language,				
		reading				
		closely to				
		identify				
		key details				
		through				
		the use of				
		graphic				
		organizers				
		and concept				
1		maps.				

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicated that 74% of our English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading is to increase the percentage of students meeting standards by 3# percentage points to 77%					
	74%(119)	77% (119)			

	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2
	DC.2.	JC.2.	DC.2.	JC.2.	JC.2.	JC.2
	Based on	Based on	Providing enrichment	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Form 44
	our data	our data	instructional activities that	1	assessments and review	Formative:
	analysis,	analysis,	include building strong	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress	
			arguments to support		L., a., at.,	Teacher-made tests,
			answers, exploring shades	Department Chair	focus based on data	Baseline Assessment,
			of meaning, using reciprocal		reports.	Interim Assessment,
				Reading Liaison	reports.	FAIR, and FCAT 2.0
	2011 -2012		answer relationships,	Liuison		
	administ		questioning the author, and			
	ration of		summarizing.		Provide during grade level	
		the FCAT	Summarizing.		meetings to share best	Summative:
	Reading	Reading			practices and reflect on	
	Test was	Test was			[4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Results from Interim
		Reporting			data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and
	Category 4-				performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading
	Information				performance.	Assessment.
		al Text and				
		Research				
	Process.	Process.				
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
D 1 1 1 1 1 1		Q ₁ ,	D D 22	D II 1 D :		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
and reference to "Guiding	Darrier		D 31.6 34 33	For the contract		
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
define areas in need of						
improvement for the following subgroup:						
5D. Students	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	
with Disabilities						
(SWD) not making						
satisfactory progress						
in reading.						

Reading Goal #5D:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
N/A	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
	_	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	ſ
student achievement data	Barrier	Strategy	1 cison of 1 ostilon	Trocess used to Determine	Evaluation 1001	1
and reference to "Guiding	24.1101		D TICM '	Ecc. 4: CC4.4		1
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		1
define areas in need of						1
improvement for the						1
following subgroup:	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	-
	DE.1.	JE.1.	DE.1.	DE.1.	DE.1.	1
Disadvantaged						1
students not making						1
satisfactory progress	Based on	Providing	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	1
IIII reading.		enrichment	Leadership Team	assessments and review	Formative.	1
			MTCC/D4I T		T1 1- 44-	1
			MTSS/RtI Team		Teacher-made tests,	1
		activities		3	Baseline Assessment,	1
	deficiency as		Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	1
	noted on the				FAIR, and FCAT 2.0	1
	2011 - 2012		Reading Liaison			1
	administra	development				1
	tion of the	and words		Provide during grade level		1
	FCAT 2.0	that signal		meetings to share best	Summative:	1
	Reading	relationship		practices and reflect on		1
		s, reducing			Results from Interim	1
		textual		data reports and student	Assessments, FAIR, and	1
		information		performance.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading	1
		to key		performance.	Assessment.	1
		-			Assessment.	1
		points,				1
		using poetry				1
		to study				1
		figurative				1
		language,				1
		reading		l		1
		closely to				1
		identify		l		1
		key details				1
		through				1
		the use of		l		1
		graphic				1
		organizers				1
		and concept				1
		-		l		1
1		maps.		I	1	1

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

Reading Goal #5E:	2012 Current	2013 Expected	ı		
Reading Goal #3E.	Level of	Level of			
	Performance:*	Performance:*			
The results of the					
2011-2012 FCAT 2.0					
Reading assessment					
indicated that 81%					
of our Students who					
are Economically					
Disadvantaged					
student's not making					
student's not making					
satisfactory progress					
in reading.					
Our goal for the					
2012-2013 FCAT 2.0					
Reading is to increase					
the percentage of					
students meeting					
standards by 1					
nercentage points to					
percentage points to 82%.					
0270.					
	81%(121)	82% (122)			
I	I		I		

5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
Based or	Providing angighment	Leadership Team	Canduat hi waaldy	Formative:
our data	Providing enrichment instructional activities that	1	Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review	rormative:
analysis,	include building strong	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress	Teacher-made tests,
the area				Baseline Assessment,
deficience	11	Department Chair		Interim Assessment,
in fifth a				FAIR, and FCAT 2.0
I I I	the teaching and question-	Reading Liaison	oporto.	11111, 1111 1 1 1 1 2 1 1
2011 - 20		reducing Dialeon		
administ	1 ,			
ration of			Provide during grade level	Summative:
the FCA			meetings to share best	
Reading			practices and reflect on	Results from Interim
Test was			additional needs based on	Assessments, FAIR, and
Reportin				2013FCAT 2.0 Reading
Category	4-		performance.	Assessment.
Informat				
al Text a	•			
Research				
Process.				
5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

Reading Professional Development

Professional
Development
(PD) aligned with
Strategies through
Professional
August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities

Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level,	meetings)		for Monitoring
Common Core - Reading	K-5	PLC Leader Lisa Alamo	or school-wide) Kinder through Fifth	August 2012	Monitoring teacher lesson plans.	Grade level chairs

2012-2013 School In	mprovement	t Plan (SIP)-F	orm SIP-1			
Effective Differentiated Instruction - to focus on Literary Analysis and Informational Text and Research Process strategies to increase student performance on the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading Test. The Differentiated Instructional PD will focus on providing teachers with mini lessons to incorporate strategies such as: Author's Purpose	3-5 Reading Teachers	Reading Liaison and Data Specialist	PLC and third through fifth grade reading teachers.	Target Date: August 20, 2012 – June 2013 Monthly Basis	Lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and follow-up Professional Development as well as monthly meetings with all Professional Learning Communities with the Administration	P
Author's Perspective						
Main Idea (Stated and Implied)						
Relevant Details						
Chronological Order						
Conclusions and Inferences						

■ Compare/Contrast

Cause/Effect

Text Structure (Organizational Patterns)

August 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011 Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Liaison

- Sequence of Events
- Theme
- Topic (within and across text)
- Elements, Characters, Settings, Events, and Problems
- Interpret Graphical Information (Text Features)
- Locate, Interpret, Organize Information
- Validity and Reliability of Information within and across texts.

Success Maker

PD

Trainer & Reading Liaison

Reading Teachers

PLC Leaders & 3rd-5th grade Target Date: August 2012-September 2013

Reading small group schedule

Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Liaison

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Grade 3-5

Reading

Include only school funded activities/		
materials and exclude district funded		

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

	T	I	I
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
In order to increase student performance in Reading Application teachers will incorporate reading strategies that assist students to: make inferences, draw conclusions, return to text as a support for looking for answers, utilize graphic organizers to analyze grade level text, and understand the structure of the text and why the author formulated in that manner. In addition, in order to increase student performance on Informational Text/Research Process teachers will incorporate reading strategies that assist students to: Build strong arguments related to the text, explore shades of text meaning through the use of reciprocal teaching and question-answer relationships, and summarizing the text according to the	Accelerated Reader is a motivational program that encourages independent reading and includes online quizzes and measures comprehension and vocabulary.	Operating Accounts	\$2,000.00
organization of the information given within the text.			
	STAR is used to determine the reading level of each student, measure their growth, and forecast results on standardized tests with 10 minute assessments.	Operating Accounts	\$2,000.00

	Brain Pop is an educational website of short Flash-based movies for students that incorporates learning strategies for Reading and correlates it to the strands that address the Sunshine State Standards.	School Fund	\$1,000.00
	Success Maker is instructional software that provides elementary school learners with adaptive, personalized paths for mastery of essential reading and math concepts correlated to the common core standards and delivers outcome-based date to inform educational decision making.	Operating Account	\$3,000.00
	Reading Plus is instructional software that provides elementary school learners with adaptive, personalized path's for reading, vocabulary, and spelling mastery of the essential reading concepts correlated to the common core standards and delivers outcome based data to inform educational decision making.	Operating Account	\$3,000.00
	Destiny is a resource management tool that helps libraries efficiently, while creating engaging and collaborative learning environments that promote and support student achievement.	Operating Accounts	\$3,500.00
Subtotal: \$12,500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			

Subtotal:		
Total: \$12,500.00		

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	-	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1 (4-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	1 1	I 1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1 I
1. Students scoring	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
proficient in					
listening/speaking.					
	Based on the results	ELI subsesses will be	Leadership Team	Administrators will	Formative:
	of the 2011-2012	ELL subgroups will be		monitor the use of ESOL	
	CELLA ELL student's	monitored frequently			Baseline Assessments
	performance demonstrated	in order to provide the necessary interventions to		Plans and students	
	a weakness in listening	necessary interventions to		progress during their walk	Interim Assessments
	and speaking. Which	strengthen their fistening/		throughs.	
	indicates that our students	speaking of the English			FCAT Test Maker
	are having difficulties	language.			
	with developing and				Classroom Walkthroughs
	comprehending a response			ESOL Liaison will	
	to what they have read.	Teachers will use the		ensure that teachers have	
				the appropriate ESOL	
		following listening			Summative:
		strategies:		their lesson plans and	
					2013 CELLA
				correctly within the grade	
		Teacher Lead Groups,			2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
		Modeling, Use Illustrations			Assessment
		/ Diagrams, and Use Simple			
		and Direct Language			
		and Direct Language		Provide Professional	
				Development to monitor	
				ELL student's progress	
		Teachers will use the		through differentiated	
		following speaking		instruction activities.	
		strategies:		instruction activities.	
		strategies.			
				EGOT I	
		Teacher / Student /		ESOL Liaison will meet	
		Modeling, Repetition, Think		with teachers' bi-monthly	
		Aloud, Role Play, Panel		to discuss students'	
		Discussions, Teacher-Led		progress and use of ESOL	
		Groups, Brainstorming		strategies.	

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

	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 59% of the students tested scored a level of proficiency in the Listening/Speaking						
portion of the test. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in Listening/Speaking during the 2012-2013 school year.						
	59% (82)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.		1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade- level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
proficient in reading.					
proneign in reading.			Leadership Team		Formative:
t E t T S C C C	the 2011-2012 CELLA	ELL subsussus will be	ESOL Liaison	Administrators will monitor the use of ESOL strategies in Lesson Plans and students progress during their walk throughs. ESOL Liaison will ensure that teachers have the appropriate ESOL strategies included in their lesson plans and	Formative: Baseline Assessments Interim Assessments FCAT Test Maker Classroom Walkthroughs — Summative: 2013 CELLA 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 Assessment
		Teachers will use the following reading strategies: Predictions, Question- Answer-Relationship (QAR), Read Alouds (RA), Choral Reading, Decoding/Phonics/ Spelling, Vocabulary With Context Clues, Visualization, Think/Pair/Share, Graphic Organizers, Dictation, Highlighting Text,		Provide Professional Development to monitor ELL student's progress through differentiated instruction activities. ESOL Liaison will meet with teachers' bi-monthly to discuss students' progress and use of ESOL strategies.	

Retelling, etc...

	<u></u>	receining, etc	·	·	<u>. </u>	
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students	<u>, </u>	<u>'</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
<u> </u>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 '	1 '	1	1
1	,	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
1	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1 17
T114 - a C 41a a	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
The results of the	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
2011-2012 CELLA	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
Test indicate that	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
38% of the students	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
tested scored a level	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
of proficiency in the	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1 17
Reading portion of the	.[1	1	1 '	1	1 17
icedanis portion of the	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
test.	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1 17
1	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
·	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1 17
1	1	1	1	1	1	1 17
Our goal is to increase	.l	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
student proficiency	1	1	1	1	1	1
Student proficiency	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1 17
in Reading during	1	1	1	1 '	1	1 17
the 2012-2013 school	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
year.	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1 '	1	1
·	1	1	1	1	1	1
·	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
·	1	1	1	1	1	1
·	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
- [1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
1	1	1	1	1 '	1	1
	38%. (52).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1	36/0. (32).	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
1	1	1	1 '	1 '	1	1
ļ		<u> </u>	[<u> </u>	4
1	1	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
1	1	1	1	1 '	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	,	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
1	1	f	f	f 7	f	f.3.
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Students write in English	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL	1	1	1	1	1	1
similar to non-ELL	1	1	1	1	1	1
students.	1	1	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	1	1
	·L	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	
August 2012						!

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

2.04.1.4.	2 1	2 1	b 1	2 1	h 1
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
proficient in writing.					
	Based on the results of	ELL subgroups will be	Leadership Team	Administrators will	Formative:
	the 2011-2012 CELLA	monitored frequently		monitor the use of ESOL	
	ELL students lack		MTSS/RtI Team		Baseline Assessments
	the necessary writing	necessary interventions to		Plans and students	
	skills. This indicates		ESOL Liaison	progress during their walk	Interim Assessments
	that our students are	speaking of the English		throughs.	
	having difficulties with	language.			FCAT Test Maker
	the six traits of writing				
	(Organization, Drafting,				Classroom Walkthroughs
	Voice, Word Choice,			ESOL Liaison will	·
	Sentence Fluency, and	ELL students will be		ensure that teachers have	L
	Conventions), which in	provided with following		the appropriate ESOL	
	part is due to the students	writing strategies by their teachers:			Summative:
	language barrier.	teachers.		their lesson plans and	
					2013 CELLA
				correctly within the grade	
		Spelling Strategies,			2013 Reading FCAT 2.0
		Writing Samples, Graphic			Assessment
		Organizers, Reading			
		Response Journal/Log,			
		Summarizing, Writing		Provide Professional	
		Prompts, Rubric Writing		Development to monitor	
		Prompts, etc		ELL student's progress	
		Tompts, etc		through differentiated	
				instruction activities.	
				ESOL Liaison will	
				meet with teachers'	
				bi-monthly to discuss	
				students' progress and	
				use of ESOL strategies.	

CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:					
The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 42% of the students tested scored a level of proficiency in the Writing portion of the test. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in Writing during the 2012-2013 school year.						
	42%. (58)					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.

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

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

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 CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary	Problem-			
Mathematics	Solving			
Goals	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			
	ent			

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

1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at	171.1.	111.11	171.11.	171.11.		
Achievement Level 3						
in mathematics.						
in mathematics.	Based on	Students will	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
	our data	be provided	_	assessments and review		
	analysis of	with grade	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress and	Teacher-made tests,	
	the 2011	level		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	FCAT	appropriate	Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	Mathematics	material		-	STAR Math and FCAT	
	Test the	through	Math Liaison			
	Reporting	the use of				
	Category of	technology		Provide during grade level		
		within the			Summative:	
		learning		practices and reflect on		
		environment.			Results from Interim	
	t shows a				Assessments, STAR	
		Which will		performance through the use		
		promote		of hands on activities.	Mathematics Assessment.	
		the use of				
	Level 3 due					
		knowledge				
		and spatial				
		reasoning				
		to develop				
	development	foundations				
	and	for				
		understandin				
		g perimeter,				
		area, volume,				
		and surface				
		area; these				
	dimensional					
	shapes, and					
		include the				
		selection of				
		appropriate				
		units,				
		strategies,				
		and tools				

l t	to solve		
	problems		
	involving		
	these		
	measures.		
	Students will		
	Students will		
	engage in the		
	following		
	activities:		
	• Ma		
	nipu		
	lativ		
	es		
	• Suc		
	cess		
	Ma		
	ker		
	Kei		
	• 5-		
	Min		
	ute W		
	W		
	alk		
	Thr		
	oug		
	hs		
	• Mi		
	ni-		
	less		
	ons		

#1 A ·	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicated that 34% of the students achieved proficiency. (Level 3).							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain Level 3 student proficiency of points 34%.							
	34% (92)	34% (93)					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	IA.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.		

#1R:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	IB.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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		

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
Students scoring						
at or above						
Achievement						
Levels 4 and 5 in		Students	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
mathematics.		will be		assessments and review		
		provided	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress and	Teacher-made tests,	
		with		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	FCAT		Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	Mathematics				STAR Math and FCAT	
			Math Liaison			
		use of				
	Category of			Provide during grade level		
		in multi-age		meetings to share best	Summative:	
		learning		practices and reflect on		
		environment		additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
	t shows a	Which		data reports and student	Assessments, STAR	
		promotes		performance through hands		
		the use of		activities.	Mathematics Assessment.	
		geometric				
	Level 3 due					
	to the lack	and spatial				
	of	reasoning to				
		develop				
		foundations				
	development					
		understandin				
	understandin					
	~	area,				
		volume, and				
		surface area;				
		these				
	dimensional					
	shapes, and					
	, ,	include the				
		selection of				
		appropriate				
		units,				
		strategies,				
		and tools to			1	

	solve		
	problems		
	involving		
	involving		
	these		
	measures.		
	Teachers		
	will also		
	provide		
	provide		
l l	students		
	with the		
	following		
	activities:		
	• Mo		
	• Ma		
	nip		
	ulat		
	ives		
	• Suc		
	cess		
	Ma		
	ker		
	• 5-		
	Min		
	ute		
	W		
	alk		
	Thr		
	oug		
	hs		
	113		
	\ \rac{1}{2}		
	• Mi		
	ni-		
	less		
	ons		

Mathematics Goal #2A:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicated that 50% of the students achieved proficiency. (Level 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain a proficiency (Level 4 and 5) of 50% percentage.		Performance:*					
	50% (138)	50% (137)					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		ZA.Z.	LA.2.	ZA.2.	LA.2.	LA.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

#2B·	Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
37/4							
N/A							
	3 77.4	37/4					
	N/A	N/A					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
		<u> </u>					
Dagad on the analysis of	Anticipate 1	Ctratagy:	Dargan or Desition	Dropous Hand to Datarriin	Evaluation Tool	i	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and define areas in need of			Temponolog for monitoring				
improvement for the				1			
following group:							

24 ECAE 2.0	3A.1.	D A 1	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	
3A. FCAT 2.0:	BA.1.	3A.1.	BA.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	
Percentage of						
students making						
learning gains in	Based on	Students	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
mathematics.		will be		assessments and review		
					Teacher-made tests,	
		with grade-		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	FCAT			based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	Mathematics		'		STAR Math and FCAT	
	Test the	opportunities	Math Liaison			
	Reporting	that				
	Category of	promote the		Provide during grade level		
		use of		meetings to share best	Summative:	
	and	geometric		practices and reflect on		
	Measuremen	knowledge			Results from Interim	
	t shows a	and spatial		data reports and student	Assessments, STAR	
		reasoning to		performance through the use		
		develop		of hands on activities	Mathematics Assessment.	
		foundations				
		for				
		understandin				
		g perimeter,				
		area,				
		volume, and				
		surface area;				
		these				
	understandin					
		should				
	determining					
		selection of				
		appropriate				
		units,				
		strategies,				
		and tools to solve				
		problems				
		involving				
		these				
		measures.				1

_			 			
ſ		Students	 			
	k	will also			1	
	Į.	participate	İ	(
	ľ	in the	İ	(
-	Ľ	following				
-	ľ	following activities:				
	į a	activities:	İ	(
	l		İ	(
	l		İ	(
	l		İ	(
	l	•	İ	(
	l	Ma	İ	(
	l	nip	İ	(
	l	ulat	İ	(
	I	ives	İ	Į i		
1	I	1,03	İ			
	I	• Suc	İ	<u> </u>		
	I		İ	Į i		
	l	cess Ma	İ	(
	I		İ	Į i		
	I	ker	İ			
	I	_	İ	Į i		
	l	• 5-	İ	(
	I	Min	İ	Į i		
	l	ute	İ	(
	l	W	İ	(
	I	alk	İ	Į i		
	l	Thr	İ	(
	l	oug	İ	(
1	I	hs	İ	Į i		
1	I		İ	Į i		
1	I	• Mi	İ	Į i		
1	l	ni-	İ	(
1	l		İ	(
1	l	less ons	İ	(
- 1		ons	1	1	١	q I

#2 A ·	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicate that 76% of the students made learning gains.							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5% percentage points to 81%.							
	76% (131)	81% (139)					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	

3B. Florida 3B.1. 3B.1. 3B.1. 3B.1. 3B.1.	
	[]
Alternate	[]
Assessment:	
Percentage of	[]
students making	<i>[</i>]
learning gains in	
mathematics.	
Mathematics Goal #3R· 2012 Current Level of Level of Level of	
#3B: Level of Level of Parformance:* Reformance:*	l ['
Performance:* Performance:*	[]
	[]
	[]
N/A	
	1
	1
	ĺ
N/A N/A	
	1
	1
3B.2. 3B.2. 3B.2. 3B.2. 3B.2. 3B.2.	<u> </u>
рв.2. рв.2. рв.2. рв.2. рв.2.	1
	1
3B.3. 3B.3. 3B.3. 3B.3. 3B.3.	
	1
Based on the analysis of Anticipated Strategy Person or Position Process Used to Determine Evaluation Tool	
student achievement data Barrier Barrier	Į
student achievement data Barrier and reference to "Guiding Barrier Barrier Barrier	
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and Responsible for Monitoring Effectiveness of Strategy	
student achievement data Barrier and reference to "Guiding Barrier Barrier Barrier	

4. FCAT 2.0:	4A1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
Percentage of						
students in lowest						
25% making						
learning gains in	Based on	Students will	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
mathematics.	our data	be provided	-	assessments and review		
mathematics.	analysis of	with grade-	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress and	Teacher-made tests,	
		level			Baseline Assessment,	
	FCAT	appropriate	Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	Mathematics			•	STAR Math and FCAT	
			Math Liaison			
		the use of				
	Category of			Provide during grade level		
		knowledge			Summative:	
		and spatial		practices and reflect on		
	Measuremen			additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
		to develop		data reports and student	Assessments, STAR	
	deficiency	foundations		performance through the use		
	in students	for			Mathematics Assessment.	
	scoring a	understandin				
	Level 3 due	g perimeter,				
	to the lack	area,				
	of	volume,				
	knowledge	and surface				
	in	area; these				
	development	activities				
		should				
	understandin					
	g of area,	selection of				
	determining	appropriate				
	the area of	units,				
		strategies,				
	dimensional					
		to solve				
		problems				
	angles.	involving				
		these				
		measures.				
		Students will				
		engage in the				

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

	following			
1	activities:			
1				
1	• Ma			
1	nip			
1	ulat			
1	ives			
1				
1	• Suc			
1	cess			
1	Ma			
1	ker			
1				
1	• 5-			
1	Min			
1	ute			
1	W			
1	alk			
1	Thr			
1	oug			
1	hs			
1				
	• Mi			
1	ni-			
	less			
- 1	i ons			

Mathematics Goal #4: The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicate that 69% in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5% percentage points to 74%.							
	69% (27)	74% (29)					
		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	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
following years 5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	87%
Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.							
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	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
subgroups by						
ethnicity (White,	White: 90% (18)					
Black, Hispanic,	DI 1 920/ (0)			G 1 .11 .11	<u>.</u>	
Asian, American	Black: 83% (9)	Students will be provided	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
Indian) not making	Hispanic: 83% (192)	with grade-level		assessments and review		
satisfactory progress in mathematics.	` ` ` /	appropriate opportunities		data to ensure progress	Teacher-made tests,	
in mathematics.	Asian: N/A	that promote the use of		and adjust curriculum	Baseline Assessment,	
	American Indian: N/A	geometric knowledge	1	focus based on data	Interim Assessment,	
	i interiodir maidir. 1771	and spatial reasoning to		reports.	STAR Math and FCAT	
		develop foundations for	Math Liaison			
	Based on our data	understanding perimeter,				
		area, volume, and surface		Dunasi da damina amada lassal	S	
	analysis of the 2011 FCAT Mathematics	area; these activities should include the selection of		Provide during grade level	Summative:	
	Test the Reporting			meetings to share best practices and reflect on	Results from Interim	
		appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems		additional needs based on		
		involving these measures.		data reports.	Math and 2013 FCAT 2.0	
		Students will engage in the		data reports.	Mathematics Assessment.	
	scoring a Level 3 due to	following activities:			iviatiiciiiaties Assessiiieiit.	
	the lack of knowledge	ionowing activities.				
	in development and	 Manipulatives 				
	understanding of area,	1 viampulatives				
	determining the area of	 SuccessMaker 				
	two- three dimensional	Successivianci				
	shapes, and classifying	• 5-Minute Walk				
	angles.	Throughs				
	mii 5103.	Imoughs				
		 Mini-lessons 				
		1000000				

Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
#5B:	Performance:*	Performance:*					
The results of the							
2011-2012 FCAT							
2.0 Math assessment							
indicated that 84% of our subgroups are not							
meeting standards.							
Our goal for the 2012							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math							
is to increase the							
percentage of students							
meeting standards by							
1 percentage points to 85%							
0370							
	84%	85%					
	White: 89% (18)	White: 90% (18)					
	Black:82% (9)	Black:83% (9)					
	Hispanic: 82% (189)	Hispanic: 83% (189)					
	Asian: N/A	Asian: N/A					
	American Indian: N/A	American Indian: N/A					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
						22.3.	

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

5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	
Language Learners	56.1.	56.1.	56.1.	JC.11.	Je.1.	
(ET I)412						
satisfactory progress in mathematics.						
in mathematics.	Based on	Students will	Leadership Team	Conduct bi-weekly	Formative:	
in mathematics.	our data	be provided	-	assessments and review		
	analysis of	with grade-	MTSS/RtI Team	data to ensure progress and	Teacher-made tests,	
	the 2011	level		adjust curriculum focus	Baseline Assessment,	
	FCAT	appropriate	Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
	Mathematics	opportunities	•	•	STAR Math and FCAT	
	Test the	that promote	Math Liaison			
		the use of				
	Category of			Provide during grade level		
		knowledge		meetings to share best	Summative:	
		and spatial		practices and reflect on		
	Measuremen			additional needs based on	Results from Interim	
		to develop		data reports and student	Assessments, STAR	
		foundations			Math and 2013 FCAT 2.0	
	_	for			Mathematics Assessment.	
	scoring a	understandin				
	Level 3 due	g perimeter,				
		area,				
		volume,				
	knowledge	and surface				
		area; these				
	development	activities				
		should				
	understandin	include the				
	g of area,	selection of				
	determining	appropriate				
		units,				
	two- three	strategies,				
	dimensional	and tools				
		to solve				
	classifying	problems				
		involving				
		these				
		measures.				
		Students will				
		participate in				

		the following	o e		
		activities:	1		
		• Ma			
		I Via			
١		nip			
١		ulat			
١		ives	8		
١					
١		• Suc	; 		
		ces	s		
١		Ma			
١		ker			
١					
١		• 5-			
١		Min			
١		ute			
١		W			
١					
١		alk			
		Thr			
-		oug			
		hs			
		• Mi			
-		ni-			
		less	: [
-		ons			
١					

Mathematics Goal #5C: 2012 Co Level o Perform	Current 20 of Lemance:* Pe	013 Expected evel of erformance:*					
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicated that 78% of our English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math is to increase the percentage of students meeting standards by 5 percentage points to 83%							
78%	% (20)	83% (21)					
	50	C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
	50	C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

D 1 4 1 1 6	A 41 1 1	Ct. t	p p 4	D II 1/ D / '	F 1 (T 1	1	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding	Ваппег						
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the							
following subgroup:							
5D. Students	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#5D:	Level of	Level of					
<u>#3D.</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
DT/A							
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
	11/11	1 1,712					
	_	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
						l	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
						l	
					<u>l</u>	l	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		

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

student achievement data

and reference to "Guiding

Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

Barrier

Responsible for Monitoring

Effectiveness of Strategy

5E. Economically	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	
Disadvantaged						
satisfactory progress in mathematics.						
in mathematics.	Based on		Leadership Team	J	Formative:	
	our data	be provided		assessments and review		
			MTSS/RtI Team		Teacher-made tests,	
	the 2011	level			Baseline Assessment,	
			Department Chair	based on data reports.	Interim Assessment,	
		opportunities			STAR Math and FCAT	
			Math Liaison			
		the use of				
	Category of			Provide during grade level		
		knowledge			Summative:	
		and spatial		practices and reflect on		
	Measuremen				Results from Interim	
		to develop			Assessments, STAR	
		foundations			Math and 2013 FCAT 2.0	
		for			Mathematics Assessment.	
		understandin				
	Level 3 due					
		area, volume,				
		and surface				
		area; these				
		activities				
	development					
		include the				
	understandin					
		appropriate				
	determining				1	
		strategies,				
		and tools				
	dimensional				1	
	shapes, and				1	
		involving				
	angles.	these				
		measures.			1	
		Students will			1	
		engage in the			1	
1		following			1	

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

	activitie	ies.		
		Ma		
		ninu		
		nipu lativ		
		es		
	•	~		
		cess		
		Ma		
		ker		
	•	5-		
		Min		
		ute		
		W		
		alk		
		Thr		
		oug hs		
		115		
	•	Mi		
		ni-		
		less		
		ons		
1	1	i		

# 5 E.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment indicated that 83% of our Students who are Economically Disadvantaged student's not making satisfactory progress in reading.							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math is to increase the percentage of students meeting standards by 1 percentage points to 84%.							
	83%	84%.					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	
				1			

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

chool Mathema	iPs Cibbans-						
	Solving						
	Process to						
	Increase						
	Student						
	Achievem						
	ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
following group:							
1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Students scoring at							
Achievement Level 3							
in mathematics.	2012 G	2012 F					
11100 COUL	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
<u>#1A:</u>		Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
1	1	I		I	1	I	I

	1	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1D El 11	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
1B. Florida	1B.1.	IB.I.	IB.1.	1B.1.	IB.1.		
Aggagement							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#1B:	Level of	Level of					
#1 D .	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		15.2.	13.2.	13.2.	15.2.	15.2.	
			h n a				
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier			1			
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of				1			
improvement for the							
following group:	ļ.	ļ.	l .	ı	ı		

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
			2A.2.			2A.2.	
			2A.3.			2A.3.	
Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

#2B.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	[
						2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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:		Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
0.11.1 0.11.1 2000	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	1	
Percentage of	1	1	1	1	1	1	
students making learning gains in	1 '	1	1	1	1	1	
mathematics.	<u> </u> '	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							

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

N/A	N/A					
	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		l
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding	Barrier			l	1		l
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	1		l
define areas in need of			_		1		l
improvement for the					1		1
following group:					1		l [
4. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Percentage of							1
					1		l
students in lowest					1		1
25% making					1		l [
learning gains in					1		1
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of			1		l [
	Performance:*	Performance:*			1		1
					1		l
N/A					1		1
IN/A					1		1
					1		l
					1		1
					1		1
					1		1
					1		l
					1		l
					1		l
	N/A	N/A					
	[''	1,17=			1		l
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
					1		l
		<u> </u>			ļ		
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	1
					1		
							<u> </u>
Based on ambitious	2011	-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
but achievable Annual					1		
Measurable Objectives					1		
(AMOs), identify					1		
reading and mathematics							
performance target for the							
following years					l .		

5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011					
Mathematics Goal						
#5A:						
N/A						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
Questions," identify and define areas in need of			recoponition for informering	Enterness of Stategy		
improvement for the						
following subgroups:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
5B. Student subgroups by	D.1.	55.1.	55.1.	00.1.	D.11.	
ethnicity (White,	White:					
Black, Hispanic,	Black:					
Asian, American	Black:					
Indian) not making	Hispanic:					
satisfactory progress	Asian:					
in mathematics.						
1	American Indian:					

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<u></u>							
N/A							
IVA							
	N/A	N/A					
	White:	White:					
	Black:	Black:					
	Hispanic:	Hispanic:					
	Asian:	Asian:					
	American Indian:	American Indian: 5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		DB.2.	35.2.	56.2.	DB.2.	ов.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool			
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding	; 	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy				
Questions," identify and define areas in need of							
improvement for the following subgroup:							

5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Language Learners	00.1.						
(ELL) = 4 = 4 = 4							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
#5C:	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	r criormance.	r criormanec.					
N/A							
	NT / A	NT / A					
	N/A	N/A					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Danid on the such in C	A4: -:4: 1	Church	Danasa an Danidia.	Durana Hardan Datan '	Faralization Total		
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding	Duillei			For the contract of			
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the							
following subgroup:	5D.1.	5D.1.	ED 1	5D.1.	5D.1.		
e z v z v u u c m v s	DD.1.	טע.ו.	5D.1.	DD.1.	DD.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.			ĺ				

	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of	1	'	1		[
#5D:	Performance:*	Performance:*	1	1	1	1	[
'	1 '	1	1	1	1	1	1
N/A	1 '	1	1	1	1	1	['
!	1 '	1	1	1	1	1	[
!	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
'	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
!	1	1	1	1	1	1	['
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	 '	 '
	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	[
-	_	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
	'	1	1	1	1	1	[
	1	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Deed on the analysis of	T Anticipated	Ctrotagy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	т	T
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person of Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation 1001	1	
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and	1 '	1	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	1	1	
define areas in need of improvement for the	1 '	1	1	1	1	1	
following subgroup:	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	 '	<u> </u>
5E. Economically Disadvantaged	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	1	
students not making	1	1	1	1	1	1	
satisfactory progress		1	1	1	1	1	
in mathematics.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		

	#5E:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
]	N/A							
			N/A					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

igh Sch	ool Matl	hemat				
		Solving				
		Process to				
		Increase				
		Student				
		Achievem				
		ent				

Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier	Strategy	1 crson of 1 ostilon	1 locess osed to Determine	Evaluation 1001		
and reference to "Guiding	5		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of improvement for the							
following group:							
1. Florida Alternate	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
	· 2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Mathematics Goal #1	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
	NT / A	NT/A					
	N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		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	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier	I					
and reference to "Guiding	5		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and				1			
following group:							
2. Florida Alternate	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	_	_
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
mathematics.							
define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2. Florida Alternate Assessment:	2.1.	2.1.		2.1.	2.1.		

Mathematics Goal #2:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A			1				
			1				
			1				
	N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
						-	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
following group:	2 1	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment:	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.		
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in				1			
mathematics.				1	1		

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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	Problem-				
Goals	Solving				
	Process to				
	Increase				
	Student				
	Achievem				
	ent				

		a	n n :::	N W 1. D .	F 1 2 F 1	1	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier			Effectiveness of			
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring				
Questions," identify and define areas in need of				Strategy			
improvement for the							
following group:							
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in Algebra 1.							
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
IN/A							
	N/A	N/A					
	IV/A	1 1 // / 1					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier				ĺ		
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and			1]			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the following group:							
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
	٤.1.	∠.1.	L.1.	Z.1.	F.1.		
at or above					ĺ		
Achievement Levels					ĺ		
4 and 5 in Algebra 1.					ĺ		
4 and 5 in Aigebra 1.							

Algebra Goal #2:		2013 Expected Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
IN/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		0.2	2.2	h 2	2.2	2.2	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress	White: Black: Hispanic:						
ili Algebia 1.	Asian: American Indian:						

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	NT / A	NT / A					
	N/A	N/A					
	White:	White:					
	Black:	Black:					
	Hispanic:	Hispanic:					
	Asian:	Asian:					
	Amencan mulan.	American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
		22.0.	22.2.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,	22.0.	

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:		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					
		3C.2. 3C.3.	3C.2. 3C.3.	3C.2. 3C.3.		3C.2. 3C.3.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.5.	50.5.	
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		

o D i o tu u cinto	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making satisfactory progress							
in Algebra 1.							
Algebra 1 Goal #3D:		2013 Expected					
-	<u>Level of</u> Performance:*	<u>Level of</u> Performance:*					
	i citormance.	i citormance.					
N/A							
1 1/11							
	N/A	N/A					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

D 1 d 1 : C		Ci i	D D :::	D II I D :	P 1 4 7 7 1	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
student achievement data	Barrier					
and reference to "Guiding				7.00		
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
define areas in need of						
improvement for the						
following subgroup:						
3E. Economically	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	
Disadvantaged						
students not making						
satisfactory progress						
in Algebra 1.						

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC	Problem-			
Goals	Solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			
	ent			

Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier						
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and define areas in need of			responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
improvement for the							
following group:							
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in Geometry.							
		2013 Expected					
Geometry Gour 111.	<u>Level of</u>	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	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	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier	Strategy	1 013011 01 1 03111011	110ccss Osca to Determine	Lvaluation 1001		
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and			responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of improvement for the							
following group:							
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Geometry.							
L. and 5 in Geometry.	<u> </u>			I			

Geometry Goal #2: N/A	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	NI/A					
	N/A	N/A 2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce	Baseline data 2011- 2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	N/A						

Geometry Goal #3A:						
N/A						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
define areas in need of improvement for the						
following subgroups:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
subgroups by	DD.1.	эв.1.	55.1.	DB.11.	DB.11	
ethnicity (White,	White:					
Black, Hispanic, Asian, American	Black:					
T 1' \ 4 I •	Hispanic:					
satisfactory progress in Geometry.	Agione					
in Geometry.	Asian.					
	American Indian:					
Geometry Goal #3B:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of				
		Performance:*				
NI/A						
N/A						

1	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	1
1	ſ '	i" '	1	i '	1	1	i I
	1 '	1	1 '	ĺ	1	1	i ['
	1 '	1 '	1	ĺ	1	1	i ['
1	L., '	L., '	1	i '	1	1	i
	White:	White:	1	i '	1	1	[1
	Black:	Black:	'				
	1 '	ı '	1	·	1	1	
	Hispanic:	Hispanic:	1	i '	1	1	[1
	1	1	1	i '	1	1	[1
	Asian:	Asian:	1	i '	1	1	
	1	l	1	l '	1	1	
		American	1	i '	1	1	[1
		Indian:	<u> </u>				
	1 '	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	1 '		1	i '	1	1	1
	↓ ′	<u>'</u>	 '				
	1 '	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	
	1 '	1 '	1	i '	1	1	
	1 '	4	1	1	· ,	1	<i>i</i> i
		<u> </u>				<u> </u>	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier	Strategy			Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding	Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and	Barrier	Strategy			Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of	Barrier	Strategy			Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the	Barrier	Strategy			Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 3C. English	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool 3C.1.		
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 3C. English Language Learners	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making	Barrier 3C.1.		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 3C. English Language Learners	Barrier 3C.1.		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			

F			•	i e	i	1	
Geometry Goal #3C:		2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
IVA							
	N/A	N/A					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
		Q: ·	7 7	7 1 7			
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier						
and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the							
following subgroup:							
3D. Students	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
(S VV D) HOU HIAKING							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							

	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<u> </u>	r on on manes.					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
following subgroup:	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged	DE.1.	DE.1.	DE.1.	DE.1.	DE.1.		
students not making							
satisfactory progress in Geometry.							

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

PD Content/Topic	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level,	meetings)		for Monitoring
Common Core - Math	K-5	PLC Leader Trainer & Mathematics Liaison	or school-wide) Kinder through Fifth	August 2012	Monitoring teacher lesson plans.	Grade level chairs
Effective Differentiated Instruction to focus on Geometry and Fractions Content Clusters.	Grade 3-5 Mathematics	Grade Level Chairs & Mathematics Liaison	3 rd -5 th Grade Mathematics Teachers	Target Date: August 20, 2012 to June 2013 Monthly Basis	Lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and monthly meetings with all Professional Learning Communities with the Administration	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Liaison
Teachers will attend PD to gain knowledge of concepts taught through the use literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for children to successfully grasp measurement and fraction concepts and allow students to make connections with realworld situations.						
Success Maker	Grade 3-5 Mathematics	Trainer & Mathematics Liaison	PLC Leaders & 3 rd -5 th grade Mathematics Teachers	Target Date: August 2012- September 2013	Mathematics small group schedule	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Math Liaison

$\underline{Mathematics\ Budget}\ (\text{Insert\ rows\ as\ needed})$

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

PD

	T .		T
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
PENDA	PENDA Learning is an online math and science resource providing interesting math and science materials for preparing for the FCAT.	Operating Funds	\$1,995.00
Subtotal: \$1,995.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PENDA	PENDA Learning is an online math and science resource providing interesting math and science materials for preparing for the FCAT.	Operating Funds	\$1,200.00
Subtotal: \$1, 200.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total: \$ 3, 195.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1 A ECATE 2 0	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
	1A.1.	1A.1.	IA.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at						
Achievement Level 3						
in science.	The area of	Students	Leadership Team	C 4 1- : 1-1	Formative:	
		will be	1	Conduct bi-weekly assessments and review		
			IN ATTRICT (ID #1 Traceres		Science projects	
	the 2012	with grade-		data to ensure progress and adjust curriculum focus		
	administratio		Department Chair	based on data reports.	Teacher made tests	
	n of the	appropriate	_	based on data reports.		
	FCAT		Science Liaison		Baseline Assessment	
	Science	that				
	Test was	develop		Provide during grade level	Interim Assessment	
	Big Idea:	science and		meetings to share best		
		engineering		practices and reflect on		
		projects to		additional needs based on		
		increase		data reports and student	Summative:	
	of	scientific		nerformance		
		thinking and			Science projects	
	and	the				
		development			Teacher made tests	
	instructional				T	
	strategies	implementati on of			Interim Assessment	
	and				Science FCAT 2.0	
	activities	inquiry based			Science FCA1 2.0	
	that are linked to	activities				
	research,	that allow				
	collaboration					
	, design, and					
		hypothesis,				
	instructional					
		analysis,				
	that increase					
	inquiry	of variables,				
	based	and				
	learning in	experimental				
	Physical	design in				
	Science.	Physical				
		Science.				

	Students			
	take part in			
	the			
	following			
	activities:			
	• Lab			
	S			
	• GIZ	-		
	MO			
	S			
	• 5-			
	● 3- Min			
	ute			
	W			
	alk			
	thro			
	ugh			
	S	1		

Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
1	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
	errormance.	errormance.					
The results of the							
2012 FCAT 2.0							
Science assessment							
indicated that 43% of							
the students achieved							
proficiency. (Level 3).							
Our goal for the 2012-							
2013 school year							
is to increase the							
percentage of students							
achieving proficiency							
(Level 3) by 3%							
percentage points to 46%.							
46%.							
	43% (42)	46% (45)					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
science.							
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Science Goal #1B.	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	I	
student achievement data	Barrier	Suarces	1 Cibon of 1 conton	1100000 Coca to Determine	Diamanon 1001		
and reference to "Guiding			n	F.C. C. C.C.			
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the							
following group:							

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
	2A.1.	ZA.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
Students scoring						
at or above						
Achievement Levels	The area of	Students	Leadership Team		Formative:	
4 and 5 in science.		will be	•	Conduct bi-weekly	01111101	
			IN ACTION / ID #1 CT on see	adjust curriculum focus	Science projects	
	the 2012	with			Serence projects	
	administratio				Teacher made tests	
	n of the	activities			reacher made tests	
	FCAT		Science Liaison		Baseline Assessment	
	Science	use of	Belefice Elaison		Buseline Hissessment	
	Test was	technology		L	Interim Assessment	
	Big Idea:	in multi-age		Provide during grade level		
	Physical	learning		meetings to share best		
		environment.		practices and reflect on		
	to the lack	Which will		additional needs based on	Summative:	
	of	develop		data reports and student		
		science and		performance.	Science projects	
	and	engineering			1 3	
	exposure to	projects to			Teacher made tests	
	instructional					
	strategies	scientific			Interim Assessment	
	and	thinking and				
	activities	the			Science FCAT 2.0	
	that are	development				
	linked to	and				
	increase	implementati				
	inquiry	on of				
	based	inquiry				
	learning in	based				
	Physical	activities				
	Science.	that allow				
		for testing				
		of				
		hypothesis,				
		data				
		analysis,				
		explanation				
1		of variables,	l		1	

ſ	_	and			
1		experimental			
1		design in			
1		Physical			
1		Physical Science.			
1		Students			
1		will engage			
1		in the			
1		following			
1		activities:			
1					
1		• Lab			
1		S			
1					
1		• GIZ			
1		MO			
1		S			
1		_			
1		• 5-			
1		Min			
1		ute			
1		W			
1		alk			
1		thro			
		ugh			
		S			
-1					

Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
20% (19)	21% (20)					
	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
science.							
Science Goal #2B:	2012 Current	2013Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
	NT/A	NT/A					
	N/A	N/A					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
		20.3.	20.3.	20.3.	20.3.	49. J.	
			1				

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

		· ·		
High School	Problem-			
Science Goals	Solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			

		1		1	1		
	ent						
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data	Barrier	Strategy	T CIDOM OF T COMMON	1100055 0500 to 20001111110	Evaluation 1001		
and reference to "Guiding			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Wontoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the following group:							
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
science.	2012 G	2012 F					
Science Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
		Performance:*					
	r criormanee.	r criormanec.					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1 ·	<u> </u>] ·	i	··	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
student achievement data,	Barrier	Strategy	1 CISON OF I OSITION	1 10ccss Osca to Determine	Lvaruation 1001		
and reference to "Guiding			D 31.6 M 34.5	F.CC 4: C.C. 4			
Questions", identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of							
improvement for the							
following group:							

2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
	Level of	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
						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	Problem-			
Goals	Solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Student			
	Achievem			
	ent			

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

	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	Level of					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
						2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) Science Liaison	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow	-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Principal, Assistant Principal, and Science Liaison
Develop Professional Learning Communities for Science	5 th Grade	Trainer / Professional Development		September 2012-June 2013 Monthly	Lesson plan revie walkthroughs, a meetings with all Learning Commu Administ	and monthly l Professional nities with the	Science Etaison
Professional Learning Communities Focus on Physical Science	5 th Grade	Science Coach	5th Grade Science Teachers	September 2011-June 2012 Monthly Basis	Monthly walktl observa		Principal, Assistant Principal, and Science Liaison
Common Core - Science	K-5	Trainer & cience Liaison	Kinder through Fifth	August 2012	Monitoring teacher	er lesson plans.	Grade level chairs
Science Budget (In	sert rows as n	eeded)					
Include only school-base activities/materials and a funded activities/materials	ed funded exclude district als.						
Evidence-based Program	n(s)/Materials(s)						
Strategy		Description	of Resources	Funding Source		Amount	

In Grade 5, students will show an increase in mastery levels in the Big Idea: Physical Science on the 2013 Science FCAT due to teachers providing enrichment activities for students to design science projects to increase scientific thinking. They will also provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students	Science experiment supplies will be ordered to properly conduct weekly investigations.	Operating Accounts	\$1,000.00
to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, and apply knowledge gained on key instructional concepts.			
In Grade 3-5 teachers will provide enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Scientific Thinking.	Studies Weekly	EESAC	\$1,152.69
Scotts Foresman 3 rd grade science textbooks teaches curriculum is organized into four units—Life, Earth, Physical, and Space and Technology. Each unit contains a balance between key science content and hands-on activities that support each lesson.	Student science textbooks and teachers editions.	Operating Account	\$2,184.16
Subtotal: \$4,336.85			
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: \$4,336.85			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1A. FCAT:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at						
Achievement Level						
3.0 and higher in						
writing.	The areas of		Leadership Team		Formative:	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		writing		score students' monthly		
	as noted on		MTSS/RtI Team		Monthly writing	
		students			assessments,	
			Lead Teacher	adjust focus as needed.		
		graphic			FCAT Writing Pretest	
			Reading Liaison			
	FCAT were					
		organized				
		with a			Summative:	
		logical			DOLD WILL DOLD	
	of Narrative				FCAT Writing Post Test,	
	writing that				FCAT 2.0 Writing Test	
		middle, and				
		end and use				
		supporting				
		details to				
		develop				
		focus and				
		elaboration, voice, and				
		details.				
		Students				
		will also				
		use revision				
		and editing				
		marks to				
		better their				
		paper.				

<u> </u>	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing							
Test indicate that 97% of students scored a							
Level 3 or higher.							
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school							
year is to maintain the percentage 97%							
students scoring Level 3 or higher.							
5 of higher.							
	97% (87)	97% (87)					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate Assessment:							
Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.							

		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	conominance.	conormance.					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	IB.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
		15.5.	13.5.	15.5.	13.3.	13.5.	

Writing Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	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
Common Core - Writing	K-5 3-4 Language Arts	PLC Leader Trainer & Reading Liaison	Kinder through Fifth	August 2012	Monitoring teacher lesson plans.	Grade level chairs
PLC will focus on narrative and expository writing		Reading/Writing Coach	g3 rd – 4 th Grade Language Arts teachers	August 13, 2012	Monthly writing prompt scores monitored by PLC	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Liaison
PLC will focus on Grammar	3-4 Language Arts	Reading/Writing Coach	2 nd − 4 th Grade Language Arts teachers	August 2012	Monitor PLC minutes and walkthroughs	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Liaison
The focus will be on teaching editing, revisions, and on how to use the holistic scoring rubric.	2-4 Language Arts	Reading/Writing Coach	2 nd – 4 th Grade Language Arts teachers	August 2012-June 2013	Weekly monitoring of student writing samples to be submitted into their writing folders. In addition, students will utilize red pens when self-correcting their writing prompt as well as their peers.	-
PLC will focus on the six traits of writing.	K-5 Language Arts Teachers	Reading/Writing Coach	Kinder through Fifth	September 17, 2012	Students receive instruction on the six traits of writing.	Grade level chairs
Writing Budget (I	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
Zaner Bloser – Writing curriculum teaches students to apply the six traits of writing at every step of the writing process—across Common Core State Standards text types and genres and across the curriculum.	Writing textbook and student workbooks.	Operating Funds	\$10,814.55
Subtotal: \$10,814.55			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Zaner Bloser – professional representative demonstrated the use of writing tools and applied to real writing samples.	Zaner Bloser certified personnel instructed teachers on the six traits of writing through the use of writing samples.	Operating Account	\$1,414.00
Subtotal:\$1,414.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:\$12,228.55			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC	Problem-			
Goals	Solving			

	Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		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.		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
			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	Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
improvement for the following group:							
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Civics.							
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
IV/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
		۵.5.	د.ے.	E.J.	۷.٥.	∠. J.	

Civics Professional Development

Professional
Development
(PD) aligned with
Strategies through
Professional
Learning
Community (PLC)
August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

or PD Activity

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

PD Content /Topic Grade Lev Subject

Grade Level/ PD

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

N/A

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

This bugget (misert tows as needs				
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 Civics Goals

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

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

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

U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A.							
- "							
	N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
and reference to "Guiding	Barrier		D TICM	Ecc. 4: CG4 4			
Questions," identify and			Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
define areas in need of improvement for the							
following group:							
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in U.S.							
History. U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
N/A							
1							

	N/A	N/A					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendan	ce Problem-			
Goal(s)	solving			
	Process to			
	Increase			
	Attendan			
	ce			

			•	•		
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Attendance	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
	Even though	Teachers	Assistant Principal	General Education Teacher		
	a high attendance	will	Guidance Counselor	will call students home after 2 absences.		
	absences	incorporate grade level appropriate	Department Chair	Administrators will monitor		
	to student	lessons on hygiene.		the school environment to ensure cleanliness in order to promote a healthy culture for students while they are learning.		
		Provide incentives for students such as				
		Maintain a clean environment throughout the school.				

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

112	106					
•						
		students such as: • Student of the		I.2. General Education Teacher will monitor students unexcused absences	1.2. Attendance Roster	
		Award				
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
		PLC Leader	,			
		Attendance		August 2012-June 2013		Attendance Clerk and
		Clerk and				Administration
	K-5 th	Grade Book	General Education Teachers		Attendance Program will be	
		Manager	and Non-Instructional Staff		implemented the first day of school	
Attendance Program					and monitored on a monthly basis.	

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
Truancy Prevention	Provide incentives for students with improved attendance	EESAC	\$ 500.00
Subtotal: \$500.00			
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: \$500.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension	1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
	Student suspension rates are due to the lack of unfamiliarity with the Student Code of Conduct. The total number of indoor	In-Class Behavior Management Plans. Parents and students will be informed of Code of Conduct and must sign Code of Conduct Contract.	Principal Guidance Counselor Lead Teacher	General Education Teacher will keep parent	Parent Contact Logs and Suspension Reports	
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by at least 1%.	of In —School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	2	2				

<u>o</u>	of Students	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended					
<u>Ir</u>	n-School	<u>In -School</u>					
	2	2					
2:	2012 Total	2013 Expected Number of					
	Number of Out-of- School Suspensions	Out-of-School Suspensions					
	3	3					
0	of Students	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended					
	Out- of- School	Out- of-School					
	3	3					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
		PLC Leader	,			
		All Staff	All grades, subjects, school-	August 2012-June 2013		Grade Level Chairs and
		Members	wide	Č		Administration
Student Code of	K-5 th				Monitor Teacher's behavior	
Conduct Contract					management plans	
	K-5 th	On individual basis				
Parent Training			Parent, Teacher and Administration	September 10, 2012	Teacher and Administration	Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Teachers and/or Administration will contact parents of students who have been on indoor suspension. Parents will be provided with a copy of the Student Code of Conduct.	Printing of Student Code of Conduct	Operating Accounts	\$ 300.00
Subtotal: \$300.00			
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: \$300.00				

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Dropout Rate:*	Dropout Rate:*					
Dropout Prevention							
Goal #1:							
N/A							
·							
	N/A	N/A					
		2013 Expected					
	Graduation Rate:*	Graduation Rate:*					
		N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

N/A

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

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)

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)).

	solving Process to Parent Involveme nt					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
		Mentor			Sign in sheets	
				determine the number of		
		attend group		limited English proficient		
		programs		parents attending school		
		and activities		events		
		they feel				
1		comfortable				
		participating in school				
		events				
		functions,				
		notify				
		and invite				
		parents/				
		guardians in a				
		timely matter				
		to make				
		appropriate				
		arrangements.				

Parent Involvement Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
Given a strong emphasis on the parental involvement at the school, 92% of parents will complete the volunteer hours defined in the parent contract during the 2012-2013 school year, as evidenced by the teacher and volunteer logs.							
	92% (527)	93% (493)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		have limited knowledge and understanding of information of the	as Open House FCAT Parent Night, Science Fair Parent Night, and Technology	Principal General Ed Teacher	Review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school events	Sign in sheets	

ſ		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
١							
-							

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	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
and/or PLC Focus		and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
		PLC Leader				
	K-5 th	Counselor	Parents and Guardians	August 20, 2012-Ongoing	Review Sign in sheets/logs to	
		and General			determine the number of parents	
Student Data		Education			attending	Student Data
		Teacher				

for

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
N/A			
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s) 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	Evaluation Tool
				Strategy	

STEM Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to engage students with STEM school wide technological activities and fairs. This will allow students to interact with technological skills within their reading, mathematical, and scientific curriculum and how it relates to personal experiences.	Due to the lack	During the 2012-2013 students in grades 2-5 will engage in weekly hands on reading and	Leadership Team MTSS/RTI Team Department Chair Science Liaison Math Liaison Reading Liaison	Grade level chairs and teachers will meet weekly to discuss, plan, and monitor scientific labs, student performances in SuccessMaker and GIZMOS. The leadership will conduct daily classroom walk throughs to monitor student progression and use of higher order questioning.	Eormative: Baseline Assessment Interim Assessment FCAT Test Maker GIZMO SuccessMaker STAR Math STAR Reading Quarterly Exams Classroom Walk Throughs
		Teachers will also engage students in GIZMO activities that will help students develop a comprehension of any challenging scientific concepts through exploration of the concepts.			Summative: 2013 Mathematics FCAT 2.0 2013 Science FCAT 2.0
		Also, students in K-5 will participate in the Science fair.			2013 Reading FCAT 2.0

	Students will also have presenters in the mathematical and science career field.			
	Students in 5 th grade will participate in the environmental club.			
	Teachers will implement Time for Kids within their social studies and science curriculum in order to apply to current events and real world experiences.			
1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,

frequency of meetings)

Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

Professional Learning Communities Focus on Science Fair Project

K-5 Science Liaison Science Liaison

October 29, 2012-December 19, 2012

Lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and monthly meetings with all Professional Learning Communities with the Administration Principal, Assistant Principal, and Science Liaison

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) Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
NI/A					
N/A					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic

Grade Level/ Subject

PD Facilitator

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

and/or PLC Focus

PLC Leader

and/or

N/A

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)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Triffer abing percentages	, morace me	mannoer or st	additio the percentage	represents hear to the pe	10011tage (0.g. 7070	(30)).	
	Problem- Solving						
Additional Goal(s)	Process to						
	Increase						
	Student						
	Achieveme	ļ					
	nt						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool		
areas in need of improvement:				Strategy			

1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Level :*	Level :*					
N/A							
	N/A	N/A					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	

2012-2013 School Improvement	Pian (SII	')-Form S	SIP-I
------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-------

ſ		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
١							
-							

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 Grade Level/ Subject PD Facilitator

cilitator PD Participants

Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

and/or PLC Focus

and/or

(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)

PLC Leader

N/A

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
N/A			

		1	1
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 Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:
Science Budget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	

	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

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.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

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

The SAC at Somerset Academy Charter School is the sole body responsible for final decision making of the school. School Climate Survey and Assessment Data were reviewed to determine school needs for the 2012-2013 school year. In the beginning of the school year, the SIP will be reviewed and revisions will be made based on the recommendations from the SAC members. In June and August, the SIP will be sent to the district School Board for approval and implementation will begin in August 2012. The SIP will be monitored during the entire school year. The SAC reviews the SIP on a quarterly basis and makes necessary adjustments.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Somerset Academy purchased Time For Kids for students in Third through Fifth Grade.	\$1,124.80