

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

University Behavioral Center

Proposed for 2012-2013

DRAFT

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: University Behavioral Center	District Name: Orange County Public Schools
Principal: William Tovine	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Lamont Lofton	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](#)

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	William Tovine	Masters-Ed. Leadership	1	7	Prior to 2009-2010, Mr. Tovine Previous Years' Performance: 2011-2012: School Achievement Level - A 2010-2011: School Achievement Level - B 2009-2010: School Achievement Level - A
Assistant Principal	Paula Riley	BS Respiratory Therapist/Biology Pre- Med	1	8	2011 – 2012: Current school not graded (N/G)

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

		MS Educational Leadership			
--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--

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	Michelle Paul	BS – Biology, MA – Exercise Physiology, MA – Science Education, ESE K-12, Elementary K-6, Biology 6-12, Mathematics 6-12	4	1	Michelle Paul was a math and science teacher at Alternative Education Centers for 3 years prior to becoming a math coach this year. 2011-2102 EOC: GEO Ach Level 2 (Proficient) – 71% 2011-2012 FCAT (retake): 100% of lowest 25% made learning gains 100% of students with matched scores made learning gains
Reading	Carla Morris	BS-Television Broadcasting/Theater, M.Ed.-Curriculum Instruction & Development, M.B.A.-Business Administration School Principal (All Levels) Educational Leadership, English 5-9	4	1	Achievement Level 3: Increase by 5% Achievement Level 4+: Increase by 10% Lowest 25%: Increase by 2% Learning Gains: Increase by 3% 2011 -2012: 25% of students were proficient in reading 40% of the lowest quartile made learning gains 25% of students made learning gains

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Professional Learning on site to assist teachers in acquiring multiple certifications that are needed to be highly qualified at	Principal, Site Administrator, Lead Teacher, Instructional	June, 2013

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

UBC.	Coaches, CRT	
2. Seek teachers with multiple certifications	Principal, Assistant Principal/Site Administrator	On-Going
3. Resource team offers Extensive Professional Learning which assists teachers to renew certifications.	Assistant Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Lead Teacher	On-Going
4. Mentor-Mentee program for beginning teachers and as instructional support for Out-of-Field teachers.	Assistant Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Lead Teacher, Instructional Leaders	On-Going
5. School decision making process is open to active input from teachers.	Assistant Principal/Site Administrator	On-Going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
10% (1)	Observations and feedback, biweekly mentoring meetings, coaching and modeling lessons with the use of thinking maps, technology, data chats and differentiated instruction, oversight of certification course work and exam preparation.

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]).

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
10	10% (1)	20% (2)	60% (6)	10% (1)	20% (2)	90% (9)	50% (5)	0%	40% (4)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Myriam Socias	Glaelle Jacques	Ms. Socias is the lead teacher for the site and is an experienced professional learning developer as well as a veteran science teacher. She is also very knowledgeable in using RtI, Thinking Maps and differentiated instruction.	Observations and feedback, biweekly mentoring meetings, coaching and modeling lessons with the use of thinking maps, technology, data chats and differentiated instruction, oversight of certification course work and exam preparation.
Myriam Socias	Keesha Dawson	Ms. Socias is the lead teacher for the site and is an experienced professional learning developer as well as a veteran teacher knowledgeable in many content areas. She is also very knowledgeable in using RtI, Thinking Maps and differentiated instruction.	Observations and feedback, biweekly mentoring meetings, coaching and modeling lessons with the use of thinking maps, technology, data chats and differentiated instruction, oversight of certification course work and exam preparation.

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 none
Title I, Part C- Migrant none
Title I, Part D - none
Title II - none
Title III - none
Title X- Homeless - none
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) - none
Violence Prevention Programs - None
Nutrition Programs - none
Housing Programs - None
Head Start - none
Adult Education - none
Career and Technical Education - none
Job Training – none
Other - none

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team. Lead Teacher, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Guidance Counselor, Special Education Placement Specialist, General Education Teachers, ESOL Compliance Specialist, and Assistant Principal/Site Administrator.
Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts? The team meets weekly to access student performance, school wide goals, and initiatives. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The team evaluates screening data on reading, math, science and writing performance for each student.2. Student strengths and weaknesses are analyzed and recorded3. An intervention plan to target weaknesses is developed including specific instructional methods and targeted assessments.4. The team reviews the progress of each student on a biweekly basis. If the intervention is not effective, the team problem solves and develops an amended intervention plan for the student.5. The team continues to progress monitor, insuring that all students achieve growth in their areas of weakness.
Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The UBC RtI team models the method used by all centers in Alternative Education (AE). The RtI team reviews diagnostic information to assist in clearly targeting the reading needs of students, enabling more students to be effectively served through the core reading and mathematics programs and making it possible to provide one on one instruction for Tier III students. The student's level of need dictates the level of support.
RtI 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. The data management system used to summarize and collect tiered data is SMS and a series of specific RtI forms designed for the Process. Data Sources for Reading: FAIR, SRI, Benchmark Tests, Benchmark Mini Tests, Intensive Reading Program assessments, diagnostic assessments. Data Sources for Math: SMI, Benchmark Tests, Benchmark Mini Tests.
Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Lead Teacher, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Guidance Counselor, and Assistant Principal.

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

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

The Literacy Leadership team convenes weekly to plan, monitor/adjust, evaluate, and address school based issues and activities.

Guidance Counselor: Provides academic input for student progression along with behavioral documentation and scheduling needs/concerns.

Instructional Coaches: Supports through developing, guiding, modeling, and evaluating school core programs. Researches scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Helps to disaggregate student data to support differentiated instruction across the curriculum. Assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring and data collection. Coordinates and implements professional learning. They also meet monthly as part of the Alternative Education LLT as a group of professional learning, disseminates information to UBC; makes decisions about reading instruction and intervention.

Assistant Principal: Oversees the implementation of the principal's and district's vision and mission. Ensures that effective school based strategies and interventions are implemented, documented, and continuously monitored to address the diverse needs of all students. Guides and supports the school based leadership team to develop researched based methods for faculty to impact student achievement through professional development. Forms a partnership with all shareholders to communicate site based plans and activities.

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

Lead Teacher, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Guidance Counselor, and Assistant Principal.

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

The Literacy Leadership team convenes weekly to plan, monitor/adjust, evaluate, and address school based issues and activities.

Guidance Counselor: Provides academic input for student progression along with behavioral documentation and scheduling needs/concerns.

Instructional Coaches: Supports through developing, guiding, modeling, and evaluating school core programs. Researches scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Helps to disaggregate student data to support differentiated instruction across the curriculum. Assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring and data collection. Coordinates and implements professional learning. They also meet monthly as part of the Alternative Education LLT as a group of professional learning, disseminates information to UBC; makes decisions about reading instruction and intervention.

Assistant Principal: Oversees the implementation of the principal's and district's vision and mission. Ensures that effective school based strategies and interventions are implemented, documented, and continuously monitored to address the diverse needs of all students. Guides and supports the school based leadership team to develop researched based methods for faculty to impact student achievement through professional development. Forms a partnership with all shareholders to communicate site based plans and activities.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives of the LLT will be as follows:

- Improvement of reading strategy instruction in all content areas.
- Differentiated Instruction and Web's DOK
- Plan and coordinate professional learning and student activities
- Develop, implement and support the instructional focus
- Develop meaningful assessment in all core areas to monitor and/or address student needs
- Implementation of Professional Learning Communities which improve effectiveness of curriculum implementation through common assessments.

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.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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.

n/a

****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?

UBC will follow the Alternative Education plan to incorporate literacy strategies. We have created several school wide initiatives that are currently being implemented throughout every classroom, regardless of content taught. All teachers participate in Response to Intervention (RtI) progress monitoring. We have incorporated a literacy focus calendar, vocabulary strategies/initiatives are provided to every teacher, and Thinking Maps are being used in every classroom. Common assessments developed for all subject areas through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will incorporate reading benchmarks. These initiatives also support the requirements for our new observation system offering additional support to the teachers.

****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?

UBC follows the Alternative Education Schools literacy vision is To develop competent, literate citizens who take ownership for personal goal setting and development in a competitive world. Guidance counselors provide a framework that assists students in choosing courses that meet high school graduation requirements and include benchmarks of the Sunshine State Standards. The framework shows relevance to students' goals by meeting Bright Futures Scholarship core and elective requirements, comprehensively align with the essential workforce skills and align with the U.S. Department of Education's 16 Career Clusters. Alternative Education counselors meet with each student and provide a course checklist outlining specific courses based on grade level and academic needs as it relates to the district's Student Progression Plan. Students on target for meeting the 24-credit minimum requirement are given the opportunity to experience a standard curriculum with career influence which promotes positive outcome for future endeavors.

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?

The Alternative Education counselors, which include the UBC counselor, have developed a Comprehensive Guidance Plan to work effectively with students. This plan includes an advising system that allows Alternative Education Counselors to meet with students on a regular basis and provide academic planning while setting college and career goals. Alternative Education counselors provide classroom instruction in collaboration with teachers by using the Choices program, a career interest inventory. Students are engaged in various lessons to motivate their learning while exercising their schemata.

The UBC counselor meets with each student and provides a course checklist, outlining specific courses based on grade level and academic needs as it relates to

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

the district's Student Progression Plan. Students are given the opportunity to create an "Electronic" Education Plan (ePEP) alongside the Alternative Education counselor to discuss courses needed for the current year and the years thereafter. Students feel involved and enthusiastic when selecting the courses with their counselor. They are also encouraged to research additional careers, track their education, check Bright Futures Scholarship eligibility, learn about postsecondary opportunities, apply online to state universities and colleges, and apply online for state and federal financial aid.

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](#).

The counselor uses an array of strategies to improve postsecondary readiness such as, placing students in appropriate courses based on specific needs (i.e. scheduling remedial courses for FCAT and other subjects for learning gains), allowing students to take advantage of online courses for advancement, grade forgiveness and/or credit recovery opportunities. Students have the chance to be placed in Math, Reading and Writing for College Success courses, Dual Enrollment, ACT and SAT preparation courses, college tours and online college readiness programs through Facts.org or Collegeboard.com.

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1 Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	1A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	1A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Reading Goal #1A: By July 2013 14% (11 of 78) students enrolled at UBC will achieve a level 3 on FCAT Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In July 2012, 13% (7 of 56) of students at UBC met high standards in FCAT reading as measured by achievement of FCAT level 3.	By July 2013 14% (11 of 78) of UBC students will achieve a level 3 on FCAT Reading.					
			1A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	1A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments.	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	1A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			1A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	1A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	1A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	1A.3. FAIR, Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Reading Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A.					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A

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

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. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	2A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	2A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	2A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Reading Goal #2A: By July 2013, UBC will increase of students scoring at or above level 4 in reading by 15% (12 of 78).	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In July of 2012, 14% (8 of 56) of students tested scored at or above level 4 in reading.	By July 2013, 15% (12 of 78) of UBC students will score at or above level 4 in reading.					
			2A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	2A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments.	2A.2. Administrator Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	2A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			2A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	2A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	2A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	2A.3. FAIR, Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 5 in reading.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Reading Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A/	N/A					
			2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A
			2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions.	3A.1. Differentiated instruction	3A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	3A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	3A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
<u>Reading Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By July 2013, 76% (19 of 25) of students at UBC will make learning gains in Reading.	In July of 2012, 75% (15 of 20) students (that had matching scores) made learning gains.	By July 2013, 76% (19 of 25) of students at UBC will make learning gains in reading.					
			3A.2. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	3A.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	3A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	3A.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	3A.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A
<u>Reading Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A
			3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4.FCAT 2.0:Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions	4A.1. Differentiated instruction	4A.1.Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	4A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	4A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u> By July 2013, 83% (5 of 6) of the lowest quartile students at UBC will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> In July of 2012, 71% (5 of 7) of the lowest quartile (that had matching scores) made learning gains in reading.	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By July 2013, 83% (5 of 6) of the lowest quartile students at UBC will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.					
			4A.2Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	4A.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	4A.2.Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	4A.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	4A.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.

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 In June 2011, 100% of the students with matched scores did not score satisfactory or above (Levels 3-5) on the FCAT Assessment		In June 2012, 22% (16/70) students at UBC, scored on Level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment.	By July 2013, 30% (24 of 78) at UBC, will score satisfactory or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment	By July 2014, 46% (36 of 78) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment	By July 2015, 69% (54 of 78) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment	By July 2016, 100% (78 of 78) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment	By July 2017, 100% (78 of 78) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment
	<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> UBC students will reduce their achievement gap by 50% more than the prior year, every year for the next 6 years							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5B.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions	5B.1. Differentiated instruction	5B.1. .Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations	5B.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples	
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> By July 2013, 76% (18 of 25) will make satisfactory progress in Reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Of 20 total students that matched scores, 75% (15/20) made gains: White: N/A Black: 80% (4 of 5) Hispanic: 33% (3 of 7) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Projected for students with matched scores. White: 75% Black: 81% (13 of 16) Hispanic: 44% (4 of 9) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A						
			5B.2. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	5B.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	5B.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5B.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations	5B.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples	

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

		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DRAFT

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. N/A	5C.1 N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1 N/A.
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A.					
			5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A
			5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions	5D.1. Differentiated instruction	5D.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5D.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations	5D.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples
Reading Goal #5D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In July 2013, 80% of Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in reading.	In July 2012, 75% (9 out of 12) Students with Disabilities made satisfactory progress in reading.	In July 2013, 80% of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.					
			5D.2. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	5D.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	5D.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5D.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations	5D.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples
			5D.3	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions.	5E.1. Differentiated instruction	5E.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	5E.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Reading Goal #5E: <i>By July 2013, 80% of the students of Economically Disadvantage will make learning gains</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In July of 2012, 25% (2 of 8) of Economically Disadvantaged students (that had matching scores) did not make learning gains in reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>By July 2013, 80% of the students of Economically Disadvantage will make learning gains</i>					
			5E.2. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	5E.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	5E.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	5E.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

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
PLC-Cornell Note taking	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teacher	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.
Incorporating Technology into the classroom	6-12 Reading	Administrators/Lead Teacher	Reading and Content Area Teachers	Throughout school year; completed by June 2013	Observation	Lead Teacher Reading Coach
Literacy PLC's	6-12 Reading	Reading Coaches	Reading Teachers	Monthly meetings throughout school year	Meeting minutes Creation of common plans and assessments	Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom Teachers
New Classroom Assessment Tool	All Subjects/Grade	Administrators District staff	Reading and Content Area Teachers	Ongoing throughout school year	Lesson plans	Administrators

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

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

	levels					
RtI	All Subjects/Grade levels	Site Admin. Instructional Coaches	Reading and Content Area Teachers	RtI/progress monitoring meetings three times per quarter	The RtI leadership team will check progress monitoring data, attend a variety of RtI meetings and check meeting logs to be sure that individual student needs are being attended to.	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom teachers
Thinking Maps	All Subjects/Grade levels	Instructional Coaches, CRT	Reading and Content Area Teachers	December 2012; follow up throughout school year as needed	Examples of student work Lesson plans	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom teachers
Differentiated Instructional Strategies – Using IMS	All Subjects/Grade levels	Instructional Coaches, CRT	Reading and Content Area Teachers	Once per semester and in coaching sessions	Lesson plans	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom teachers

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

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
Supplemental Reading Materials	Tangible items that the students consider motivational (books, magazines)	Supplemental Academic Instruction	TBD
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
To maintain a Read 180 lab (s) for the purpose of providing supplemental instruction to all reading students.	Paper, supplies, software, books, etc...	School budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	TBD
To enhance staff capabilities in all content areas.	Software, books, materials, consultant, etc...	School budget	TBD
Have two teachers trained to become Lesson Study facilitators.	District-level professional development	School Improvement Budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	TBD
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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. N/A	1.1. NA	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A				
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:									
N/A	N/A									
		1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A				
		1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A				
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. N/A	3A.1.N/A	2.1 N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A				
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:									
N/A	. N/A									
	Look at the testing students only. Redo numbers						2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
							2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CELLA Goal #3: N/A	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	N/A					
		2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
		2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of 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. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A	1A.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1A: In June 2012 due to the small number of students, data was insufficient.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A					
			1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A	1A.2. N/A
			1A.3. N/A	1A.3. N/A	1A.3. N/A	1A.3. N/A	1A.3. N/A
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1B: In June of 2012 due to the small number of students, data was insufficient	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> N/A	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> N/A					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
			1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A	2A.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2A: In June of 2011-12 to the small number of students, there was insufficient data	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2A.2. N/A	2A.2.	2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A	2A.2. N/A
			2A.3. N/A.	2A.3.	2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A	2A.3. N/A
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1.	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2B: In June of 2011-12 due to the small number of students, there was insufficient data	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2B.2. N/A	2B.2.	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2.
			2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A/N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A

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

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

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

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	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							
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u>								
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.			N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
N/A	N/A	N/A						
	White:	White:						
	Black:	Black:						
	Hispanic:	Hispanic:						
	Asian:	Asian:						
	American Indian:	American Indian:						
			5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2.	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	
			5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A.	N/A.					
			5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2.
			5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A.					
			5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A
			5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A

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

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1 Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	1A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	1A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2013, 7% (2 out of 29) students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2012, 5% (2 out of 41) students scored at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2013, 7% (2 out of 29) students will score at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		1A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	1A.2.Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2.Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	1A.2.Test samples and lesson plans.	
		1A.3.Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	1A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	1A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	1A.3.Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>						
N/A	N/A	N/A					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
		N/A	N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	2A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	2A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	2A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Content Area Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2013, 7% (2 out of 29) students will score at or above a Level 4 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2012, 5% (2 out of 41) students scored at or above a Level 4 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2013, 7% (2 out of 29) students will score at or above a Level 4 on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			2. A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment. 1A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	2A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	2A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	2A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			2A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	2A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	2A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	2A.3. Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A
			2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions	3A.1. Differentiated instruction	3A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers 4A.2. Teacher observations, benchmark and mini assessments, and PLC teacher product samples.	3A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	3A.1. Teacher observations, benchmark and mini assessments, and PLC teacher product samples.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
In July 2013, 69% (11 out of 16) students with matched data, will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2012, 64% (9 out of 14) students with matched data, made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	In July 2013, 69% (11 out of 16) students with matched data, will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			3A.2. Content Area Teachers are not utilizing reading strategies effectively.	3A.2. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	3A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	4A.3. Teacher observations, PLC Content Area Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.	3A.2. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
			3A.3. Lack of arithmetic skills and math fluency impedes current instruction	3. A.3. Implement intervention strategies in text and CIA Blueprint	3. A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	3. A.3. Tracking though RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	3A.3. Scholastic Math Inventory
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1. N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal #3B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A
			3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4.FCAT 2.0:Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. Lack of arithmetic skills and math fluency impedes current instruction	4. A.1. Implement intervention strategies in text and CIA Blueprint	4. A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	4A.1. Tracking though RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	4A.1. Benchmark and mini assessments
Mathematics Goal #4: In July 2013, 86% (6 out of 7) students in the lowest 25%, with matched data, will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In July 2012, 80% (4 out of 5) students in the lowest 25%, with matched data, made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* In July 2013, 86% (6 out of 7) students in the lowest 25%, with matched data, will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			4A.2. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions	4A.2. Differentiated instruction	4A.2.Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	4A.2. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	4A.2. Teacher observations, benchmark and mini assessments, and PLC teacher product samples.
			4A.3.Content Area Teachers are not utilizing reading strategies effectively.	4A.3. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	4A.3.Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	4A.3. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	4A.3. Teacher observations, PLC Content Area Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.

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%. <u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> UBC students will reduce their achievement gap by 50% more than the prior year , every year for the next 6 years	Baseline data 2010-2011 In June 2011, 100% of the students with matched scores did not score satisfactory or above (Levels 3-5) on the FCAT Math Assessment		5.A In June 2012, 9% (5 of 54) students at UBC, scored on Levels 3 or above on the FCAT Math Assessment.	5.A By July 2013, 15% (8 of 54) at UBC, will score satisfactory or above on the FCAT Math Assessment	5.A By July 2014, 22% (12 of 54) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Math Assessment	5.A By July 2015, 33% (18 of 54) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Math Assessment	5.A By July 2016, 50% (27 of 54) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Math Assessment	5.A By July 2017, 75% (41 of 54) at UBC, will score on satisfactory or above on the FCAT Math Assessment
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. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	5B.1. N/A	
Mathematics Goal #5B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	N/A	N/A						
			5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	5B.2. N/A	
		5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A	5B.3. N/A		

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A	5C.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A	5C.2. N/A
			5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A	5C.3. N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A	5D.1. N/A
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A	5D.2. N/A
			5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A	5D.3. N/A

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #1: 0 students	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A	3.1. N/A
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					
			3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A	3.2. N/A
			3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A	3.3. N/A

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.			1A.1. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	1A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	1A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In July 2013, 18% (5 out of 28) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	In July 2012, 17% (1 out of 6) students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	In July 2013, 18% (7 out of 25) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.					
			1A.2. Alignment between instruction and assessment.	1A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	1A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			1A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	1A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	1A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	1A.3. Algebra I EOC Benchmark tests
			1. A.4. Lack of arithmetic skills and math fluency impedes current instruction	1. A.4. Implement intervention strategies in text and CIA Blueprint	1. A.4. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	1. A.4. Tracking through RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	1. A.4. Benchmark and mini assessments.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1. Loss of skill level.	2.1. Differentiating instruction to provide enrichment at a challenging level.	2.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	2.1. Tracking through RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	2.1. Algebra I EOC Benchmark Tests
Algebra Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

<i>goal in this box.</i> In July 2013, 18% (5 out of 28) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Algebra I EOC.	In July 2012, 17% (1 out of 6) students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Algebra I EOC.	In July 2013, 25% (7 out of 28) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Algebra I EOC.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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 No EOC data reported	3.A.1 In July 2012, 17% (1 out of 6) students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	3.A.1 In July 2013, 15% (3 out of 20) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	3.A.1 In July 2014, 25% (5 out of 20) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	3.A.1 In July 2015, 40% (8 out of 20) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	3.A.1 In July 2016, 60% (12 out of 20) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	3.A.1 In July 2017, 90% (18 out of 20) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Algebra I EOC.	
UBC students will reduce their achievement gap by 50% more than the prior year , every year for the next 6 years								
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. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	
Algebra 1 Goal #3B:			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
N/A			N/A	N/A				
			3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	
			3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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.			1A.1 Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	1A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	1A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In July 2013, 13% (1 out of 8) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC assessment.	In July 2012, 0% (0 out of 2) students were proficient on the Geometry EOC assessment.	In July 2013, 13% (1 out of 8) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC assessment.					
			1A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	1A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	1A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			1A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	1A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	1A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	1A.3. Geometry EOC Benchmark tests
			1A.4. Lack of arithmetic skills and math fluency impedes current instruction	1A.4. Implement intervention strategies in text and CIA Blueprint	1. A.4. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	1A.4. Tracking though RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	1A.4. Benchmark and mini assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					1		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1. Loss of skill level.	2.1. Differentiating instruction to provide enrichment at a challenging level.	2.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	2.1. Tracking though RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	2.1. Geometry EOC Benchmark Tests
Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

In July 2013, 13% (1 out of 8) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Geometry EOC assessment.	In July 2012, 0% (0 out of 2) students were proficient on the Geometry EOC assessment.	In July 2013, 25% (2 out of 8) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Geometry EOC assessment.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

DRAFT

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 In July 2012, 0% (0 out of 2) students were proficient on the Geometry EOC assessment.	3A.1 In July 2013, 14% (1 out of 7) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.	3A.1 In July 2014, 28% (2 out of 7) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.	3A.1 In July 2015, 42% (3 out of 7) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.	3A.1 In July 2016, 71% (5 out of 7) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.	3A.1 In July 2017, 10% (7 out of 7) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.					
Geometry Goal #3A: By June 2011 students at UBC will reduce their achievement gap by 50% more students a year scoring at Levels 4 or 5 than the year before, for the next 6 years.											
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. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A	3B.1. N/A					
Geometry Goal #3B:	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	N/A	N/A						
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>										
N/A	N/A										
		3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A	3B.2. N/A					
		3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A	3B.3. N/A					

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC-Cornell Note taking	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teacher	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.
Incorporating Technology into the classroom	6-12 Mathematics	Administrators/Lead Teacher	Mathematics and Content Area Teachers	Throughout school year; completed by June 2013	Observation	Lead Teacher Reading Coach
Mathematics PLC's	6-12 Mathematics	Reading Coaches	Mathematic Teachers	Monthly meetings throughout school year	Meeting minutes Creation of common plans and assessments	Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom Teachers
New Classroom Assessment Tool	All Subjects/Grade levels	Administrators District staff	Mathematics and Content Area Teachers	Ongoing throughout school year	Lesson plans	Administrators
RtI	All Subjects/Grade levels	Site Admin. Instructional Coaches	Mathematics and Content Area Teachers	RtI/progress monitoring meetings three times per quarter	The RtI leadership team will check progress monitoring data, attend a variety of RtI meetings and check meeting logs to be sure that	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers

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

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

					individual student needs are being attended to.	Classroom teachers
Thinking Maps	All Subjects/Grade levels	Instructional Coaches, CRT	Mathematics and Content Area Teachers	December 2012; follow up throughout school year as needed	Examples of student work Lesson plans	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom teachers
Differentiated Instructional Strategies – Using IMS	All Subjects/Grade levels	Instructional Coaches, CRT	Mathematics and Content Area Teachers	Once per semester and in coaching sessions	Lesson plans	CRT Instructional Coaches Site Administrators Lead Teachers Classroom teachers

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

Mathematics Budget(Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Develop a mathematics lab to incorporate technology in math instruction and student practice.	Mathematics software	School budget	TBD
Student participation in hands-on mathematics activities (i.e., graphing) activities as presented throughout curriculum.	Graphing calculators/software for upper level mathematics courses.	School budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Have two teachers trained to become Lesson Study facilitators.	District-level professional development	School Improvement Budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A.FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			2A.1. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	2A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	2A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	2A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Content Area Content Area Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In July 2013, 8% of students taking the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment will score at Achievement Level 3.	In July 2012, 4% (1 out of 23) students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment.	In July 2013, 8% of students taking the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment will score at Achievement Level 3.					
			2A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	2A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	2A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	2A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			2A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	2A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	2A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	2A.3. Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams
			2. A.4. Lack of arithmetic skills and math fluency impedes current instruction	2. A.4.. Implement intervention strategies in text and CIA Blueprint	2. A.4. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers Rtl Team	2. A.4.. Tracking though Rtl Meetings and Math PLCs	2. A.4.. Scholastic Math Inventory
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	N/A	N/A					

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

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

		1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A
		1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A	1B.3. N/A

DRAFT

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2.1. Loss of skill level.	2.1. Differentiating instruction to provide enrichment at a challenging level.	2.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers RtI Team	2.1. Tracking though RtI Meetings and Math PLCs	2.1. Science Benchmark Tests
Science Goal #2A: In July 2013, 8% of students taking the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 4.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In July 2012, 4% (1 out of 23) students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In July 2013, 8% of students taking the FCAT 2.0 Science assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 4.					
			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 science.			2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A	2B.1. N/A
Science Goal #2B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* N/A					
			2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A	2B.2. N/A
			2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A	2B.3. N/A

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. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Science Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A	1.2. N/A
			1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A	1.3. N/A
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A	2.1. N/A
Science Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A	2.2. N/A
			2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A	2.3. N/A

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			1. A.1. Ineffective use of reading strategies in content areas.	1.A.1. Training content area teachers in reading strategies through PLCs and on-site staff development.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Leadership team will cooperate to implement a continuous schedule for classroom observations.	1A.1. Teacher observations, PLC Content Area Content Area Reading Rubric, and PLC teacher product samples.
Biology 1 Goal #1: In July 2013, 33% (1 out of 3) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Biology EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In July 2012, 33% (2 out of 6) students were proficient on the Biology EOC assessment, however actual achievement levels have not yet been determined by the state.	In July 2013, 33% (1 out of 3) students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Biology EOC assessment.					
			1.A.2 Alignment between instruction and assessment.	1.A.2. Train teachers in the use of CIA blueprint and test item specs in creating common assessments	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Teachers will engage in structured comparison among CIA blueprint, test item specifications, and assessments.	1.A.2. Test samples and lesson plans.
			1A.3. Consistent utilization of data for instructional decision making.	1A.3. Train and provide continuous support using the IMS system and use of consistent data collection.	1A.3. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.3. Comparison of student performance on common assessment to specified standardized assessments.	1A.3. Benchmark and Mini-Benchmark exams
			1A.4. Ineffective implementation of targeted interventions.	1A.4 Differentiated instruction	1A.4 .Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers Rtl Team	1A.4. Rti Team and Science PLCs discuss data and problem solve.	1A.4. Teacher observations, benchmark and mini assessments,

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.			2. A.1. Lack of hands on experiences due to agency rules.	2. A.1 Provide training and support to. increase use of smart boards and Safari Montage or other virtual experiences	2. A.1.Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Science Teachers	2. A.1.Rtl Team and Science PLCs discuss data and problem solve.	2. A.1. PLC teacher product samples.
Biology 1 Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In July 2013, 33% (1 out of 3) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Biology EOC assessment.	In July 2012, 33% (2 out of 6) students were proficient on the Biology EOC assessment, however actual achievement levels have not yet been determined by the state.	In July 2013, 33% (1 out of 3) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the Biology EOC assessment.					
			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
PLC-Common Assessments	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teachers	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.
PLC-Cornell Note taking	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teachers	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.

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
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Have two teachers trained to become Lesson Study facilitators.	District-level professional development	School Improvement Budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

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 writing skills.	1A.1. Implement use of the FCAT writing rubric across content areas.	1A.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Collaboration meetings using student writing samples from school wide prompts.	1A.1. Writing Rubrics, School wide Prompts PLC Teacher Products
Writing Goal #1A: In July 2013, 18% of students taking the FCAT Writing assessment will score at Achievement Level 3.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In July 2012, 15% (3 out of 20) of students taking the FCAT Writing assessment scored at Achievement Level 3.0.	In July 2013, 18% of students taking the FCAT Writing assessment will score at Achievement Level 3.0.					
			1A.2. Lack of practice using the rubric.	1A.2. Writing Boot Camp	1A.2. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Collaboration meetings using student writing samples from school wide prompts.	1A.2. Writing Rubrics, School wide Prompts PLC Teacher Products
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A	1B.1. N/A
Writing Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A	1B.2. N/A

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
PLC-Common Assessments	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teachers	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.
PLC-Cornell Note taking	Content Areas	CRT/Coaches/Lead Teachers	Content Area Teachers	Once a Month/by the end of May 2013	Continuous improvement through PLC's.	CRT/Coaches/Department Head/Administrators.
Lesson Study	All Areas/Grade Levels	Reading Coach/Lead Teacher	Reading and Content Area Teachers	Second Semester	Continuous improvement through site meetings.	Reading Coach, Lead Teacher, Administrators

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:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Have two teachers trained to become Lesson Study facilitators.	District-level professional development	School Improvement Budget	TBD
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

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

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

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			N/A	N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Attendance Goal #1: Residential Facility – N/A	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive tardiness (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardiness (10 or more)</u>					
	N/A	N/A					
			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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of 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	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal #1: Interventions will be implemented to ensure that no more than 1% of the students will be suspended out of school.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	Socially unaccepted behaviors	Warning Student/Teacher Conference	Teachers/Lead Teachers School clerk Administrative Dean Assistant Principal	Intervention Log Chart with parental contacts
	N/A	N/A	Refusal to get adult help	Parent/Conference		Nine week evaluation tool
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School	Poor conflict-resolution skills	Intervention Log Discipline Contract		
	N/A	N/A				
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	1% of the students (1 of 95) were suspended out of school	No more than 1% of the students will be suspended out of school.				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	Same as above: 1 % of the students (1 of 95) were suspended out of school	Same as above: No more than 1% of the students will be suspended out of school.				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Suspension Professional Development

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal:			

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal:			

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal:			

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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. Student lacks motivation	1.1. Guidance counselor identifies struggling students within the first six weeks of school.	1.1. Teachers/Lead Teacher School clerk Guidance Counselor Administrative Dean Assistant Principal	1.1. Guidance Counselor follows timeline for follow-up meetings student and periodic meetings with parent to discuss progress.	1.1. Individual Progress Monitoring Plan (IPMP)
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: UBC, like other Alternative Education programs, is designed to prevent student drop outs by offering smaller classes, credit recovery and alternative settings to standard high schools. However, students graduate from their home high schools; if they drop out, that data is maintained by home high school. Therefore, we have no data.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*	Student has no real academic goals	Guidance counselor meets with teacher, parent, and student, along with Intervention Specialist, to complete the Individual Progress Monitoring Plan (IPMP) with specific goals and strategies for success. Students below the minimum of 24 credits and has a "D" or "F" are eligible for E2020 courses.		Student's progress is tracked and mid-point adjustments are made to ensure success.	
	N/A	N/A					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	N/A	N/A					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of 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
1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: In June of 2013, 11 % (10 of 92 families) of UBC parents will participate in school activities.	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	Distance to travel to site Lack of interest	Parent notifications sent home by mail. Parent conferences requested by school official or parent. Invitation to special programs or events Teacher communication with parents/other agency officials regarding behavior and academic strengths and areas for improvement	Teachers/Lead Teacher School Registrar ESE Placement Specialist Administrative Dean Assistant Principal	Parental responses to school contacts Teacher and parent communication
	In June 2012, 7% (7 of 95 families) of UBCparents participated in school activities.	In June of 2013, 11% (10 of 92 families) of UBCparents will participate in school activities.				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parental involvement is provided through the University Behavioral Center agency/staff.	N/A	N/A	N/A
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: UBC will incorporate one STEM lesson in every middle school science classroom.	1.1. Lack of Professional Learning on STEM	1.1. Provide training opportunities for utilization of STEM curriculum.	1.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1.1. RtI Team and PLCs discuss data and problem solve.	1.1. Teacher lessons and student responses.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic 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**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: UBC will provide Career Development for all students who will be transitioning to their assigned home schools for the upcoming school year.	1.1. Lack of employability skills	1.1. Incorporate employability skills through the curriculum as offered in mandatory classes, Peer Counseling/Personal Social Skills.	1.1. Administrator CRT Coaches/Support staff Lead Teacher Classroom Teachers	1.1. Student feedback	1.1. The number of students who participate and successfully complete courses addressing employability. Career Inventory student product.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic 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
1. Additional Goal			1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A	1.1. N/A
Additional Goal #1: N/A due to school program being designated as non-permanent/transitional placement.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*				
	N/A	N/A				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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:\$
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:\$
Science Budget	Total:\$
Writing Budget	Total:\$
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total:
	Grand Total:\$

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

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

The SAC committee will meet monthly to review progress of the 2012-2013 SIP and begin developing the 2013-2014 SIP. They will conduct and review a needs assessment targeting teachers, students, parents and agency personnel where applicable. They will use assessment results to address budget, training, instructional materials, technology, staffing, student support services, specific school safety, discipline strategies, student health and fitness, and indoor environmental air quality. They will participate in school activities to be determined throughout the school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.

Amount