Florida Department of Education

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: Pasco Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Katie Lail	Superintendent: Mrs. Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Angela Bennett	Date of School Board Approval:

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

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

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Katie Lail	BA- Elementary Ed., MA-Education Leadership, MA- Guidance and Counseling, SLD K-12, Math 6-8, ESOL Certification	1	8	11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 72%, Math 65%, Writing 81%, and Science 56%, Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 61%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 45% and Math 60% 09-10: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 73%, Math 70%, Writing 83%, and Science 51%, Learning Gains in Reading 60% and Math 73%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 42% and Math 74% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 78%, Math 64%, Writing 73%, and Science 52%, Learning Gains in Reading 75% and Math 66%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 63% 07-08: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 67%, Writing 68%, and Science 44%, Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 68%
Assistant Principal	Nena Green	BA-Elementary and Middle Ed., MA – School Administration	0		N/A

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Math	Lindsay Campbell	BA-Elementary Ed.	11	5	11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 65%, Math 61%, Writing 89%, and Science 34%, Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 62%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 58% 09-10: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 70%, Math 64%, Writing 77%, and Science 33%, Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 54%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 48% and Math 74% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 71%, Writing 86%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 68% and Math 64%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 69% and Math 72% 07-08: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 69%, Math 63%, Writing 70%, and Science 25%, Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 64%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 67%

Reading	Elizabeth Mitchell	MA-Reading, BA-Elementary Ed., ESOL certification	1	5	11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade A, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 77%, Math 70%, Writing 81%, and Science 63%, Learning Gains in Reading 67% and Math 65%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 53% and Math 68% 09-10: School Grade A, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 77%, Math 69%, Writing 84%, and Science 52%, Learning Gains in Reading 61% and Math 66%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 55% and Math 73% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 83%, Math 74%, Writing 84%, and Science 62%, Learning Gains in Reading 71% and Math 68%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 70% 07-08: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 67%, Writing 68%, and Science 44%, Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 68%

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruit: The district advertises and recruits regionally and nationally when necessary. HR Department carefully screens all applicants. Title 1 Principals were trained in the Haberman Assessment to ensure quality teachers are hired in high poverty schools.	Human Resources	On-going

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

2.	Retain: Beginning teachers are assigned to highly qualified teachers, who are trained as a mentors to provide support, resources and advice throughout the first year. In addition, all teachers are provided staff development and coaching opportunities to meet their individual professional needs.	District Office, School-based administrators, mentors and coaches	Monthly meetings and as needed throughout the year
3.			
4.			

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% (0)	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]).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
52	0	27% (14)	33% (18)	38% (20)	25% (13)	Data not available until 10/2012	20% (10)	2% (1)	84% (43)

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.

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Liz Mitchell	Instructional staff based upon data	Assistance w/implementation of 90 min. reading block w/fidelity	Coaching, Modeling
Lindsay Campbell	Instructional staff based upon data	Providing assistance with implementation of core math instruction using best practices.	Coaching, Modeling

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

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Title I funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school. Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to support after-school tutoring. SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I-Part D funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. Title I funds will be used to expand the summer school program to Level 2 students.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant funding will be used to provide Instructional Assistants to service migrant and/or homeless students. Migrant funding will be used to provide academic support and social services to students on the Priority for Services list.
Title I, Part D
Title II Title II funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school. IDEA funding will be used in conjunction with Title II funds to train teachers in the Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies that are proven to work with students with disabilities and students with behavior problems.
Title III Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide extra support to English Language Learners (ELLs) by offering after school tutoring in academic language acquisition, to assist ELLs meet the academic content and English proficiency standards. Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to support after-school tutoring.
Title X- Homeless District homeless social worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services, referrals) for students identified as homeless to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs The guidance department provides developmentally appropriate lessons to students in K-5 in violence prevention. The Sheriff Department provides an "Officer Friendly" to present Gang Resistance programs to students throughout the year.

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

Nutrition Programs Student Nutrition Services provides free breakfast to all students. Students are provided fruits and vegetables for a healthy snack. Lunch is free to eligible students.
Housing Programs
Head Start Pre-K provides assessment and preparation for Kindergarten.
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Members of the MTSS leadership team are: Administration, Literacy Coach, Math Resource Teacher, ESE Teacher, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, Behavior Specialist, K-5 General Education Teachers, Speech Language Pathologist, Technology Specialist and RtI Coach.
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 RtI Leadership team meets monthly to review universal screening data and progress monitoring data as well as plan for interventions. The leadership team will complete an assessment of the RtI implementation progress as well as the staff's practices and skill development to determine the level of technical assistance and professional development assistance needed to support the school-wide implementation of RtI. Members of the Lead Literacy Team, Team Facilitators, and PBS leadership team serve on the RtI Leadership to ensure RtI efforts are coordinated throughout the school.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI Leadership team will analyze current data including relevant demographic and school profile information, school-wide and grade level achievement data, progress monitoring data, student, staff and parent surveys as well as disaggregated data to make recommendations for school improvement. They also plan for interventions, gather resources for support, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for RtI interventions to be successful.
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. Student data is housed with-in Pasco Star, PMRN, Core K-12 and Terms. Data may be accessed through these systems for problem-solving with whole school, grade, class and individual students. In addition, formative classroom data is collected for each academic area throughout the year. The leadership team presents this data graphically in grade level meetings to facilitate curriculum and instructional decisions to meet students' academic and behavioral needs. Formative and summative data are analyzed to address Tier 2 and Tier 3 concerns for groups and individual students. Grade level teams, with the support of the RtI Leadership Team, use the data to problem-solve Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic needs and develop behavior intervention plans. Reading – MMH Weekly and Unit Assessments, FAIR, Quick Phonics Screener, Running Record Math – Pre/Post unit test, CORE K-12 Science – Chapter Post Test, CORE K-12 Writing – School-wide writing prompts, MMH Unit assessments
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The School-Based RtI Leadership Team will receive tiered coaching support from the district PS/RtI coach. A primary focus of this coaching will be building capacity for all School-Based RtI Leadership Team members to serve as facilitators in the problem solving process with a gradual release of responsibility to the grade level facilitators.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. The SBLT will meet monthly as a PLC to problem-solve the continued school-wide support of MTSS. Team facilitators will provide imbedded PD to team members on MTSS during collaborative planning meetings.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). • Administration • Literacy Coach • ESE Teacher • School Psychologist • School Social Worker • K-5 Basic Education Teachers • Speech Language Pathologist • Media/Technology Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Lead Literacy Team meets monthly to review data from a variety of sources to determine the level of technical assistance and professional development assistance needed to support the literacy goals and objectives connected to ELA-CCSS. The lead literacy team is charged with prioritizing and developing staff development needs, developing and monitoring the SIP's literacy goals, analyzing data and communicating the school's literacy priorities connected to ELA-CCSS..
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The LLT team will analyze reading data, provide input into the School Improvement Plan, and monitor the progress of literacy goals and objectives throughout the year. They include: ● ELA-CCSS ● Research and Inquiry projects (core MMH reading strategy) ● Writing components within the MMH reading series ● Enhancement and differentiation of Literacy Stations ● Independent reading time with teacher conferencing ● Data analysis for effective problem solving within Tier 1 and Tier 2

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

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

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

At Pasco Elementary School, all Kindergarten students are assessed upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instruction, and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Screening data will be collected and aggregated by mid September, 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavior instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice of all academic and /or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Specific screening tools our school will use include: FLKRS, FAIR, and ECHOS.

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 personally 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.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1A.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS	1A.1. Teachers will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning using NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS with an emphasis on developing purposeful text-dependent questions. Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.	1A.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions	

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

Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students achieving Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 19% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	19% (62)	35% (114)					
		1A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	1A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	1A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

		1A.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text	1A.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	1A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Reading Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS	2A.1. Teachers will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning using NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS with an emphasis on developing purposeful text-dependent questions.	2A.1. Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.	2A.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions		
Reading Goal #2A: The percentage of students achieving Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 21% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21% (69)	35% (113)					

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

		2A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	2A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	2A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes
		2A.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text.	2A.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	2A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2A.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

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

2B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Reading Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

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

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

3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS	3A.1. Teachers will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning using NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS with an emphasis on developing purposeful text-dependent questions. Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.	3A.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	3A.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	3A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions	

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

Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 58% to 75%.							
	58% (188)	75% (243)					
		3A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	3A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	3A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	3A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	3A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

		3A.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text	3A.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	3A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	3A.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	3A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Reading Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.	4A.1. Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common planning time. Classroom teacher and intervention staff will use common and consistent language.	4A.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	4A.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	4A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes		

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

Reading Goal #4A: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 64% to 75%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	64% (51)	75% (61)				
		4A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	4A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	4A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	4A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	4A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

	4A.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text	4A.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	4A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	4A.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	4A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	
Reading Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				

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

		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 34%	39%	45%	50%	56%	62%	67%
Reading Goal #5A: The reading achievement gap will be reduced by 50% by 2016-2017.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. White: Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS Black: Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS Hispanic: Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS	5B.1. Teachers will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning using NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS with an emphasis on developing purposeful text-dependent questions. Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.	5B.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5B.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5B.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions	

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

Reading Goal #5B: Based upon the 2013 FCAT: The percentage of students in the white subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 55% to 70%. The percentage of students in the black subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 21% to 40%. The percentage of student in the Hispanic subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 38% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 55% (60) Black: 21% (11) Hispanic: 38% (58) Asian: American Indian:	White: 70% (76) Black: 40% (21) Hispanic: 60% (91) Asian: American Indian:					

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

		5B.2. White: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text Black: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text Hispanic: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	5B.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5B.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5B.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5B.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

| | | 5B.3.
White: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text

Black: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text

Hispanic: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text | 5B.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently.

Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing.

Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity.

Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. | 5B.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers | 5B.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares | 5B.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes | |

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with ELL support.	5C.1. ELL Resource Teacher and IA's will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning to connect Core instruction with ELL interventions. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies.	5C.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5C.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5C.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions		

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

Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 9% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	9% (3)	40% (13)				
		5C.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending vocabulary and multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text using ELL specific resources	5C.2. PD will be provided to build f teachers' capacity and knowledge of effective ELL strategies within the CORE and during interventions The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies.	5C.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5C.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5C.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.	5D.1. Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common planning time. Classroom teacher and intervention staff will use common and consistent language.	5D.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5D.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5D.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes		

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

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 15% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15% (11)	40% (29)					
		5D.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	5D.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5D.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5D.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5D.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

		5D.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text	5D.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5D.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5D.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares

(Note: final column) 5D.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

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

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS	5E.1. Teachers will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning using NG-SSS and ELA-CCSS with an emphasis on developing purposeful text-dependent questions. Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.	5E.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5E.1. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5E.1. Weekly and unit assessments, student performance tied to rubrics, FAIR and teacher developed questions		

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

Reading Goal #5E: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher will increase from 36% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	36% (102)	60% (170)				
		5E.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text	5E.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5E.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5E.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5E.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

| | | 5E.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text | 5E.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently.

Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing.

Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity.

Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. | 5E.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers | 5E.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares | 5E.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes | |

Reading Professional Development

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

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

ELA-CCSS Framework	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	August 8-9, 2012	Guided question discussions during weekly grade level PLCs.	Literacy Coach and Administration
ELA-CCSS Text Complexity and Text Dependent Questions	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Lesson Planning for CCSS	K-5	PLC Leaders	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Meta-Cognition and Gradual Release of Responsibility	K-5	Literacy Coach and PLC Leaders	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Independent Reading and Conferencing	K-5	Literacy Coach and PLC Leaders	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Comprehension and vocab. strategies for ELL learners	K-5	Literacy Coach and ELL Resource Teacher	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach and ELL Resource teacher	Literacy Coach and Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Classroom Libraries connected with CCSS	Literature and Non-Fiction books	Title 1	$10,000.00
Increase stamina and engagement in reading complex text	Journals, classroom books	Title 1	$7,000.00
Subtotal:$17,000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Increase stamina and engagement in reading complex text	Computer-based programs	Title 1	$10,000.00
Subtotal:$10,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collaborative Planning	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	$7,000.00
Subtotal:$7,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention	Reading Intervention Teacher (2)	Title 1	$90,000.00
Subtotal:$90,000.00			
Total:124,000.00			

End of Reading Goals

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Lack of opportunity to engage verbally in collaborative sharing of thoughts and ideas	1.1. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies.	1.1. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	1.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
CELLA Goal #1: The percent of students who speak and understand English at the proficient level will increase from 44% to 60% based upon the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	44% (60)					

		1.2. Lack of opportunity to practice speaking and responding to oral information in English	1.2. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies.	1.2. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	1.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes.
		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	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with ELL support.	2.1. ELL Resource Teacher and IA's will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning to connect Core instruction with ELL interventions. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies	2.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
CELLA Goal #2: The percent of students who score proficient in reading will increase from 23% to 35% based upon the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					

23% (32)					
		2.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending vocabulary and multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text using ELL specific resources	2.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	2.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Lack of instruction in grammar, spelling and conventions utilizing ELL specific resources.	2.1. Additional time will be scheduled to ensure implementation of the language arts component using MMH treasures	2.1. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing	

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

CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
The percent of students scoring proficient in writing will increase from 17% to 30% based upon the 2013 CELLA.						
	17% (23)					
		2.2. Scoring and feedback on student writing is not consistent across vertical and horizontal teams.	2.2. Professional development, coaching and mentoring will be offered in student conferencing, scoring and writing rubrics. Develop common writing rubrics that clearly outline student expectations in the writing process, grammar, conventions, & spelling	2.2. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing
		2.3.Lack of opportunities for students to write across the curriculum in response to reading.	2.3. Students will use a writing log throughout all content areas to respond to learning and reading	2.3. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.3. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collaborative Planning	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	$500.0
Visualizing and Verbalizing	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	$500.00
Subtotal:$1,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:$1,000.00			

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding.	1A.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers	1A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	1A.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		

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

Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 24% to 45%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24% (78)	45% (146)					
		1A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	1A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test-data that support higher-order thinking strategies.\n\nStudents will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	1A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	1A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

		1A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	1A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures. Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	1A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	1A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding.	2A.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers	2A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		
Mathematics Goal #2A: The percentage of students scoring at or above levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 17% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	17% (54)	35% (113)				
		2A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	2A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test-data that support higher-order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	2A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12
			2A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	2A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	2A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12

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

2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding.	3A.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers	3A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	3A.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	3A.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		
Mathematics Goal #3A: Based upon the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of students making learning gains will increase from 69% to 80%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

69% (224)	80% (260)					
	3A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	3A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test-data that support higher-order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	3A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	3A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	3A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
	3A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	3A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	3A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	3A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	3A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

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

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

4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.	4A.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers to collaboratively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common planning time.	4A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	4A.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	4A.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

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

Mathematics Goal #4A: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains will increase from 65% to 75%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	65% (52)	75% (60)				
		4A.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	4A.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	4A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	4A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	4A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12

		4A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	4A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	4A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	4A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	4A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	

		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 33%	39%	45%	50%	56%	62%	67%
Mathematics Goal #5A: The percent of students scoring a level 1 or level 2 (67%) will decrease by 50% by 2016-2017.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding. Black: Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding. Hispanic: Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding.	5B.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/School math resource teachers	5B.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5B.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5B.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: Based upon the 2013 FCAT: The percentage of students in the white subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 49% to 65%. The percentage of students in the black subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 35% to 50%. The percentage of student in the Hispanic subgroup scoring a level 3 or higher will increase from 38% to 55%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: 49% (54) Black: 35% (18) Hispanic: 38% (58) Asian: American Indian:	White: 65% (72) Black: 50% (26) Hispanic: 55% (84) Asian: American Indian:					

		5B.2. White: Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	5B.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test-data that support higher-order thinking strategies.	5B.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5B.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5B.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
		Black: Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction				
		Hispanic: Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.					

		5B.3. White: The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data. Black: The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data. Hispanic: The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	5B.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	5B.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5B.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5B.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

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

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with ELL Interventions.	5C.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers to collaboratively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common planning time	5C.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, ELL Resource teacher	5C.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5C.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

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

Mathematics Goal #5C: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 6% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	6% (2)	40% (13)				
		5C.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	5C.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5C.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, ELL Resource teacher	5C.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5C.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

		5C.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	5C.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	5C.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, ELL Resource teacher	5C.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5C.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.	5D.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers to collaboratively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common planning time	5D.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, Intervention/ESE teacher	5D.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5D.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 24% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24% (17)	40% (28)					
		5D.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	5D.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5D.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, Intervention/ESE teacher	5D.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5D.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

		5D.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	5D.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	5D.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, Intervention/ESE teacher	5D.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5D.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understanding.	5E.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers	5E.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5E.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5E.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12		
Mathematics Goal #5E: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 37% to 50%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

37% (105)	50% (141)					
		5E.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacognitive) when solving complex, multi-step word problems.	5E.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test-data that support higher-order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5E.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5E.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5E.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12
		5E.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry-based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	5E.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	5E.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5E.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5E.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

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

| Mathematics Goal #3B:\
\
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		

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

Mathematics Goal #4B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical 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.	
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		

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

4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*			
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

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

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

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

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

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

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

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

Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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						

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

Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Content Knowledge	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration
Standards of Professional Practices	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	School-Wide	August 8-9, 2012	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration
Math-CCSS	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Motivate and Engage students in math problem solving	Computer based programs	Title 1	$5000.00
Subtotal:$5,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Standards of Mathematical Practices	Stipends	Title 1	7,000.00
Math-CCSS	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	$4,000.00
Subtotal:$11,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Modeling, Coaching and Training	Math Resource Teacher	Title 1	$30.000.00
Subtotal:$30,000.00			
Total:$46,000.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Limited knowledge in analyzing science assessment data to plan for inquiry based lessons that connect with Science NG-SSS.	1A.1. Grade level teams will plan inquiry-based lessons connected with labs, which are connected to Science NG-SSS and based upon Core K-12 science data.	1A.1. Administration, classroom teachers	1A.1. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.1. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12		

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

Science Goal #1A: The percent of students scoring a level 3 will increase from 24% to 50% based on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	24% (21)	50% (43)				
		1A.2. Extending and refining learning strategies are not consistently implemented in core science instruction.	1A.2. Classroom teachers will utilize Moodle, learning logs, inquiry-based labs and technology as instructional tools to extend learning in science.	1A.2. Administration, classroom teachers	1A.2. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.2. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	

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

Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.						
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		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 student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Limited knowledge in analyzing science assessment data to plan for inquiry based lessons that connect with Science NG-SSS.	2A.1. Grade level teams will plan inquiry-based lessons connected with labs, which are connected to Science NG-SSS and based upon Core K-12 science data.	2A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.1. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.1. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

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

Science Goal #2A: The percent of students scoring a level 4 and 5 will increase from 8% to 20% based on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	8% (7)	20% (17)				
		2A.2. Extending and refining learning strategies are not consistently implemented in core science instruction.	2A.2. Classroom teachers will utilize Moodle, learning logs, inquiry-based labs and technology as instructional tools to extend learning in science.	2A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.2. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.2. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

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

Science Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem					

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

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. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

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

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

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

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry based Science Lessons	K-5	District Trainer	Grade-level PLC	3x year – substitutes and stipends	Lesson Plans, walkthroughs, Core K-12	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science collaborative planning	Stipends	Title 1	$2,000.00
Subtotal:$2,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Inquiry-based learning	Science lab materials	Title 1	$5,000.00
Subtotal:$5,000.00			
Total:$7,0000.00			

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Lack of instruction in grammar, spelling and conventions utilizing MMH resources.	1A.1. Additional time will be scheduled to ensure implementation of the language arts component using MMH treasures	1A.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing		

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

Writing Goal #1A: The percentage of 4th grade students achieving Level 3.0 in FCAT Writes will increase from 79% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	79% (71)	90% (82)				
		1A.2. Scoring and feedback on student writing is not consistent across vertical and horizontal teams.	1A.2. Professional development, coaching and mentoring will be offered in student conferencing, scoring and writing rubrics. Develop common writing rubrics that clearly outline student expectations in the writing process, grammar, conventions, & spelling	1A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing
		1A.3. Lack of opportunities for students to write across the curriculum in response to reading.	1A.3. Students will use a writing log throughout all content areas to respond to learning and reading	1A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.3. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student conferencing, rubric and scoring	K-5	Literacy Coach	Grade level PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	Lesson plans, PLC meeting notes, Walkthroughs, Writing	Administration, literacy coach

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student conferencing, rubric development and scoring	Stipends, substitutes	Title 1	$4000.00
Subtotal:$4000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:$4,000.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. There are not enough powerful incentives for attending school or consequences for excessively missing school.	1.1. An incentive plan will be developed for students who have met their attendance goal. Students who have excessive absences and tardies will be assigned a mentor and parents will be contacted on a consistent basis.	1.1. Guidance counselor, social worker, PBS team, CSC Counselors	1.1. The PBS team will analyze attendance data on a quarterly basis.	1.1. School-wide and Individual student attendance rates.		

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

Attendance Goal #1: The percent of students with excessive absences and tardies will decrease by at least 20%.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	94%.	96%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	35% (231)	15% (99)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	22% (142)	10% (66)					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance awards	Trophies and Certificates	Title 1	$500.00
Subtotal:$500.00			
Total:$500.00			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Replacement behaviors are not taught, modeled and practiced throughout the day.	1.1. The guidance counselor and behavior specialist will conduct intervention groups to practice replacement behaviors for aggression	1.1. Administration	1.1. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.1. Discipline Reports		
Suspension Goal #1: The total number suspensions and students suspended (In-school and Out-of-School) will decrease by 25%.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	8	6					

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

	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	6	4				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	28	21				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	6	4				
		1.2. Discipline issues are not being reported or recorded accurately to facilitate problem-solving	1.2. Clearly communicate procedures and referral flowchart with staff.	1.2. Administration	1.2. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.2. Discipline Reports and discipline tracker
		1.3. Suspensions have little effect on changing students behavior	1.3. Implement a mentorship program for students who have ingoing discipline issues.	1.3. Administration	1.3. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.3. Discipline Reports

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning						

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

Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Tier II and Tier III Problem-solving	K-5	PBT Facilitator	PBT team and grade level PLC	Monthly – August, 2012- May, 2013	Discipline referral data and Discipline Tracker	Administration, Behavior Specialist

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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Behavior Incentives	Guest speakers, Bounce House, Tangibles	Title 1	$2000.00
Subtotal:$2000.00			
Total:$2000.00			

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.	
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* *Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*				

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

	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
		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 and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Resource Area	Books, Literature, games, curriculum practice	Title 1	$5000.00
Subtotal:$5000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Activities and student celebrations	Food and incentives	Title 1	$2500.00
Provide monthly activities to involve parents in student learning	.5 Parent Involvement assistant	Title 1	$8,000.00
Subtotal:$10,500.00			
Total:$15,500.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Increase staff awareness of STEM during the 2012-13 school year.	1.1. Staff has limited knowledge of STEM.	1.1. SBLT will provide information and activities to staff members on a monthly basis.	1.1. SBLT, Tech Specialist, Administration Math Resource Teacher	1.1. Review of lesson plans for information and STEM activities Annual monitoring of guest speakers and training calendars that focused on STEM areas.	1.1.LessonPlans, science lab calendar, training calendar
	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					

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

PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integration od STEM	K-5	Admin., Math resource, tech specialist	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan, science lab calendars, training schedule	Administration

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase students' awareness of career and technical opportunities.	1.1.Students have limited knowledge of career and technical opportunities.	1.1. Increase the number of guest speakers with a CTE focus.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Annual monitoring of guest speakers	1.1. Annual Activity and GATI calendar of guest speakers
	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					

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

Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

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

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:$124,000.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total:$1,000.00
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:$46,000.00
Science Budget	
	Total:$7,000.00
Writing Budget	
	Total:$4,000.00
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:$500.00
Suspension Budget	
	Total:$2,000.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:$15,500.00
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:$200,000.00

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☐ Yes   ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council plays a vital role in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. During the monthly meetings, SAC members will analyze teacher, student and parent survey data, formative and summative assessment data, attendance data, discipline data and the achievement of objectives from the 2012-13 SIP to make informed decisions regarding the development of the 2013-14 SIP. The School Advisory Council will also discuss the Title I funded programs and make decisions related to Title 1 funds to support the instructional needs of the school.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Student Planners	600.00