## Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan <br> 2012-2013

Name of School:
West Shore Jr. /Sr. High School

## Principal: <br> Superintendent:

Eric Fleming

## Area:

Central

## Area

Sandy Demmon

## SAC Chairperson:

Susan Orton and Donna McKeever

## Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

## Mission Statement:

Excellence Achieved

## Vision Statement:

West Shore Junior/Senior High School, a center for excellence, creates a nurturing secondary learning environment (grades 7-12), providing unique experiences for intellectual development, academic achievement, and preparation life's work.

# Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan <br> 2012-2013 

RATIONAL - Continuous Improvement Cycle Process
Data Analysis from multiple data sources: (Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)

## Reading

FCAT 2.0 was officially implemented during 2011-12, and the West Shore, Brevard County school district, and Florida state scores reflect a reduction in overall performance as the students struggled with the more difficult standards. West Shore, however, remains well above the state and district averages, and students have demonstrated some gains. West Shore's $7^{\text {th }}$ grade students averaged 253 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Mean Scale Score, with $96 \%$ of students passing with a 3.0 or better. This is a slight reduction from 2010-11 scores where $97 \%$ of $7^{\text {th }}$ grade students passed with a 3.0 or above. However, the $7^{\text {th }}$ grade students performed exceedingly well when compared to the state and district that only had a $58 \%$ and $69 \%$ pass rate respectively. The $8^{\text {th }}$ grade scores reflected no change with $93 \%$ of students passing with a 3 or above in 2011-12 and 2010-11. Again the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade scores are well above state and district averages ( $55 \%$ and $64 \%$ respectively). On a high note, the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade pass-rate scores increased two percentage points from $96 \%$ in 2010-11 to $98 \%$ in 2011-12. Again, the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade scores are well above the state's $52 \%$ and the district's $66 \%$ pass rate. The 10th grade pass-rate in 2011-12 was $98 \%$, which was a one percent decrease from the 2010-11 pass-rate of $99 \%$. However, in 2010-11 only $89 \%$ of the 10th grade students scored a Level 3 or above, while $98 \%$ scored a Level 3 or above in 2011-12. Important Note: the scale score was modified after the 2010-11 test and the new scale score was applied to the 2011-12 test. For all tests prior to and including the 2010-11 test, a 300 scale score was categorized as a high Level 2 . Starting with the 2011-12 test, a 300 scale score was now categorized as a Level 3. Again, the $10^{\text {th }}$ grade students scored well above the state's $50 \%$ pass rate and the district's $64 \%$ pass rate. Overall, when considering the increase in difficulty of the exam and the raising of the minimum passing score to a 3.0 and the changing of the scale score, West Shore students did very well and demonstrated an increase in learning gains.
However, there are improvements that can be made. After analyzing the data, it is evident that students are still struggling with the high level critical thinking questions. Also, there are a high percentage of non-fiction texts that are science and/or social science based that some students have difficulty comprehending. To address student needs, teachers revised the curriculum vertical alignment plan during the summer of 2012 to integrate Common Core Standards and hone the focus of CRISS (Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies). During the 2012-13 year, English teachers will implement the vertically aligned Common Core Standards and curriculum, which includes incorporating more non-fiction texts and using district mandated "Task Templates" at least twice during the school year. Also, teachers will ensure students master a minimum of two CRISS strategies each year. Integrating these strategies, along with a new school-wide emphasis on Common Core Literacy Standards in non-English subjects, should increase student skills, resulting in reading gains on the 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. In addition, teachers will use the new early release days to collaborate and improve lesson plans.

## Writing

The implementation of more stringent standards on the 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 writing standard resulted in a drop in writing scores across the state, district, and individual schools, including West Shore. The new grading standards required assessors to place more emphasis on grading for spelling, grammar, and other conventions.
For West Shore $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students, the writing score dropped from 4.8 average in 2011 to 4.0 average in 2012. On a positive note, $98 \%$ passed with a 3 or above, which is the current state requirement for demonstrating grade-level writing. While only $71 \%$ received a 4 or above, which is the required score the state wants to implement, West Shore students demonstrated they are well above the $33 \%$ state and district average for students scoring 4 or above. Also, $2 \%$ of West Shore $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students scored a 6 , while the state and district average for a score of a 6 was less than $1 \%$.
For the $10^{\text {th }}$ grade, $100 \%$ of West Shore students scored a 3 or above, which is well above the district and state averages. West Shore students' average score was a 4.5 while the state average was a 3.4 and the district average was a 3.5 . The percentage of West Shore $10^{\text {th }}$ graders scoring a 4 was $92 \%$. Again, this is above the state average of $38 \%$ and the district average of $41 \%$. Also, $6 \%$ of West Shore $10^{\text {th }}$ grade students earned a 6 on the assessment, which is the highest percentage of 6 's earned at any school in the state of Florida. At Pine View School for the Gifted only $4 \%$ of their $10^{\text {th }}$ graders earned a 6 and at Edgewood only 2\% earned 6 's. Less than $1 \%$ of students in the state and district earned a 6 .
After the 2011-12 FCAT Writing scores were released and assessed, the state recognized the need to modify the writing assessment as the students do not have enough time to revise and edit spelling, grammar, and other conventional errors in 45 minutes. As a result, students will have 60 minutes to write and revise their essays during the 2012-13 FCAT Writing exam.

There are several changes at the district and school level being implemented to address the changes to the FCAT Writing exam. Brevard County has modified its fall district writing practice test to allow students 60 minutes to write and revise essays. At the school level, the implementation of Common Core Standards, the emphasis on writing across the curriculum and the continued focus on CRISS strategies will increase writing skills. Also, the new early release days will allow teachers to collaborate on strategies, allowing them time to devise methods to assist struggling students and elevate average writers.

## SMART Goals

- Integrate Common Core Standards into vertical alignment (completed alignment plan summer 2012)
- Incorporate two "Task Templates" at each grade level during the 2012-13 school year.
- Focus CRISS strategies so two strategies are mastered each year.
- Collaborate with other departments for effectively implementing Common Core Literacy Standards in science, social studies, and technical subjects.


## Mathematics

The Common Core Mathematics standards will be gradually implemented this year. By the year 2014, the state will fully implement the Common Core Mathematics standards. Standardized tests and state-mandated assessments will gradually reflect the transition to Common Core Standards for Mathematics. Grades 7 and 8 students will take the FCAT 2.0 Math assessment. Computer-based End-of-Course Exams for Algebra I and Geometry will be graduation requirements for high school students. College readiness skills for Mathematics will be assessed through the ACT which all $11^{\text {th }}$ graders will take in the Spring 2013.
West Shore students achieved the following scores for Mathematics based on the results of Spring 2012 assessments:
FCAT $2.07^{\text {th }}$ grade: $99 \%$ scoring level 3 or higher (increased by $1 \%$ )
FCAT $2.08^{\text {th }}$ grade: $96 \%$ scoring level 3 or higher (decreased by $3 \%$ )
Algebra I End-of-Course Exam : 94\% scored a level 3 or higher (on a scale of 1 to 5)
Geometry End-of-Course Exam: 100\% scored a level 2 or 3 (on a scale of 1 to 3 )
AP Calculus AB Exam: $96 \%$ scored a 3 or higher
AP Calculus BC Exam: $100 \%$ scored a 3 or higher
AP Statistics Exam : not offered for 2011-2012
Most of the 2011-2012 School Improvement Plan goals were met.
$7^{\text {th }}$ grade: showed improvement in Ratios/Proportions Relationships (mean score increased from $75 \%$ to $83 \%$ )
Geometry: 100\% of students passed the End-of-Course Exam
Advanced Placement programs: students achieved a $96 \%$ pass rate for AP Calculus AB and $100 \%$ pass rate for AP Calculus BC. Enrollment continues to increase in the following courses offered this year: AP Calculus AB, AP Calculus BC, and AP Statistics.

These are the specific areas which need to be addressed for 2012-2013:
$7^{\text {th }}$ Grade: Continue to maintain $99 \%$ scoring level 3 or higher and maintain a minimum of $80 \%$ mean score for each area tested $8^{\text {th }}$ grade: FCAT pass rate decreased by $3 \%$ and Geometry and Measurement mean score was $65 \%$ (decreased by $11 \%$ ). Teachers of $8^{\text {th }}$ graders taking Algebra I and Geometry courses should also focus on preparing the students for the FCAT $2.08^{\text {th }}$ grade Math assessment and not just the EOC exams.
Algebra I: Pass rate decreased from $99.5 \%$ to $94 \%$. Teachers must continue to prepare students for the End-of-Course Exams.
Geometry: Continue to prepare students and maintain the $100 \%$ pass rate for the End-of-Course Exam

For the Advanced Placement programs, the school's goal is to increase the number of students taking AP courses in Math and to continue to provide a challenging curriculum for the students to insure a passing rate of $95 \%$ or higher for the 2013 AP Exams.

The Math Department will continue to provide a rigorous curriculum and will also provide enrichment activities to prepare students for other standardized tests needed for college: PLAN, PSAT, ACT and SAT. Teachers will also use more released sample test items, more hands-on activities, real life applications, and technology applications in the Mathematics classes to address the Common Core Mathematics standards. Teachers will be trained on these standards and applications.

## Science

$8^{\text {th }}$ Grade FCAT Science scores were again the highest in the District. A closer look at student performance in the four strands of Nature of Science, Earth/Space, Physical and Life shows that Nature of Science questions are still our area for growth. Instructors will implement additional strategies to review scientific method and data analysis throughout the year. Lab reports, inquiry labs and CRISS strategies will be used to increase critical thinking. The 2012 FCAT Nature of Science strand was at a $77 \%$ average and the goal is to increase that to $80 \%$. New Common Core Standards in reading and writing will also be infused this year.

After studying the Biology EOC scores, West Shore was $5^{\text {th }}$ in the state with an average score of 63.93 students scored in the top third of the state, 9 in the middle third and 1 in the bottom third. For comparison, the statewide mean scale score was 49 and the Brevard County average was 52. The EOC was also broken down into three categories. Scores were lowest in molecular and cellular biology ( $72.65 \%$ average). Classification, Heredity and Evolution followed at $76.93 \%$. The highest scoring category was organisms, populations and ecosystems at $80.57 \%$. Our teachers would like a more detailed breakdown of the data, so they have developed a diagnostic test that will be given to the students at the beginning of the year. This test will assess each standard required for the EOC. Data from the diagnostic test will be used to shape the depth of the curriculum in that particular area of need. In addition, as specific needs are identified, $7^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade curriculum can be enhanced to support Biology EOC performance. We feel that this targeted approach will yield significant results in overall test scores. There is also a need for more work on reading in the content since the EOC is basically a reading test. Teachers will be increasing use of CRISS strategies for reading, writing, and critical thinking. This will also fulfill the need to accomplish new Common Core Standards implemented this year in reading and writing. The West Shore Biology EOC average score was 63 and our goal is to raise that to 65 .

EOC Exams are coming in Chemistry and Physics. The District has created diagnostics to test the readiness for the EOC in both courses. These will be administered and analyzed this year to determine student needs.

Another standard of science performance is the pass rate for Advanced Placement Science classes. The 2012 pass rate was $91 \%, 11$ points higher than last year. Accessibility was also increased with 32 more AP Science students than the previous year. AP success will be supported by all science teachers with the use of CRISS Strategies for reading, writing and critical thinking in the content area. The implementation of Common Core Standards for reading and writing will also support student performance.

## Analysis of Current Practice: (How do we currently conduct business?)

Current practice at West Shore simply involves the teachers trying to engage students with concept formation and a lecture discussion format. Although teachers do foster some element of creativity in their lessons, most information presented does not fully engage students with higher order questioning and thinking skills. CRISS will afford teachers the ability to challenge students to form and defend opinions about content being studied in a collegial, congenial, and controlled format. Due to our tremendous systemic commitment to CRISS strategies and philosophies across our campus, our School Advisory Council (SAC) decided it was important to send two of our current teachers to CRISS Level II training to become certified CRISS district trainers. Since we have a continual need for CRISS Level 1 training for new staff members and CRISS follow-up training for existing staff members, our SAC felt that having two certified CRISS trainers on staff was a worthwhile investment of SAC funds. Additionally, with our collective hard work in transitioning our teachers and staff to the new Common Core Standards, our school also felt the need to invest in systemic vertical curriculum alignment in all academic subject areas. Because funds are scarce, we were able to only set up curriculum alignment with the Social Studies and Language Arts departments this past summer. Their focus was to create a vertical alignment schedule and transition to the new Common Core Standards. Also imbedded within the curriculum alignment was an effort to vertically align the CRISS strategies in order to diversify instructional delivery across grade levels.

Funding was also secured through our PTA grant process for the purpose of restocking teacher classroom libraries with $70 \%$ nonfiction material as this is the new standard of Common Core Assessments. Language Arts teachers across grade levels were awarded more than $\$ 1,800.00$ in grants from our PTA in order to meet or exceed this new standard.

Best Practice: (What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)
CRISS (CReating Independence through Student-owned Strategies) is a staff professional development program grounded in research that promotes higher order thinking skills among students. Instructional delivery centers on a very interactive, systemic model using
concept formation and discussion that is solely student driven. Because instruction within the model is collaborative in nature, the lessons are simply guided by the teacher and facilitated by students. The purpose of using CRISS strategies is to promote and foster thinking through the full range of Bloom's Taxonomy of learning domains with the end result being higher order thinking questions and answers at the synthesis level.

## CONTENT AREA:

| $\triangle$ Reading | $\triangle$ Math | $\square$ Writing | $\square$ Science | Parental Involvement | $\square$ Drop-out Programs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Language Arts | Social Studies | $\triangle$ Arts/PE | $\square$ Other: |  |  |

School Based Objective: (Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)

CRISS Level I Training will occur with any and all "new" staff members to West Shore and CRISS update training will occur with one third of our staff during the 2012-2013 school year. Instructional staff members will utilize CRISS philosophies and strategies to enhance classroom instruction throughout the curriculum and the use of these strategies will be aligned by grade level in order to facilitate instructional delivery diversity.

## Strategies: (Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)

| Barrier | Action Steps | Person <br> Responsible | Timetab/e | Budget | In-Process <br> Measure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.Lack of trained <br> CRISS <br> facilitators | 1.Identify, Target, <br> and secure staff <br> members | Principal, AP, <br> Selected Teachers | Fall 2012 | $\$ 0.00$ | Training Schedule |
| 2.Lack of Funds <br> for Training | 2.Solicit SAC <br> budget and <br> recommend use of <br> funds | Principal | September 2012 | $\$ 2500.00$ | Schedule training for <br> identified facilitators |
| 3.Schedule for <br> staff trainings | 3.Calendar <br> Meeting, date <br> identification | Principal, Selected <br> CRISS trained <br> teachers | Fall and Spring <br> $2012-2013$ | $\$ 0.00$ | Calendar |
| 4. | 4. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | 5. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | 6. |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | 7. |  |  |  |  |
| 8. | 8. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION - Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: (Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)

[^0]Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: (Measures of student achievement)

2012-2013 Test Score results in:
FCAT Reading, FCAT Math, FCAT Science
FCAT Writing
EOC's - Alg. 1, Geometry, Biology
Advanced Placement
SAT/ACT
GOAL: Meet or exceed 2011-2012 totals for all assessments!!

## APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

| Reading Goal <br> 1. | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students $28 \%=129$ students) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the , $31 \%=1134$ students) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Barrier(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Strategy(s): } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| FCAT 2.0 <br> Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | 96\%=618 | 98\%=645 |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| FCAT 2.0 <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | 79\%=509 | 81\%=533 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| FCAT 2.0 <br> Percentage of students in lowest 25\% making learning gains in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. <br> Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | $86 \%=554$ $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $88 \%=579$ <br> N/A |
| Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50\%: <br> Baseline data 2010-11: | 96 | 97 |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : |  | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance $\begin{aligned} & 2 \%=15 \\ & 2 \%=1 \\ & 2 \%=2 \\ & 2 \%=1 \\ & 0 \%=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | $8 \%=2$ | 5\%=1 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | 0.5\% $=3$ | $0.3 \%=2$ |

## Reading Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target <br> Dates/Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vertical Alignment | Summer 2012 | English Department Vertical Alignment Product |
| Common Core Transition | Early Release Days and <br> Department Meetings | Observations, Lesson Plans and Department Meeting <br> Minutes |
| Reading Writing Leadership Team | August 2012-May 2013 | Meeting Agendas and Minutes |


| CELLA GOAL | Anticipated <br> Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/ <br> Monitoring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students <br> Proficient in Listening/ Speaking: | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students <br> Proficient in Reading: <br> $\square$ | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students <br> Proficient in Writing: <br> nnyy | N/A | N/A | N/A |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|}\hline \text { 1. Mathematics Goal(s): } & \begin{array}{c}\text { 2012 Current } \\ \text { Level of } \\ \text { Performance } \\ \text { (Enter }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { 2013 Expected } \\ \text { Level of } \\ \text { percentage } \\ \text { Performance } \\ \text { information and } \\ \text { the number of } \\ \text { students that } \\ \text { percentage } \\ \text { reflec percentage }\end{array} \\ \text { rnformation and } \\ \text { the number of } \\ \text { students that } \\ \text { percentage } \\ \text { reflects) }\end{array}\right]$

| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in <br> Mathematics <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FCAT 2.0 <br> Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | $74 \%=242$ | $76 \%=255$ |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| FCAT 2.0 <br> Percentage of students in lowest 25\% making learning gains in Mathematics <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | 81\% $=264$ | $83 \%=279$ |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Percentage of students in Lowest 25\% making learning gains in Mathematics <br> Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. | N/A | N/A |
| Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50\%: <br> Baseline Data 2010-11: | 99 | 99 |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in Mathematics: | Enter numerical data for current level of performance <br> $2.7 \%=7$ <br> 0 <br> $4.8 \%=1$ <br> 0 <br> 0 | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance $\begin{aligned} & 2 \%=5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \%=0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | N/A | N/A |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | $12 \%=2$ | 8\%=1 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics | 0 | 0 |

## Mathematics Professional Development

| PD Content/Topic/Focus | Target <br> Dates/Schedule | Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Common Core Transition | Early Release Days and <br> Department Meetings | Observations, Lesson Plans and Department Meeting <br> Minutes |
| CRISS Update Training | September 11 and 12, <br> 2012 | Meeting agendas and lesson plans |


| Writing | 2012 Current Level <br> of Performance <br> (Enter percentage <br> information and the <br> number of students <br> that percentage <br> reflects) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter percentage <br> information and the <br> number of students <br> that percentage <br> reflects) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement <br> level 3.0 and higher in writing | $1 \%=4$ | $0.5 \%=2$ |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |


| Science Goal(s) <br> 1. Elementary and Middle) | 2012 Current Level <br> of Performance <br> (Enter percentage <br> information and the <br> number of students <br> that percentage <br> reflects) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter percentage <br> information and the <br> number of students <br> that percentage <br> reflects) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at <br> Achievement level 3 in Science: | $42 \%=67$ | $45 \%=75$ |


| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in <br> Science | N/A | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above <br> Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science: | $49 \%=78$ | $55 \%=92$ |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at or above Level 7 in <br> Reading | N/A | N/A |


| Science Goal(s) <br> (High School) | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science | N/A | N/A |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: <br> Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science | N/A | N/A |
| FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science | N/A | N/A |
| Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science | N/A | N/A |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Science. | N/A | N/A |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Science | N/A | N/A |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Science | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Science | N/A | N/A |

## APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS ONLY)

| Algebra 1 EOC Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra: | $36 \%=56$ | 40\% $=62$ |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra: | 58\%=91 | 60\% $=94$ |
| Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50\%: Baseline Data 2010-11 $\square$ | N/A | N/A |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \%=7 \\ & 3.6 \%=1 \\ & 1.2 \%=1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \%=5 \\ & 0 \%=0 \\ & 0 \%=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | N/A | N/A |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | 0 | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra | 0 | 0 |


| Geometry EOC Goal | 2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) | 2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier(s): <br> Strategy(s): <br> 1. |  |  |
| Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry: | 91\%=153 | $46 \%=78$ |
| Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry: | N/A | $54 \%=91$ |
| Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50\%: Baseline Data 2010-11 $\square$ | N/A | N/A |
| Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <br> White: | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | N/A | N/A |
| Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | 0 | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry | 0 | 0 |


| Biology EOC <br> Goal | 2012 Current <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Students scoring <br> at Achievement <br> level 3 in Biology: | $93 \%=150$ | $95 \%$ |
| Students scoring <br> at or above <br> Achievement <br> Levels 4 and 5 in <br> Biology: | N/A |  |


| Civics EOC | 2012 Current <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Students scoring <br> at Achievement <br> level 3 in Civics: | N/A | $100 \%$ |
| Students scoring <br> at or above <br> Achievement <br> Levels 4 and 5 in <br> Civics: | N/A |  |


| U.S. History <br> EOC | 2012 Current <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) | 2013 Expected <br> Level of <br> Performance <br> (Enter <br> percentage <br> information <br> and the <br> number of <br> students that <br> percentage <br> reflects) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Students scoring <br> at Achievement <br> level 3 in U. S. <br> History: | N/A | $100 \%$ |
| Students scoring <br> at or above <br> Achievement <br> Levels 4 and 5 in <br> U. S. History: | N/A | N/A |


| Science, Technology, <br> Engineering, and Mathematics <br> (STEM) Goal(s) | Anticipated <br> Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of school data, <br> identify and define areas in need of <br> improvement: |  | N/A |  |
| Goal 1: | N/A | N/A |  |
| Goal 2: |  |  |  |


| Career and Technical <br> Education (CTE) Goal(s) | Anticipated <br> Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of school data, <br> identify and define areas in need of <br> improvement: |  |  |  |
| Goal 1: | N/A | N/A |  |
| Goal 2: |  | N/A |  |


| Additional Goal(s) | Anticipated <br> Barrier | Strategy | Person/Process/Monitoring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on the analysis of school data, <br> identify and define areas in need of <br> improvement: |  |  |  |
| Goal 1: | N/A | N/A |  |
| Goal 2: |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C

## (TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

## Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Descriptions of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion <br> Date |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1. |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-offield 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 paraprofessionals that are <br> teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly <br> effective | Provide the strategies that are being <br> implemented to support the staff in becoming <br> highly effective |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)<br>Mike Drake - Director of Guidance<br>Glenda Lovel - Guidance Counselor<br>Dina Dearmin - Guidance Counselor<br>Kathy Thayer- Teacher<br>Jackie Ingratta - Administrator

The West Shore RtI Team's role is primarily to ensure that no student "slips through the cracks" and that every child has a personal and meaningful connection here at school; especially those students who are in need of additional services. The RtI Leadership Team's role in development of the School Improvement Plan is to ensure funds and program resources are available to enhance services for all students. The Whole Child Connection concept is fostered through the theme of RtI at West Shore. This process continues to evolve and additional focus is added each year.

The primary tool used to summarize tiered data here at West Shore is the Desktop Student Data System and Information Specific AS400 Data Books. Manipulation of this data allows teachers, administrators, and collaborative teams to focus on roster and strand specific gaps in student performance on FCAT. Additionally, this data manipulation allows for prescriptive instructional methodology which in turn equates to better future performance on assessments.

The primary training tool used to educate staff is through district and building level in-services, faculty meetings, and SLC Collaborative Team Meetings. The RtI team requests time on faculty meeting and staff development calendars in an effort to update teachers and ensure compliance.

## PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

West Shore will improve communication and involvement among parents by increasing the number of active parent and student Edline accounts to 100\%

## ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

Meet or exceed $97 \%$ attendance rate.

## SUSPENSION:

Comprehensive administrative and SRO counseling leads to a very low suspension rate at West Shore.
DROP-OUT (High Schools only):
$100 \%$ of West Shore Jr/Sr High School seniors graduated in 2011--2012. Additionally, 100\% of these students met the Diploma of Distinction requirements. West Shore establishes a very strong relationship bond with students and parents through our IPS meetings held each year with our guidance staff. At West Shore we believe that research cited above is validated through a strong vertical alignment of our curriculum combined with a solid relationship bond with students and staff within the school. Drop Out potential is virtually eliminated because of the strong connectivity and accelerated nature of our program. Graduation requirements are highlighted and reviewed for every senior during these IPS Meetings. West Shore Jr/Sr High School will provide students with a variety of accelerated academic opportunities to maintain success and fulfill all established School of Choice requirements.
POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (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? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)

According to 2011-2012 graduation data, 100\% of West Shore seniors graduated from West Shore with a Diploma of Distinction (DD) designation. The DD designation is a more academically rigorous path of study and students leave our school ready to enter college at the university level. 35 of our 148 graduates earned Advanced Placement Scholar honors concurrently at the time of their graduation. $89 \%$ of 2012 graduates went directly into a university and $11 \%$ enrolled at the Community College level. IPS meetings with students and counselors throughout the year help to solidify interests and appropriate coursework for the students' postsecondary needs. ACT/PLAN data is also used to make decisions on courses and college selection.


[^0]:    Qualitative: CRISS Discussions at Faculty Meetings,
    Department Meetings, Collaborative Team Meetings
    Quantitative: Collaborative Team Meeting Agenda, Pre-observation conferences with evaluating administrator, Peer observation checklist, Walk-Through checklist,

    Daily student assignments, quizzes, homework, projects

