

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2011-2012

2011 – 2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Ribault Middle School	District Name: Duval County
Principal: Edward Robinson	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Daniels
SAC Chair: Sharon Robinson	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

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.)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 5A-5D of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3A-3D of the writing goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

Highly Qualified Administrators

List your school’s highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	Edward Robinson	B.S. Education Florida A&M University; Master of Educational Leadership, University of North Florida	2	11	2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP. 2009-2010 - Saint Clair Evans Academy - Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 49%; Learning Gains:46%; Lowest 25%;:53%; Math Master: 55%; Learning Gains:64%; Lowest 25%: 74; School did

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					not AYP. 2008-2009- Saint Clair Evans Academy- Grade D; Reading Mastery; 55%; Learning Gains:51% Lowest 25%: 59%; Math Mastery: 40%; Learning Gains: 56%; Lowest 25%: 71%
Assistant Principal	Johnny Bryant, III	B.S. Physical Education, Florida State University; Master of Educational Leadership, University of North Florida Certification: Physical Education K-8; Educational Leadership K-12	4	6	2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP. 2009-2010: Ribault Middle - Grade F. Reading Mastery: 35%, Learning Gains: 45%, Lowest 25%: 60%. Math Mastery: 39%, Learning Gains: 52%, Lowest 25%: 56%. School did not make AYP. 2008-2009: Ribaulr Middle - Grade B. Reading Mastery: 49%, Learning Gains: 70%, Lowest 25% Gains 74%. ESE did not make AYP in Reading. 2008-2009: Grade B. Math Mastery: 51%, Learning Gains: 74%, Lowest 25% Gains 74%. ESE did not make AYP in Math.
Assistant Principal	Cynthia Carter	B.A. in Sociology/ Counselor Education, South Carolina State University Masters of Arts in Education Leadership and Administration, UOP Certification: Texas Elementary Education K-6; Florida Elementary Education 1-6; Educational Leadership K-12; School Principal/ (All Levels)	3	2	2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP. 2009-2010: Ribault Middle – Assistant Principal - Grade F. Reading Mastery - 35%, Learning Gains - 45%, Lowest 25% Gains – 60%, ESE did not make AYP in Reading. 2008-2009: Normandy Village Elementary- Instructional Coach- Grade B, Reading Mastery – 68%, Learning Gains – 60%, Lowest 25% Gains – 58%, ESE made AYP in Reading and Math 2008-2009- Grade B, Math Mastery 2007-2008: Mandarin Oaks Elementary – Lead Math/Science Teacher - Grade A, Math Mastery-88%, Learning Gains Math – 76%, Lowest 25% - 78%, AYP met for Economically Disadvantage, Blacks and ESE in Math and Reading
Assistant Principal	Vivian O. Forshee	B.A. English, Bethune-Cookman University; Master of Arts in Teaching	2	7	2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		Educational Leadership, Jacksonville University Certification: ELA 6-12; ESOL & Middle Grades Endorsed; Educational Leadership K-12			2009-2010: Previous school Grade D, with highest learning gains in district.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Gladys Jackson	Professional Educator's: ELA 6-8; Elementary Education; Reading Endorsed	9	7	<p>2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP.</p> <p>2009-2010: Ribault Middle - Grade F. Reading Mastery - 35%, Learning Gains - 45%, Lowest 25% Gains – 60%, ESE did not make AYP in Reading.</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade B. Reading Mastery: 49%, Learning Gains: 70%, Lowest 25% Gains 74%. ESE did not make AYP in Reading.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade C. Reading Mastery: 44%, Learning Gains: 58%, Lowest 25% Gains 65%.</p>
Math Coach	Alicia Monroe	Professional Educator's: Mathematics 5 – 9	7	4	<p>2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP.</p> <p>2009-2010: Ribault Middle - Grade F. Math Mastery: 39%, Learning Gains: 52%, Lowest 25%: 56%. School did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade B. Math Mastery: 51%, Learning Gains: 74%, Lowest 25% Gains 74%. ESE did not make AYP in</p>

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					Math. 2007-2008: Grade C. Math Mastery: 51%, Learning Gains: 76%, Lowest 25% Gains 79%.
Instructional Coach	Monyel Bryant	AA degree Elementary Ed- FCCJ BA degree- English/minor Sociology- University of North Florida MA degree- School Guidance- Nova Southeastern University Certification – 5-9 ELA	2		2010 – 2011 – Jean Ribault Middle Grade: C; Reading Mastery: 36%; Learning Gains: 57%; Lowest 74%; Math Master: 41%; Learning Gains: 62%; Lowest 70% - School did not make AYP. 2009-2010: Ribault Middle - Grade F. Math Mastery: 39%, Learning Gains: 52%, Lowest 25%: 56%. School did not make AYP in Math

Highly Qualified Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Conduct monthly grade level meetings with principal	Principal	On-going until June 2012	
2. Weekly grade level common planning PLC meetings	Principal, Grade Level Administrator, Grade level Team	On-going until June 2012	
3. Weekly Administrators PLC meetings	Grade Level Administrator	On-going until June 2012	
4. District and Early Dismissal Professional Development	Teachers; School Based Coaches; Leadership Team; Administrative Team; District Professional Development Facilitators	On-going until June 2012	
5. SIG Saturday Professional Development	SIG Teachers; School Based Coaches; Leadership Team; Administrative Team; District Professional Development	On-going until June 2012	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	Facilitators		
--	--------------	--	--

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
NONE			

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
36	0% (0)	24% (12)	40% (18)	5%(7)	10% (5)	78% (36)	4% (2)	0% (0)	2% (1)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program 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
Monyel Bryant	David Chauncey	Mentor CET trained, highly qualified, possess great student rapport, effectively manage student behavior; highly accessible to teachers, possess a willingness and desire	Teacher observations, common planning meeting times, Monthly Teacher Induction Meetings with PDF, Administrator, and Coaches

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		to assist and inspire teacher growth and development.	
Shonne Robinson - School Counselor	Mei Lu	Mentor CET trained, highly qualified, possess great student rapport, effectively manage student behavior; highly accessible to teachers, possess a willingness and desire to assist and inspire teacher growth and development.	Teacher observations, common planning meeting times, Monthly Teacher Induction Meetings with PDF, Administrator, and Coaches
Ms. Monyel Bryant	Heather Flow	Mentor CET trained, highly qualified, possess great student rapport, effectively manage student behavior; highly accessible to teachers, possess a willingness and desire to assist and inspire teacher growth and development.	Teacher observations, common planning meeting times, Monthly Teacher Induction Meetings with PDF, Administrator, and Coaches
Gloria Davis	Maureen Malone	Mentor CET trained, highly qualified, possess great student rapport, effectively manage student behavior; highly accessible to teachers, possess a willingness and desire to assist and inspire teacher growth and development.	Teacher observations, common planning meeting times, Monthly Teacher Induction Meetings with PDF, Administrator, and Coaches

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.

<p>Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through TEAM-UP after-school programs or through district sponsored summer school. Services range from “Differentiated Instructions” in each classroom, Compass Odyssey during school and in the after school computer lab, tutoring after school, and grade recovery after school. Additionally, services will be provided during Saturday school.</p>
<p>Title I, Part C- Migrant N/A</p>
<p>Title I, Part D District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students Eligible students that qualify for standards-based promotion must participate in Team Up and Saturday school.</p>

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Title II Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English language Learners
Title III Services are provided through the district for professional development training, education materials, and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners
Title X- Homeless District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Students may also be provided medical, dental, mental and other health services.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide after school and Saturday school remediation for students reading below grade level, particularly those level 1 and 2 students who may have problems.
Violence Prevention Programs Counselor program will utilize character education curriculum which is provided by the district
Nutrition Programs District contract with Chartwell Food Services to promote healthy dietary food choices; breakfast provided in individual classrooms for all students.
Housing Programs N/A
Head Start N/A
Adult Education N/A
Career and Technical Education N/A
Job Training N/A
Other: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Turn Around fund will be used for Saturday Academy and Write Score2. Magnet funds will support the school magnet program target goals3. SIG funds will support the school target goals

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Principal: Mr. Ed. Robinson; **Assistant Principals:** Cynthia Carter; Johnny Bryant; Vivian Forshee; **Coaches:** Monyel Bryant; Alicia Monroe; Gladys Jackson; **Counselor:** S. Robinson; **Teachers:** Mrs. Wells; P. McDaniel

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 RTI Leadership Team will focus meetings around: how do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers and our students. *The Big Ideas will center around the following academic and behavioral questions: 1. What do we expect the students to learn? 2. How do we know they have or have not learned what was expected? 3. What will we do when they do or don't learn? 4. What evidence do we have to support our response to these questions?*

The team meets bi-weekly and informally to engage in the following activities: Review data and link to instructional decisions; review Progress Monitoring at the classroom level. The team will identify professional development and resources based on the school recent data. The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation and make decisions.

Identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assist with school-wide assessments that will programs that provide early intervening services for students that may be "at-risk". Assists in the design and implementation for Progress Monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring

Principal: Promotes and provides a common vision for the utilization of data-based decision making; ensures that the school based team is implementing RTI; conducts quarterly review of assessments; ensures implementation of intervention support with documentation; ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers: Provide information about core instruction; participate in student data collection and disaggregation; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, and collaborates with staff to implement Tier 2 interventions.

ESE Support: Participate in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities; into Tier 3 instructions.

Instructional Coach/Reading Coach/Math Coach: Develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/program; identify and analyze existing literature on evidence based curriculum assessment.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Support: Tutoring provided by Ameri-Corp for Bottom Quartile students in 6th and 7th grade (level 1 and level 2)

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 RTI Leadership team met with the Principal to assist in the development of the SIP based on the data-based needs assessment of the school. The team provides data on Tier 1 and tier 2 and tier 3 targets; assists in setting clear expectations for instructions (rigor, relevance, and relationships); facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching; and aligned processes and procedures.

The RTI Collaborative Problem Solving Team will meet once weekly via team meetings and PLC to engage in a systematic Problem Solving Process to improve the academic and behavioral performance of the students in alignment with the SIP goals. The Problem Solving Progress will proceed as follows: Problem Identification (What is the problem?); Problem Analysis (Why is the problem occurring?); Intervention Design (What are we doing to do about it); and Response to Intervention (Is it working). The team will review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk.

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.

Baseline Data: SAPSI Results; Belief Survey; AIDE, Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment -2 (DRA-2), District Benchmark Assessment as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT); SRI – Bottom Quartile.

Midyear: FAIR, DRA-2, District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate.

End of year: Belief Survey; FAIR; FCAT; EOC Exam

Ongoing Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FAIR (ongoing formative assessments),

Frequency of data review: Twice monthly.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Professional Development training will be offered during Early Dismissal professional development training, and continues throughout the year during team meetings and during PLC meetings offered by the RTI facilitator.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Principal: Mr. Ed. Robinson; **Assistant Principals:** Cynthia Carter; Johnny Bryant; Vivian Forshee; **Coaches:** Monyel Bryant; Alicia Monroe; Gladys Jackson; **Teachers:** Latrice Smith; A. Curry; **Media:** B. Moses

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

Principal: As the instructional leader, the principal supports the goal of the Literacy Leadership Team in the development of reading related goals and objectives of the School Improvement Plan.

Teachers: Team members must demonstrate a long-term, professional commitment on increased student achievement in reading by improving classroom instruction and practices.

Instructional Coach/Reading Coach: The reading/instructional coach is vital in the process of providing job embedded professional development at the school level. Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/program; regularly focus on the reading and literacy goals of the School Improvement Plan; promotes reading and literacy initiatives at the school –based level; models and supports teachers in literacy initiatives, data, and literacy concerns throughout the school year.

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

Major Initiatives of the LLT will include but not limited to:

- Engage in regular, ongoing, literacy Professional Development for LLT for strong leadership.
- Use data to create a capacity of reading knowledge within the school and focus on areas of literacy concerns
- Ensure the all stakeholders understand and support the school’s reading goals through a whole school approach

NCLB Public School Choice

- **Notification of School in Need of Improvement (SINI) Status**

Upload a copy of the Notification of SINI Status to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

- **Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**

Upload a copy of the CWT Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

June 2011

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised June 1, 2011 FRH

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

• **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

****Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition***

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

****Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (b) F.S

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

Reading strategies will be directed in PLC meetings. Administrators will conduct Classroom Walkthrough to monitor instructional strategies and elements implemented across the curriculum for each grade level.

****High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S., Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

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

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

June 2011

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised June 1, 2011 FRH

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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.

--

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
1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading			1.1. Student prior knowledge	1.1. Team-up tutoring; extended school hours, SIG, Differentiated Instruction.	1.1. Teachers, Coaches, Administration	1.1. Classroom data notebook, data collection	1.1. Pre/Post Assessment; Benchmarks
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u>							
Increase student achievement from 25% to 42% proficiency	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36% (141)	42% (252)	1.2. Class size	1.2. Differentiated instructions strategies	1.2. Individual Teachers	1.2. Classroom walk through	1.2. Pre/Post Assessment;

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

						Benchmarks
		1.3. Explicit content instructional delivery	1.3. PLC's content pedagogy; NG-CAR-PD; Classroom Walk Through	1.3. District Coach; School-based Math Coach; NG-CAR-PD	1.3. PLC attendance sign-in sheets, CWT	1.3. District CAST; Instructional Data chats; NG-CAR-PD Certificate
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 achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading						
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u>						
Increase student achievement from 5% to 20% proficiency.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	2.1. Fidelity of data analysis and data driven instruction	2.1. Intensive Coaching Model.	2.1. Teachers, School-based Coaches, Administration	2.1. Classroom data notebook; CWT monitoring forms
	5% (32)	20%(120)				
			2.2. Students need high order supplemental instruction	2.2. Extra support with math resources and math coach; small group instructions; vertical articulation with Ribault High School; use of technology; FCIM; Vertical Articulation with high school	2.2. District Math Coach; School-based Math Coach; Teachers	2.2. Classroom walk through (CWT)
		2.3. Maintaining and increasing students current level of performance	2.3. AVID Strategies; FCIM; Project Based Problem Solving	2.3. District Coach; School-based Math Coach	2.3. PLC attendance sign-in sheets, CWT	2.3. Teacher CAST; Daily Lesson Plans
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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<u>Reading Goal #3:</u>			Fidelity of Differentiated Instruction (DI), Response to Intervention (RtI)	PD's; Intensive Coaching Model	Math Coach, Administration	Data Analysis; Pre and Post Test; Benchmarks; CWT; Florida Achieves; PD's; evaluation tool	Evidence Notebook; Lesson Plans
Increase student achievement from 57% to 61% learning gains.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	57% (342)	61% (366)					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			Fidelity of Instructional Delivery	FCIM; Differentiated Instructions strategies; Vertical Articulation	Math Coach; Administration; District Coach	Classroom walk through; District feedback	PD evaluation; Evidence Folder; Lesson Plan
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>			Comprehensive use of FAIR data and tools	Quarterly PD with teachers on the decision tree and materials to address student needs	Administrative Staff, Academic Coaches	CWT, Lesson Plan and Decision Tree	SRI; FAIR:
Increase student achievement in lowest 25% from 74% to 77% learning gains.	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	74%(79)	77%(82)					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			Use of DI instruction and RTI in Core Classes that meet reading needs	PD for Differentiated Instruction using data	Administrative Staff, Academic Coaches	Grouping of students and assignments attached to Lesson plans CWT	Benchmark PMAs
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the applicable subgroup(s):			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u>	Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)		5A.1. White: Black: Community Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. PD Level of Complexity for reading material and questions	5A.1. Coaches and Administrative Staff	5A.1. Materials and level 3 & 4 Questions placed in Lesson Plans CWT	5A.1. Benchmark & PMA's
Decrease student achievement from 64% to 54% Adequate Yearly Progress	2011 Current Level of Performance:* Black: 64% (336)	2012 Expected Level of Performance:* Black:54% (324)	Complex reading assignments				
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
5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u>	Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2011 Current Level of Performance:* NA	2012 Expected Level of Performance:* NA					
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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading	Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		5C.1. Teachers knowledge of how to instruct	5C.1. PD on how to develop lessons to address the	5C.1. Administrative staff, Coaches	5C.1. CWT Lesson Plans	5C.1. Evidence Notebook

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Goal #5C:			students with disabilities	needs	and ESE district Coach		C.A.S.T.
Decrease student percentages from 55% to 53% for Adequate Yearly Progress.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*		Utilize support facilitator model in core classes			
	55% (54)	53% (52)		Team Teaching			
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2	5C.2
			CARPD trained Support facilitators	Inclusion teachers enrolled in CARPD classes or get reading endorsed	Administrative Staff, Academic coaches,	Teachers enrolled and working on end project	Completion of project to receive certificate
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading	Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged		5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D:			Complex reading assignments	Professional Development - Level of Complexity for reading material and questions	Coaches and Administrative Staff	Materials and level 3 & 4 questions placed in Lesson Plans	Benchmark & PMA's
Decrease student percentages from 63% to 60% Adequate Yearly Progress.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*				CWT	
	63% (292)	60% (360)					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction /Modalities of Learning	6-8	Reading Coach	All core classes	September 2011 (on-going)	Sign-in Logs, Fair Reports	Reading Coach
Data Mining /Unpacking the Standards /Lesson Planning/	6-8	Academic Coaches and District Coach	All core classes	September 2011 (on-going)	Sign-In Logs, Focus Walks, View of Agenda Boards in correlation to Learning Schedule	Instructional and Reading Coaches
AVID Strategies	6-8	Academic Coaches	School-wide	October 2011 (on- going)	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Instructional and Reading Coaches, Administration
Writing Across the Curriculum	6-8	Academic Coaches	School-wide	October 2011 (on- going)	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Instructional and Reading Coaches, Administration
Integrating Technology	6-8	Academic Coaches; STC	School-wide	October 2011 (on- going)	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Instructional and Reading Coaches, Administration

Reading 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
Build capacity for reading by providing classroom libraries, a well-stocked library media center, and incentives for reading through the 25 Book goal, Book of the Month, and individual classroom promotional incentives	Reading Club	General Fund; Magnet Funds	
Read across the curriculum, incorporating reading strategies into lesson plan.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Integrating of Technology across the curriculum	PODCAST; YouTube; Internet	Magnet Funds; General Funds	
			Subtotal:

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals

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

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. Students achieving proficiency (Level 3) in mathematics			1.1. Student prior knowledge	1.1. Team-up tutoring; extended school hours, SIG, Differentiated Instruction.	1.1. Teachers, Coaches, Administration	1.1. Classroom data notebook; team-up; data collection	1.1. Pre/Post Assessment; Benchmarks
Mathematics Goal #1:							
Increase student achievement from 41% to 47% proficiency.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (157)	47% (157)					
			1.2. Class size	1.2. Differentiated instructions strategies	1.2. Teachers	1.2. Classroom walk through	1.2. Pre/Post Assessment; Benchmarks
			1.3. Explicit content	1.3. PLC's content	1.3. District Coach;	1.3. PLC attendance sign-in	1.3. District CAST;

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		instructional delivery	pedagogy; NG-CAR-PD; Classroom Walk Through	School-based Math Coach	sheets, CWT	Instructional Data chats; NG-CAR-PD Certificate	
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 achieving above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics		2.1. Fidelity of data analysis and data driven instruction	2.1. Intensive Coaching Model	2.1. Teachers, School-based Coaches, Administration	2.1. Classroom data notebook; team-up; data collection; CWT monitoring forms	2.1. Pre/Post Assessment; Benchmarks; PMA's; Evidence Notebook	
Increase the number of students achieving above proficiency from 8% to 12% proficiency	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>						<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>
	8% (46)						12% (65)
		2.2. Students need high order supplemental instruction	2.2. Extra support with math resources and math coach; small group instructions; vertical articulation with Ribault High School; use of technology	2.2. District Math Coach; School-based Math Coach; Teachers	2.2. Classroom walk through	2.2. Pre/Post Assessments; Benchmarks; FCIM Data	
		2.3. Maintaining and increasing students current level of performance	2.3. Team-up; AVID Strategies; FCIM; Project Based Problem Solving	2.3. District Coach; School-based Math Coach	2.3. PLC attendance sign-in sheets, CWT	2.3. Teacher CAST; Daily Lesson Plans	
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. Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics (excluding 9th grade; learning gains will not be available for this grade)		3.1. Fidelity of DI, RtI	3.1. PD's; Intensive	3.1. District Coach;	3.1. Data Analysis; Chapter Pre and Post Test; Benchmarks;	3.1. Exit Slips; Assessment;	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Goal #3:				Coaching Model	Math Coach, Administration	CWT; Florida Achieves	Benchmarks; FCIM Assessments
Increase the percentage of students making learning gains from 62% to 66%	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (342)	66% (396)					
			3.2. Explicit Instructions	3.2. FCIM; Differentiated instructions strategies	3.2. Teachers	3.2. Classroom walk through	3.2. Pre/Post Assessment; Benchmarks; FCIM Assessments
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4:			Student prior Knowledge	Extra support provided by teacher in small group setting - Differentiated Instruction; Use of technology	Principal; Assistant Principal; Math Coach; District Coach; Teachers	CWT	Benchmark Assessments; PMA's; Student Notebook Assessments
Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains from 70% to 73%.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70%(68)	73%(71)		Professional Development - Content Instructional Delivery			
			4.2. Use of reading strategies	4.2. Professional Development CARPD	4.2. Math Coach; District Coach; Principal; Assistant Principal	4.2. CWT; Lesson Plans	4.2. Benchmark Assessments; PMA Assessments; Teacher CARDP certificate
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the applicable subgroup(s):			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5A:	Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)		5A.1. White: Black: Lack of Basic Skills Knowledge Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. Extra support provided by teacher in small group setting; Differentiated Instruction; Use of technology Train teachers in content Instructional Delivery	5A.1. Principal; Assistant Principal; Math Coach; District Coach; Teachers	5A.1 CWT	5A.1. Benchmark Assessments; PMA Assessments	
	Decrease AYP percentage from 58% to 55% for subgroup (blacks) not making AYP.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		Black: 58% (305)	Black: 55% (275)					
			5A.2 Use of reading strategies	5A.2. Professional Development CARPD	5A.2. Math Coach; District Coach; Principal ;Assistant Principal	5A.2 CWT; Lesson Plans	5A.2. Benchmark Assessments; PMA Assessments; Teacher CARDP certificate	
			5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5B:	Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
	Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		NA	NA					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

2011-2012 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. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5C: Decrease subgroup not making AYP from 52% to 49% yearly progress – Students with Disabilities	Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		5C.1.	5C.1. Professional Development - Lesson Planning Professional Development - Instructional Delivery	5C.1. Math Coach; District Coach; Teachers; Principal ;Assistant Principal; ESE Facilitator	5C.1. CWT	5C.1. Benchmark Assessments; PMA’s
	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	52% (51)	49%(47)					
			5C.2. Student lack of reading comprehension	5C.2. Professional Development - CARPD	5C.2.	5C.2. CWT	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5D: Decrease percentage from 58% to 55% for student to make AYP.	Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged		5D.1. Fidelity of Instructional Delivery for ESE	5D.1. Professional Development - Lesson Planning Professional Development - Instructional Delivery	5D.1. Math Coach; District Coach; Teachers; Principal ;Assistant Principal; ESE Facilitator	5D.1. CWT	5D.1. Benchmark Assessments; PMA’s
	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58% (269)	55% (255)					
			5D.2. Student lack of reading comprehension	5D.2. Train teachers in mathematics reading strategies; Problem Solving Strategies;	5D.2. Math Coach; District Coach; Teachers; Principal ;Assistant Principal	5D.2. CWT	5D.2. Benchmark Assessments; PMA Assessments

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			Students take advantage of extended learning opportunities through TEAM UP and extended school hours			
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	6-8	District and Math Coaches	Core teachers	Coaching cycle	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Math Coach and Administration Team
Differentiated Instruction	6-8	Academic Coaches	School-wide	on- going	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Instructional, Math, Reading Coaches, Administration
Problem Solving Strategies	6-8	Academic Coaches	Core teachers	On-going	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Administration and Coaches
AVID Strategies	6-8	Academic Coaches	School-wide	October 2011 (on- going)	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Instructional and Math Coach, Administration
Data Mining /Unpacking the Standards /Lesson Planning/	6-8	Academic Coaches and District Coach	All core classes	September 2011	Sign-In Logs, Focus Walks, View of Agenda Boards in correlation to Learning Schedule	Instructional and Math Coach, Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group student / teacher conferencing during the instructional period • Intensive Math • Daily use of Differentiated Instruction Additional support in a Resources class	Differentiated Instruction; AVID	General Fund; Magnet Funds	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Integrating of Technology across the curriculum	PODCAST; YouTube; Internet	Magnet Funds; General Funds	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement
--	--

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

SCIENCE GOALS			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science							
Science Goal #1:							
Increase student achievement from 15% to 24% proficiency	<u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	1.1. Students experiencing difficulties with higher level questioning.	1.1. Teachers will use WEBB DOK and AVID strategies when developing lessons and assessments; Students will use Cornell Notes process.	1.1. Science teachers, Science Coach; Instructional Coach; District Science Coach; Administration	1.1. Classroom Walk Through	1.1 FCIM Assessment; Formative and Summative Assessments
	15% (23)	24%(44)					
			1.2. Student prior knowledge.	1.2. Teachers will implement FCIM Focus Lessons based on benchmarks; Vocabulary acquisition Build content knowledge through Professional Development and PLC for teachers	1.2. District Science Coach; Science Coach; Administration	1.2. CWT	1.2. Formative and Summative Assessments; FCIM Calendar
			1.3. Ability to understand informational text based on reading level	1.3. AVID – Cornell Notes; Reading strategies;; Vocabulary Acquisition	1.3. District Science Coach; Science Coach; Administration	1.3. CWT.	1.3. Formative and Summative Assessments
			1.4 Fidelity to the implementation of the 5E's lesson plan format and planning	1.4 Professional development - 5E's lesson planning and correlation with FLDOE Item Specification ;Modeling; Intensive Coaching cycle	1.4 District Science Coach; Science Coach; Administration	1.4 CWT	1.5 Formative and Summative 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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2:		Lack of differentiation in lesson planning and delivery	Teachers use Instructional Focus lessons to meet the needs of students.	District Coach; Administration	Lesson Plans; CWT; Collaborative Planning	Formative and Summative Assessments; FCIM calendar; FOCUS Lesson
Increase student achievement from 0% to 10% proficiency.	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*	Teachers use the “extend” portion of the 5 E lesson format to enrich or re-teach and check for understanding			
	0%	10% (17)				
			2.2. Lack of rigor, scaffolding, probing, and higher order thinking in advanced classes	2.2. Unpacking standards; Use of Webb’s Depth of Knowledge that reflect rigor, scaffolding, probing, and higher order thinking questioning.	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal; Coaches, Science Coach; District Coach	2.2. CWT, Lesson Plans, Collaborative planning
		2.3 Content knowledge by science teachers	2.3 Teachers- Build Content knowledge through Lesson Study, Professional Development and PLC	2.3 Science Coach; District Coach; Administration	2.3 CWT; Lesson Study; Lesson Plans	2.3 Formative and Summative Assessments

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Middle School Science- Content – Lesson Study	All Levels	District Coach	Content School-wide	Early Dismissal; PLC	Lesson Plan Review; Classroom Walk through; Training Evaluation	Coaches; Administration
Lesson Planning – 5E’s	All Levels	District Coach ;	Grade level	Grade Level PLC	Lesson Plan Review; Classroom	Coaches; Administration

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Model		Science Coach			Walk through; Training Evaluation	
Differentiated Instruction	All Levels	District Coach, Science Coach	Content- School Level	Early Dismissal; PLC	Lesson Plan Review; Classroom Walk through; Training Evaluation	Coaches; Administration
AVID Strategies	All Levels	Academic Coaches	School-wide	October 2011 (on- going)	Sign-in Logs, Focus Walks, Informal Observations	Coaches; Administration
Unpacking Standards; FCAT Annually Assessed Benchmark Investigation ; Item Specification	All Levels	District Coach ; Science Coach	Grade level	Grade Level PLC Dates	Lesson Plan Review; Classroom Walk through; Training Evaluation	Coaches; Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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
1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing			1.1 Writing across the curriculum within content areas	1.1 Professional Development; Coaching Cycle; In-house Writing Workshop; collaborative planning; vertical articulation within grade levels	1.1. Administrative Staff Coaches	1.1. Focus Walks, Informal and Formal Observations	1.1. District Writing Benchmark; In house writing assessment; Student Portfolio; Write Score
Increase level 3.0 and higher from 84% to 86%	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	84% (153)	86% (172)					
			1.2. New Teachers	1.2. Professional Development use of effective writing strategies, incorporating Writing Stations, In house Writing Workshops for teachers and students	1.2. Instructional Coach	1.2. Sign-In Logs, Evidence of Student Work, Write Score Data, PLC meetings, Informal focus walks	Write Score; District Timed Writing; In-House Writing Assessment
			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
2A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing			2A.1. White: Black: Novice teachers lack of content knowledge Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2A.1. Professional Development for writing; Intensive coaching cycle; In house writing workshop	2A.1 Instructional Coach Administrative Staff	2A.1. CWT	2A.1. Student Evidence (Portfolios); District Timed Writing; Write Score
Writing Goal #2A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)							
2011 Current Level of Performance:*							
2012 Expected Level of Performance:*							

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Increase subgroups not making AYP from 1% to 5%	Black: 1% (3)	Black: 5% (12)					
			2A.2. Effective use of FCAT scoring rubrics	2A.2. PLC and common scoring of writing assignments	2A.2 Teachers, Instructional Coach, Administrators.	2A.2. Scoring rubrics, writing assignments, student portfolios	2A.2. Student Evidence (Portfolios) , District Timed Writing, Write Score
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2B:	Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)		2B.1.	3B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, 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
2C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C:	Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		2C.1	2C.1.	2C.1.	2C.1.	2C.1.
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>this box.</i>	NA	NA					
			2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.	2C.2.
			2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D:	Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged		2D.1. Novice teachers lack of content knowledge	2D.1 Professional Development for writing; Intensive coaching cycle; In house writing workshop	2D.1. Instructional Coach Administrative Staff	2D.1. CWT	2D.1. Student Evidence (Portfolios);District Timed Writing; Write Score
Increase subgroup not making AYP from 1% to 3 %	2011 Current Level of Performance:*	2012 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	1% (3)	3% (12)					
			2D.2.	2D.2.	2D.2.	2D.2	2D.2
			2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.	2D.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Process (1412, QFRIESS, Elaboration techniques/Writing Stations)	All grades	Instructional Coach	ELA and Social Studies Teachers	(on- going)	Sign-In sheets, Informal Observations,	Instructional Coach and Administrators
Intensive Coaching Cycle	8 th Grade	Instructional Coach	ELA Teachers	1 st and 2nd quarter	Sign-In Sheets and Informal Observations	Instructional Coach and Administrators
Useful Transitions	All grades	Instructional	ELA and Social Studies	(on-going)	Sign-In Sheets and Informal	Instructional Coach and

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

(FBI) and Mature Command of Language		Coach	Teachers		Observations	Administrators
Analysis of Anchor Papers	All grades	Instructional Coach	ELA and Social Studies	(on-going)	Sign-In Sheets and Informal Observations	Instructional Coach and 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
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Writing Goals

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

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

ATTENDANCE GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1 Transportation (Tardies)	1.1. Phone calls to parents/guardian to students who have had more than 5 unexcused absences in a 30 day period.	1.1. School Truancy Officer; Administrative Staff Assistant Principal; Guidance Counselor	1.1. Attendance Contracts for Parents and students to sign	1.1. Attendance reports
Attendance Goal #1:							
Increase student attendance from 95% to 97%	2011 Current Attendance Rate:*	2012 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	<i>95% (556)</i>	<i>97% (582)</i>					
	2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	<i>112</i>	<i>100</i>					
	2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
<i>120</i>	<i>110</i>						
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

SUSPENSION GOAL(S)		Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:		1.1 Parents agreement to Alternative to Outside School Suspension (ATOSS).	1.1. Increase Administrative and teacher duty with fidelity; Student Behavior Modification Contract; School-wide Code of Conduct Expectation Assembly; ATOSS Benefits	1.1. Administrative Staff; ATOSS Staff	1.1. Daily Suspension Report	1.1. Monthly Referral Report	
Decrease suspension goals 425 to 325	2011 Total Number of In-School Suspensions						2012 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
	425						325
	2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School						2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
	153						100
	2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions						2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
	443						343
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School						
205	105						
		1.2. Number of teacher	1.2. Foundations	1.1. Administration	1.1. Disciple Report	1.1. Disciple Report	

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		Referrals	(CHAMPS) Professional Development for teachers and staff			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Foundations	All levels	Foundations Team; Administrator	School-wide	On-going	Disciple Referral reports	Administrative Staff
CHAMPS	All Levels	District CHAMPS Trainer	School-wide	Early Dismissal	Monthly Reports	Administrative Staff

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

DROPOUT PREVENTION GOAL(S)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2010-2011 school year.</i>		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
NA	2011 Current Dropout Rate:*	2012 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>				
	2011 Current Graduation Rate:*	2012 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>				

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Subtotal:
Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

PARENT INVOLVEMENT GOAL(S)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>			1.1. Inadequate /Insufficient contact information	1.1. Update parent information quarterly. Newsletter notification	1.1. Teachers. Administrative Staff. CRT Operator	1.1. Genesis Report; Teacher Phone Logs;	1.1. Parent Log Sheet. Student Agendas. Newsletter. Climate Survey. Parent Link Report
Parent Involvement will increase by 8%	2011 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2012 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	5% (29)	8%(42)					
			1.2. Parent Mobility (Transportation). Foster Care Population.	1.2. Guidance identify Foster Parents and relay viable school information	1.2. Assistant Principal. Guidance	1.2. Parent Contact Log. Parent Link Report. Increased Parental Involvement	1.2. Climate Survey. Sign-In Sheet

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1.3. Parental Attendance at Parent Workshops	1.3. Teacher /Parent Mentor Participation	1.3. Assistant Principal; Parent Liaison	1.3. Parent Participation Contact Log	1.3. Survey; sign-in sheet

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Portal Workshop for Parents.	All levels	Guidance. Coaches	Community parents	Open House/ Sept. 6th	Monitor Parent Portal Usage	Guidance
PLC for Teachers	All levels	Guidance. Coaches	School-wide	On-going	Monitor Parent Portal Usage	Guidance

Parent Involvement Budget

*** Please ensure that items included in the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) are outlined in the following budget section.**

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			

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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 Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1:							
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in</i>		2011 Current Level :*	2012 Expected Level :*				

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET (Insert rows as needed)

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

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select “checked” under “Default Value” header; 3. Select “OK”, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status					
<input type="checkbox"/> Intervene	<input type="checkbox"/> Correct II	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent II	X Correct I	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent I	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

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

School Advisory Council

June 2011

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised June 1, 2011 FRH

2011-2012 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

School Advisory Council (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 citizens 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.

X Yes

No

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

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year.

Describe projected use of SAC funds.	Amount