2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Lake Asbury Junior High School
2851 SANDRIDGE RD
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043
904-291-5582
http://laj.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Middle School	No	39%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	27%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
A	B	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    ◦ Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    ◦ Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    ◦ Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Lake Asbury Junior High School

Principal

Catherine Richardson

School Advisory Council chair

Ed Swenson

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Cathy Richardson	Co-Chairperson
Bonnie King	Co-Chairperson
Christina Cornwell	Vice-Principal
David Burke	Assistant Principal
Ellen Suedkamp	Guidance
Elise Love	ESE Support Facilitator
James Crosby	Math Dept. Head
Pam Eaton	Reading Dept. Head

District-Level Information

District

Clay

Superintendent

Mr. Charles E Vanzant, Jr

Date of school board approval of SIP

Pending

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Cathy Richardson - Principa
Ed Swenson and Jim Crosby - Co Chair and teachers
Katie Guzman, Meg Sieruta - teachers
Joyce Aldridge - support employee
Lanell Thomas, Sandy Melton, Jennifer Davies, Deanna Foreman - parents

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

Members of the SAC collaborate with each department in the writing of the School Improvement Plan. The SAC reviews school performance data, determines causes of low performances and advises the school on its School Improvement Plan.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

There are five scheduled meetings throughout the year. During the various meetings, we discuss the school budget, results of climate survey, and review/discuss and decide on request for funds from various staff members.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

School planners - $3200\
Scantrons for semester and year-end test $200
Copier for ESE/Guidance department - $1400
Computers for Reading lab - $3125

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC
In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

# of administrators
3

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Catherine Richardson		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 8	Years at Current School: 6

Credentials

Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Education in Physical Education, Master of Education in Educational Leadership

Performance Record

2010-2011 – The school grade – A (FCAT)
Reading - 78% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students made a year's worth of progress in reading and 67% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 80% of students or above grade level in math, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math and 78% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 87% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2011-2012 – The school grade – A (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 69% of students reading at or above grade level and 61% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 68% of students at or above grade level in math and 59% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 80% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2012-2013 – The school grade – B (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 64% of students reading at or above grade level and 54% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 70% of students at or above grade level in math and 68% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 44% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2010-2011 – The school grade – A (FCAT)
Reading - 78% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students made a year's worth of progress in reading and 67% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 80% of students or above grade level in math, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math and 78% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 87% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2011-2012 – The school grade – A (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 69% of students reading at or above grade level and 61% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 68% of students at or above grade level in math and 59% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 80% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2012-2013 – The school grade – B (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 64% of students reading at or above grade level and 54% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 70% of students at or above grade level in math and 68% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 44% of students are meeting state standards of writing.

Christian Cornwell		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 8	Years at Current School: 8

Credentials

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, Masters in Education Leadership

Performance Record

2010-2011 – The school grade – A (FCAT)
Reading - 78% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students made a year's worth of progress in reading and 67% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 80% of students or above grade level in math, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math and 78% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 87% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2011-2012 – The school grade – A (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 69% of students reading at or above grade level and 61% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 68% of students at or above grade level in math and 59% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 80% of students are meeting state standards of writing.
2012-2013 – The school grade – B (FCAT 2.0)
Reading – 64% of students reading at or above grade level and 54% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading.
Math – 70% of students at or above grade level in math and 68% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math.
Writing – 44% of students are meeting state standards of writing.

David Burke		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 5	Years at Current School: 5

Credentials	Masters in Educational Leadership
Performance Record	2010-2011 – The school grade – A (FCAT) Reading - 78% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students made a year's worth of progress in reading and 67% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 80% of students or above grade level in math, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math and 78% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 87% of students are meeting state standards of writing. 2011-2012 – The school grade – A (FCAT 2.0) Reading – 69% of students reading at or above grade level and 61% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 68% of students at or above grade level in math and 59% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 80% of students are meeting state standards of writing. 2012-2013 – The school grade – B (FCAT 2.0) Reading – 64% of students reading at or above grade level and 54% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 70% of students at or above grade level in math and 68% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 44% of students are meeting state standards of writing.

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches
1

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Bonnie King		
Part-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 7

Areas	Reading/Literacy, RtI/MTSS
Credentials	ESE K12, Middle Grades Integrated, 6-9 Business Education, Educational Leadership.
Performance Record	2010-2011 – The school grade – A (FCAT) Reading - 78% of students reading at or above grade level, 63% of students made a year's worth of progress in reading and 67% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 80% of students or above grade level in math, 75% of students making a year's worth of progress in math and 78% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 87% of students are meeting state standards of writing. 2011-2012 – The school grade – A (FCAT 2.0) Reading – 69% of students reading at or above grade level and 61% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 68% of students at or above grade level in math and 59% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 80% of students are meeting state standards of writing. 2012-2013 – The school grade – B (FCAT 2.0) Reading – 64% of students reading at or above grade level and 54% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in reading. Math – 70% of students at or above grade level in math and 68% of struggling students made a year's worth of progress in math. Writing – 44% of students are meeting state standards of writing.

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers
70

 # receiving effective rating or higher
0%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
0%

 # certified in-field
70, 100%

 # ESOL endorsed
12, 17%

 # reading endorsed
13, 19%

 # with advanced degrees
26, 37%

 # National Board Certified

, 0%

 # first-year teachers

6, 9%

 # with 1-5 years of experience

16, 23%

 # with 6-14 years of experience

33, 47%

 # with 15 or more years of experience

15, 21%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals

15

 # Highly Qualified

15, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

0

 # receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Available positions for Lake Asbury Junior High are posted on the county's Human Resource website. The principal reviews all candidates and those that meet the required criteria are scheduled for an interview. A standard questionnaire is used for each applicant that covers all areas of teaching from planning, technology, communications, classroom management and others.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

At the beginning of each school year, we provide a breakfast and overview of the school's procedures and policies. Also each department head is present so they can spend time with the new teacher. If it is a new teacher or a veteran teacher new to our school we assign them to a teacher that they can meet with and ask questions as they come up. Also we have several meetings with new teachers to discuss items such as posting grades, classroom management, various procedures for Lake Asbury Junior High and allow them to ask questions or share concerns that they have.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

All 7th and 8th grade students will take a benchmark assessment 3 times per year. School-based leadership teams will meet after each assessment period to review student data. Quality of Tier 1 instruction will be analyzed within these meetings. The Reading Coach at my school will focus upon supporting quality Tier 1 instruction in all content areas. Administrators will meet monthly with all grade level/content area teams. At these monthly meetings, administrators and teachers will look at specific student data and will initiate Tier 2 or Tier 3 plans for those students who are struggling to meet grade level/course expectations. These monthly meetings will focus on student achievement and the provision of appropriate, effective interventions. District and school resources will be allocated based upon individual student needs.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes Performance Matters benchmark assessments, and formal assessments such as FCAT 2.0 and high schools EOCs. The principal is the leader of the meeting. Assistant principals attend the meetings in a support role for the principal. The reading/intervention coach serves to suggest effective interventions for Tier 1 instructional needs. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/ content area grouping.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

All students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions are tracked with the Performance Matters MTSS tracking system. Training on this tracking system took place in August, 2013. To assist administrators in identifying which students should be receiving interventions, administrators are able to pull a report from FOCUS that will indicate which students are receiving each tier of interventions, along with a date to reassess student performance. Students listed on the FOCUS reports will be addressed at the monthly intervention meetings. At this time, the teachers and administrators - as an intervention team - will make the decision as to continue interventions at the current level, change or intensify interventions or discontinue the intervention.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

In grades 7th and 8th, core reading and math instruction is analyzed using benchmark assessments within the performance Matters system. Supplemental and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science and writing are analyzed using in-program assessments, progress monitoring assessments available through Performance Matters, District-supplied assessments, and through teacher-selected progress monitoring assessments. District specialists and reading/intervention coaches provided engagement strategy training during pre-planning of the 2013 school year and will continue to provide support in this area throughout the year.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Meetings have been scheduled with school administrators and district staff (October, January and May) to discuss MTSS implementation. Meetings with Intervention Team Facilitators will meet in August, January and May to discuss and clarify procedures for documenting MTSS plans for students. A brochure explaining MTSS has been updated and posted on the district website. Copies of this brochure are available to hand to parents during conferences.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 30

Students are identified by teachers needing additional instruction in core academic subjects. Personal invitations are sent to parents informing of this opportunity and requesting their child participates in this tutoring. Teachers are available to assist students in Language Arts, Math Science, and Social Studies.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Each teacher will monitor their students' progress through teacher made assessments, Performance Matters, FCAT 2.0 and other formal and informal assessments provided throughout the school year.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Each teacher that provides tutoring throughout the school year.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Cathy Richardson	Principal
Christina Cornwell	Vice Principal
Bonnie King	Reading Coach
Elise Love	ESE/Support Facilitator
Pam Eaton	Teacher - LA
Jim Crosby	Teacher - Math
Kelly Watt	Teacher - Social Studies
Greer Yacavone	Teacher - Science
Pam Supan	Teacher - Science

Name	Title
Maria Behnken	Teacher - Career and Consumer Science

How the school-based LLT functions

The school based LLT meets monthly. During each meeting we will focus our discussion around the following 4 Critical Questions:
What do we want our students to learn?
What instructional strategies will we use?
How will we know if students are learning?
How will we respond when individual students need remediation or enrichment?

Major initiatives of the LLT

1. Content-area literacy instruction which include vocabulary instruction, close reading of complex text, text-dependent questioning strategies
2. Academic conversation strategies which include student engagement, student-centered classroom discussion
3. Content-area writing strategies which include 6 plus 1 traits of writing and answering text-dependent questions.
4. Implement the standards for mathematical practice into the classroom.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Reading through the content area is heavily stressed within all content classes. Teachers will be highly encouraged to take and implement NG CAR-PD and implement the research based strategies and techniques in expository reading, summarizing, questioning, text-structure, content-area writing, and vocabulary.

Preschool Transition
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

n/a

College and Career Readiness
This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

Students have the opportunity to select a variety of elective course during their 7th and 8th grade year. Each course is one semester in length. They vary from college and career readiness class to fine arts. Two of our college and career readiness classes are high school credit earning courses: Introduction to Informational Technology and Agriculture Foundations. These two classes are also the required courses for two of our high school academies.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Students will have the opportunity to attend open house for the Career Academies in January/February. Also one of the county's College and Career Readiness coordinators speak to our students during their English classes and each high school meets with their students during their History class to discuss the many options that is available to them as they register for high school.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

n/a

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	71%	63%	No	74%
American Indian				
Asian	79%	80%	Yes	81%
Black/African American	63%	49%	No	66%
Hispanic	66%	64%	No	69%
White	72%	67%	No	75%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	48%	36%	No	54%
Economically disadvantaged	67%	55%	No	70%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	318	29%	37%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	334	31%	39%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		30%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	15	47%	52%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	630	58%	61%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	146	54%	61%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)			

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	234	44%	60%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	10	67%	70%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	72%	70%	No	75%
American Indian				
Asian	88%	93%	Yes	89%
Black/African American	64%	56%	No	68%
Hispanic	69%	69%	Yes	72%
White	73%	72%	No	75%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	50%	39%	No	55%
Economically disadvantaged	65%	62%	No	69%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	288	29%	34%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	368	38%	43%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	15	47%	50%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		28%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	652	67%	72%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	184	68%	72%

Middle School Acceleration

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry certifications			
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications			

High School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	72%		No	75%
American Indian				
Asian	88%		No	89%
Black/African American	64%		No	68%
Hispanic	69%		No	72%
White	73%		No	75%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	50%		No	55%
Economically disadvantaged	65%		No	69%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

Goals Summary

G1. Teachers will routinely include remediation and enrichment activities into their classroom.

G2. All content-area teachers will routinely implement Common Core literacy standards, engagement structures, and content-area writing strategies into their classrooms.

G3. All Math teachers will routinely and consistently implement the standards for mathematical practice into their classrooms.

Goals Detail

G1. Teachers will routinely include remediation and enrichment activities into their classroom.

Targets Supported

- All Areas

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

- Writing

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)

- Algebra 1 EOC

- Geometry EOC

- Social Studies

- U.S. History EOC

- Civics EOC

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- Science - Middle School

- Science - High School

- Science - Biology 1 EOC

- STEM

- STEM - All Levels

- STEM - High School

- CTE

- Parental Involvement

- EWS

- EWS - Elementary School

- EWS - Middle School

- EWS - High School

- EWS - Graduation

- Additional Targets

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- PLCs will serve as an opportunity to plan remediation and enrichment activities with department members. The Reading Coach and ESE Support Facilitator will serve as support within the classrooms

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teacher Knowledge and additional instructional resources needed.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student Achievement data will be reviewed to monitor progress toward goal.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Administration, Reading Coach, ESE Support Facilitator, and Guidance.

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly

Evidence of Completion:

Quarterly PM assessment data, progress monitoring data, Universal Screeners, student grades.

G2. All content-area teachers will routinely implement Common Core literacy standards, engagement structures, and content-area writing strategies into their classrooms.

Targets Supported

- All Areas

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

- Writing

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)

- Algebra 1 EOC

- Geometry EOC

- Social Studies

- U.S. History EOC

- Civics EOC

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- Science - Middle School

- Science - High School

- Science - Biology 1 EOC

- STEM

- STEM - All Levels

- STEM - High School

- CTE

- Parental Involvement

- EWS

- EWS - Elementary School

- EWS - Middle School

- EWS - High School

- EWS - Graduation

- Additional Targets

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Instructional materials from DBQ, CAR-PD, CPALMS, 6 Traits or Writing, Common Core instructional materials from EngageNY and other online resources as well as faculty training on Common Core State Standards.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Pedagogical Teacher Knowledge

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student Achievement - gains

Person or Persons Responsible
Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
Quarterly

Evidence of Completion:
PM, Clay Writes data and Universal Screeners.

G3. All Math teachers will routinely and consistently implement the standards for mathematical practice into their classrooms.

Targets Supported
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC

Resources Available to Support the Goal
- PLCs, Engage NY, CPalms and Curriculum Maps provided by the county office.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal
- Teacher knowledge.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student achievement will be monitored through Performance Matters quarterly assessments and Universal Screeners. Further monitoring will be conducted through classroom walk-throughs.

Person or Persons Responsible
Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:
Quarterly

Evidence of Completion:
Performance Matters, Universal Screeners, and teacher walk-through data.

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. Teachers will routinely include remediation and enrichment activities into their classroom.

G1.B1 Teacher Knowledge and additional instructional resources needed.

G1.B1.S1 Monthly data meetings will be held to analyze student assessment data in order to identify student weaknesses. Teachers will then discuss ways to support struggling students during core instruction and design intervention plans to address weaknesses.

Action Step 1

Data Meetings will focus on analyzing student assessment data in order to identify weaknesses. Teams will then discuss ways to support struggling learners during core instruction and create intervention plans for individual students.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration, Reading Coach, Support Facilitator and team members.

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

PM Tier II and III plans, Universal Screeners, PM Quarterly Data, Common Assessment data, and student grades.

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Reading Coach, ESE Support Facilitator, Guidance and team members

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Teachers and Reading Coach will write intervention plans during monthly data meetings. Teachers will use the Reading Coach as a resource throughout the intervention cycle as needs arise.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going during the 2013-14 school year

Evidence of Completion

RtI plans

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Intervention teams will review progress monitoring data to make instructional decisions.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Teachers will input weekly data students for all students on intervention plans. The Reading Coach will monitor the data points. Teams will meet once a month with administration, Reading Coach, ESE Support Facilitator, and guidance to review student data.

Evidence of Completion

RtI plans, Universal Screeners, and student achievement data.

G1.B1.S2 Instructional resources or modeling of strategies will be gathered or provided by the Reading Coach and ESE Support Facilitator.

Action Step 1

Compilation of teacher resources

Person or Persons Responsible

Reading Coach and ESE Support Facilitator

Target Dates or Schedule

2013/14 school year

Evidence of Completion

Binder of resources by subject area

Facilitator:

King and Love

Participants:

LAJH teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S2

Teachers will use the resources being gathered in the way they were designed to be used

Person or Persons Responsible

Reading Coach, ESE Support Facilitator and LAJH Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

2013/14 school year

Evidence of Completion

Student Work samples

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S2

PM testing progress

Person or Persons Responsible

Students

Target Dates or Schedule

Quarterly

Evidence of Completion

Student Work samples and PM testing data

G2. All content-area teachers will routinely implement Common Core literacy standards, engagement structures, and content-area writing strategies into their classrooms.

G2.B1 Pedagogical Teacher Knowledge

G2.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs.

Action Step 1

PLC's will focus on content-area literacy instructions, academic conversation strategies and content-area writing strategies.

Person or Persons Responsible

Departments

Target Dates or Schedule

Twice a month.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Meeting Minutes, Walk Throughs, PM quarterly data, common assessment data and Universal Screeners.

Facilitator:

Department Heads, Reading/Intervention Coach and Support Facilitator

Participants:

Department members

Action Step 2

Initial CAR-PD trainings will be offered along with ongoing PD for teachers who have completed the CAR-PD training. Trainings will focus on reading, writing, and engagement strategies within the content-area classroom.

Person or Persons Responsible

Content-area teachers, CTE Teachers and Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

2013-14 school year (ongoing)

Evidence of Completion

CAR-PD Program Completion and Reading Coach Quarterly Report

Facilitator:

Reading Coach

Participants:

All CAR-PD trained teachers and initial CAR-PD participants (Cathy Richardson, Alice Snyder, Sharon Moore, Chris Carella, Michael Filz, Elise Love, Susan Schultz).

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

PLC meeting minutes will be filled out at every PLC. Minutes will reflect that teachers have discussed instructional strategies that support the implementation of the Common Core literacy standards. Minutes will also reflect that teachers have reviewed student achievement results to further inform instruction.

Person or Persons Responsible

Department Heads will turn meeting minutes into Mrs. Richardson (principal).

Target Dates or Schedule

Two times per month

Evidence of Completion

Meeting minutes will be kept discussed at SBLT in order to ensure that core instruction is effective. Sign-in sheets will also be kept to ensure teacher participation in PLC meetings.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Administration will participate in PLC's and then conduct Walk Throughs to ensure implementation of strategies shared.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Meeting minutes, student achievement data, and Universal Screeners will be discussed during SBLT and Curriculum Council meetings to ensure progress toward PLC goals and student learning are being attained.

G3. All Math teachers will routinely and consistently implement the standards for mathematical practice into their classrooms.

G3.B1 Teacher knowledge.

G3.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs will focus on research-based teaching strategies to support the implementation of the Common Core mathematical practices.

Action Step 1

Math department members will meet in small groups to learn strategies and design lessons that can be implemented in the classroom that reflect the Common Core standards for mathematical practices.

Person or Persons Responsible

Math Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Twice a month

Evidence of Completion

PLC Meeting Minutes, Walk Throughs, student assessment data, and PM Quarterly Data

Facilitator:

Department Head, Reading/Intervention Coach and ESE Support Facilitator

Participants:

Math department members.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

PLC Meeting Minutes, walk through data, student work samples, and student assessment data.

Person or Persons Responsible

PLC leader will submit meeting minutes to administration along with student work samples and student assessment data.

Target Dates or Schedule

Twice a month.

Evidence of Completion

Meeting minutes will be reviewed and sign-in sheets will be submitted to ensure teacher participation in PLC meetings.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Administrators will participate in PLCs and then conduct walk throughs to ensure implementation of strategies shared during PLC meetings.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Walk throughs data, Performance Matters data, student achievement data and student work samples from ideas shared in previous PLCs.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Teachers will routinely include remediation and enrichment activities into their classroom.

G1.B1 Teacher Knowledge and additional instructional resources needed.

G1.B1.S1 Monthly data meetings will be held to analyze student assessment data in order to identify student weaknesses. Teachers will then discuss ways to support struggling students during core instruction and design intervention plans to address weaknesses.

PD Opportunity 1

Data Meetings will focus on analyzing student assessment data in order to identify weaknesses. Teams will then discuss ways to support struggling learners during core instruction and create intervention plans for individual students.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Reading Coach, ESE Support Facilitator, Guidance and team members

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

PM Tier II and III plans, Universal Screeners, PM Quarterly Data, Common Assessment data, and student grades.

G1.B1.S2 Instructional resources or modeling of strategies will be gathered or provided by the Reading Coach and ESE Support Facilitator.

PD Opportunity 1

Compilation of teacher resources

Facilitator

King and Love

Participants

LAJH teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

2013/14 school year

Evidence of Completion

Binder of resources by subject area

G2. All content-area teachers will routinely implement Common Core literacy standards, engagement structures, and content-area writing strategies into their classrooms.

G2.B1 Pedagogical Teacher Knowledge

G2.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs.

PD Opportunity 1

PLC's will focus on content-area literacy instructions, academic conversation strategies and content-area writing strategies.

Facilitator

Department Heads, Reading/Intervention Coach and Support Facilitator

Participants

Department members

Target Dates or Schedule

Twice a month.

Evidence of Completion

PLC Meeting Minutes, Walk Throughs, PM quarterly data, common assessment data and Universal Screeners.

PD Opportunity 2

Initial CAR-PD trainings will be offered along with ongoing PD for teachers who have completed the CAR-PD training. Trainings will focus on reading, writing, and engagement strategies within the content-area classroom.

Facilitator

Reading Coach

Participants

All CAR-PD trained teachers and initial CAR-PD participants (Cathy Richardson, Alice Snyder, Sharon Moore, Chris Carella, Michael Filz, Elise Love, Susan Schultz).

Target Dates or Schedule

2013-14 school year (ongoing)

Evidence of Completion

CAR-PD Program Completion and Reading Coach Quarterly Report

G3. All Math teachers will routinely and consistently implement the standards for mathematical practice into their classrooms.

G3.B1 Teacher knowledge.

G3.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs will focus on research-based teaching strategies to support the implementation of the Common Core mathematical practices.

PD Opportunity 1

Math department members will meet in small groups to learn strategies and design lessons that can be implemented in the classroom that reflect the Common Core standards for mathematical practices.

Facilitator

Department Head, Reading/Intervention Coach and ESE Support Facilitator

Participants

Math department members.

Target Dates or Schedule

Twice a month

Evidence of Completion

PLC Meeting Minutes, Walk Throughs, student assessment data, and PM Quarterly Data

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
	Total	$0

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
	$0	$0
Total	$0	$0

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Teachers will routinely include remediation and enrichment activities into their classroom.

> **G1.B1** Teacher Knowledge and additional instructional resources needed.

> > **G1.B1.S2** Instructional resources or modeling of strategies will be gathered or provided by the Reading Coach and ESE Support Facilitator.

> > > **Action Step 1**
> > >
> > > Compilation of teacher resources
> > >
> > > **Resource Type**
> > >
> > > Evidence-Based Program
> > >
> > > **Resource**
> > >
> > > **Funding Source**
> > >
> > > **Amount Needed**

G2. All content-area teachers will routinely implement Common Core literacy standards, engagement structures, and content-area writing strategies into their classrooms.

G2.B1 Pedagogical Teacher Knowledge

G2.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs.

Action Step 1

PLC's will focus on content-area literacy instructions, academic conversation strategies and content-area writing strategies.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed

Action Step 2

Initial CAR-PD trainings will be offered along with ongoing PD for teachers who have completed the CAR-PD training. Trainings will focus on reading, writing, and engagement strategies within the content-area classroom.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed

G3. All Math teachers will routinely and consistently implement the standards for mathematical practice into their classrooms.

G3.B1 Teacher knowledge.

G3.B1.S1 Twice monthly departmental PLCs will focus on research-based teaching strategies to support the implementation of the Common Core mathematical practices.

Action Step 1

Math department members will meet in small groups to learn strategies and design lessons that can be implemented in the classroom that reflect the Common Core standards for mathematical practices.

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed