

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Differentiated Accountability



School Improvement Plan (SIP)

Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2010-2011

2010 – 2011 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Stanton College Preparatory School	District Name: Duval County
Principal: Nongongoma Majova-Seane	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Larry Cobb	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window. Longitudinal data will be displayed in the print view of the SIP.

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	Nongongoma Majova-Seane	Bachelor of Science Degree in Mathematics, Masters Degree in Mathematics Education, Certification in Educational Leadership and is currently (ABD) as a candidate for a doctoral	2	10	2000 – 2001 Twin Lakes Academy – A (Yes) 2001 – 2003 Ed White – D (Yes, No) 2003 – 2006 Eugene Butler F, D, C and (No) 2006 – 2009 William M. Raines –F (No) 2009 - 2010 Stanton College Preparatory - Pending

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		degree in Educational leadership/Certified in Mathematics 9-12 and Educational Leadership			
Assistant Principal	Norma Hayward	Bachelor of Science Degree in History and Political Science, Master of Science Degree in Specific Learning Disabilities, and Doctorate Degree in Educational Leadership/ Certified in Gifted Endorsement, History 6-12, Political Science 6-12, Specific Learning Disabilities K-12, and Educational Leadership	8	13	2002-2003 Ed White - D (AYP – No) 2003-2009 Stanton College – A (AYP – Yes, No, Pro, Yes) 2009 – 2010 Stanton College Preparatory – Pending 2009 - 2010 Stanton College Preparatory - Pending
Assistant Principal	Julie Dupries	Bachelor of Arts Degree in English and Master of Science Degree in Educational Leadership/Certified in English for Speakers of Other Languages K-12, English 6-12, and Educational Leadership	4	5	2006-2007 Mandarin Middle - A (AYP- Yes) 2007 - 2009 Stanton College – A (AYP – No, Yes) 2009 - 2010 Stanton College Preparatory - Pending
Assistant Principal	Sonya Gaiter	Bachelor of Science Degree in Biology and Master of Science Degree in Educational Leadership/Certified in Mathematics 5-9, Mathematics 6-12, and Educational Leadership	2	4	2008-2009 Douglas Anderson – B (AYP – No) 2007-2008 Douglas Anderson – A (AYP - Yes) 2009 - 2010 Stanton College Preparatory - Pending

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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)				
					School	2009		2008	
					Grade	AYP	Grade		
Mathematics	Ahmed Khalifa	-B.S. Mathematics Education -M.A. Mathematics Education -Florida Certificate in Mathematics (Grades 6-12) with Gifted Endorsment -NSDC Leadership Academy	Grand Park: 1 y	3	Baldwin	C	NO	D	
			Sandalwood: 1 y		Sandalwood	C	NO	D	
			Baldwin: 1 y		ACHS	N/A	N/A	N/A	
			ACHS: 0 year		Grand Park	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Language Arts	Melanie Pittman	B.A. Communications; M.A. Human Resources; English 6-12 and Educational Leadership	Grand Park, Mandarin, Stanton, Paxon - 2 yrs. Baldwin - 1	9	A.P. Randolph D,D (2003, 2004) Forrest C, D, F, F, D (2005 - 09)				

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
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. Transcripts and areas of certification are reviewed for content knowledge, experience, qualifications and teaching	Principal and interviewing team	Ongoing	
2. Teachers participate in in-school Professional Learning Communities sessions	Monitoring Team	Ongoing	
3. Teachers attend professional development identified in their Individual Professional Development Plan including AP & IB including AP, IB and other district offered training opportunities	Monitoring Team	Ongoing	
4. Classroom WalkThroughs and feedback	Monitoring Team	Ongoing	

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
Tia Thomas	English 6 - 12	Read 180/Intensive Reading	Assigned Teacher Mentor, Bi-weekly meetings with Professional Development facilitator, District Workshops
Michael Sims	Mathematics 6 - 12	Statistics and Algebra II	Assigned Teacher Mentor, Bi-weekly meetings with Professional Development facilitator, District Workshops
Lisa Bunge	Social Sciences and Latin	AP World History and Latin	Assigned Teacher Mentor, Bi-weekly meetings with Professional Development facilitator, District Workshops
Ryan Angney	Social Studies	AP World History	Assigned Teacher Mentor, Bi-weekly meetings with Professional Development facilitator, District Workshops

Staff Demographics

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school who are teaching at least one academic course.

*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
	6%(4)	10%(8)	49%(40)	35%(29)	56%(46)	95%(78)	0%(0) Work in progress	22%(18)	43%(35)

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
Amanda Hohne	Ryan Angney	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Casey Carpenter-Smith	Lisa Bunge	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Kathy Feierstein	Michael Sims	All mentor	Pre-planning orientation,

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Matilda Bagby	Tia Thomas	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Janet Hall	Joel Adams	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Shirley Sacks	Jessica Besecker	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Lauren Burke	Yan Lan	All mentor teachers	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Bob Turba	May Ibasco	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Brian Heggood	Kevin Sharpe	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)
Jessica Cumber	Patricia Gruhn	All mentor teachers received Clinical Educator Training (CET) and are members of the mentee department.	Pre-planning orientation, Beginning of the year luncheon with mentor, Development/completion support of Action Plan, Participate in bi-weekly professional learning community group (PLC)

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Principal, Nongongoma Majova-Seane: The principal will provide the shared vision for the use of data-based decision making, will ensure that the school-based RTI team implements RTI as well as apply, and evaluate the Tiers at needed levels; will ensure that the RTI Leadership Team receives the necessary training so that they can in-turn train staff members; will ensure that intervention support and documentation is implemented, will assess the RTI skills of staff members and ensure that they are trained accordingly, and will keep parents abreast of school-based RTI plans and activities. She will also provide information about core instruction to teachers in her PLC (Science); will participate in student data collection; will assist teachers with the delivery of Tier 1 instruction/interventions; will collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and will assist with integrating Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Assistant Principal, Norma Hayward: She will provide information about core instruction to teachers in her PLC (Social Studies); will participate in student data collection; will assist teachers with the delivery of Tier 1 instruction/interventions; will collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and will assist with integrating Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. She will act as liaison for implementation of RTI at the school level; will workshop the teachers on RTI at the beginning of the school year; will receive ongoing RTI training that the district provides and will deliver information to the school as well as provide training where applicable; will provide direct intervention services to an identified group of students and track their progress; will guide school in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support RTI. Educates the team in the role that (ESOL) second language acquisition plays in the learning process and collaborates with general education teachers.

Assistant Principal, Julie Dupries: She will provide information about core instruction to teachers in her PLC (English/Language Arts); will participate in student data collection; will assist teachers with the delivery of Tier 1 instruction/interventions; will collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and will assist with integrating Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Will develop technology necessary to manage and display data; will provide technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management relating to PMPs, and progress monitoring activities for struggling students.

Assistant Principal, Sonya Gaiter: She will provide information about core instruction to teachers in her PLC; will participate in student data collection; will assist teachers with the delivery of Tier 1 instruction/interventions; will collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and will assist with integrating Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. She will provide information about school-wide and class-wide behavior curriculum and instruction; will participate in behavioral data collection; will provide professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and will collaborate with staff to implement behavioral interventions.

Gifted and Exceptional Education Coordinator and RTI/Reading Leadership Team Leader, Knight and Heggood: The Coordinator and Team Leader along with the **teacher-led RTI Leadership Team: Heggood, Cumber, Crider, Miguez, Thomas and Breuer** will serve as the RTI Facilitators for the school. They will participate in the district-based RTI training; will participate in the design and delivery of professional development; will fully support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans and ensure that the staff knows how and when to apply each Tier; will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content programs; will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; will identify systematic patterns of student needs while using strategies gained via district training to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; will assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk";

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

will assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; and will continuously describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions). **Guidance Counselor, Bob Turba:** As part of the leadership team and the department head for our Guidance Department, he will provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; will keep other Counselors abreast of available interventions for “at risk” students; will link community agencies to schools and families to support the child’s academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; will provide consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; will provide group and individual student interventions; and will conduct direct observation of student behavior via classroom visits. **Activities Director, Marigene O’Connor:** Will provide information about school-wide and class-wide behavior curriculum and instruction; will keep a running record of RTI activities on the school-wide calendar. **IB Coordinator, Matt Hemphill:** Will provide technical support to IB teachers and staff regarding data management for any RTI related issues.

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 focus of the RTI Leadership Team will be governed by the following essential questions: What does the data tell us? What do we want the data to tell us? What interventions will be used to meet the needs of students who did not demonstrate mastery after each core instruction and supplemental intervention? What other steps can we take to calibrate the work governing this initiative? The Leadership team will meet once a week as a whole group to monitor the progress of intervention strategies outlined in the School Improvement Plan. Teachers will screen data in their respective PLCs and make informed instructional decisions; an extensive review of data from formatives and benchmarks will assist in identifying intentional non-learners and failed learners. The PLCs will then devise a plan to provide interventions to students as per noted patterns and/or deficiencies presented by the data at hand. The administrative team will meet weekly to discuss classroom monitoring of instructional strategies and provide support. Support will be provided by the following: Mrs. Majova-Seane (Science PLC), Dupries (Reading/Writing PLC), Gaiter (Mathematics PLC), Hayward (Foundations/Safety program), Gifted Coordinator (Gifted and ESE students) and Guidance (Parental Involvement). The teacher led RTI team will meet twice a month after the Gifted Coordinator and the Lead teacher meets with the Leadership and Monitoring Teams. This team will fully support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans and ensure that the staff knows how and when to apply each Tier; will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content programs; will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; will identify systematic patterns of student needs and provide strategies gained via district training to identify appropriate, and evidence-based intervention strategies; will assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students and collect, analyze and disseminate data relating to progress made through RTI implementation.

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 perused the data from 2009/2010 school year. Duties were disseminated at different levels for each subgroup of the RTI Leadership team. They worked together in the gathering of data used to develop the needs assessment of the school. The Principal shared the data with SAC to solicit their assistance with external resources. The Assistant Principal shared the PLC information with department heads to solicit their input as the SIP is developed. The other Assistant Principal organized the needed training for the teacher-led RTI subgroup. Entities will be provided data on all targets set for each Tier; academic and social areas will be addressed via seminars for gifted students and via Guidance Counselors for other students; the PLCs will develop a strategic plan to adjust classroom instruction and shift intentional interventions whenever there are areas that need attention. The RTI Leadership subgroups will collectively work together to monitor the interventions, adjust the modification thereof, and align the entire schemata. The SIP is a living document and will be treated as such, as data is collected, desegregated, analyzed and used to differentiate instruction for each child.

RtI Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. The following will be used as baseline data: **Reading:** The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) results from Read 180 Classes; the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) data retrieved via Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), and the 2008-2009 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), IB and AP results for **Mathematics and Science**. Progress Monitoring: PMRN for **Reading**; AIDE for **Reading, Mathematics, and Science**; Compass Odyssey; Formatives; Summatives; Writing prompts and Benchmarks **for Reading, mathematics, Science, and Writing**. Midyear Assessments: FAIR; School-based Common Assessments and District Benchmarks. End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, IB and AP.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

The initial training of the staff on RTI took place during teacher pre-planning seminar workshops last school year. In addition, follow-up training occurred during beginning of the

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

school year faculty and departmental meetings. Small group training will be ongoing during Small Learning Communities morning mini-sessions and during PLCs this school year. The RTI Leadership Team will attend the district-based RTI training and will come back to train the rest of the staff. RTI efforts for each department will also be discussed at bi-weekly Department Head meetings so that best practices can be shared.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team for our school includes: The Principal and her Monitoring Team along with all the English Language Arts and Reading teachers.

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

The Monitoring Team visits classes and shares the findings during the weekly meetings. A member of the monitoring team will meet with designated teachers during PLCs to discuss the assessment results and student progress. During classroom walkthroughs, teachers will provide a member of the monitoring team with a toolkit consisting of: lesson plans, data, student work, efforts of RTI and differentiated instruction (as noted on lesson plans) to address individual student needs. The areas of concern are shared with the Reading Leadership team lead teacher. The Reading Leadership Team brainstorms and shares strategies with the entire faculty. In addition, the Reading teacher shares the SRI lexile scores with the ELA teachers to ensure that they assist struggling students as evidenced by the data. The test coordinator also shares FAIR data with the teachers. In support of the district's reading goals and our school-based reading goals, we have established a bi-weekly protocol whereby each PLC delves into our Reading deficiencies and discusses ways/strategies to close the gaps. Each PLC reviews data to ensure that reading in the content area is consistent with our school goals. The monitoring team meets with the teachers during Quarterly Curriculum Reviews to formulate plans for effective implementation of targeted reading goals and gauge the progress on targets set on the IPDP. The main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the way in which it is being delivered across all content and grade levels to provide next steps for improving the reading achievement of all students/subgroups.

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

1. Collaboration during PLC – Peruse data from common assessments, identify areas of concern and share strategies to address the weak areas.
2. Use Benchmark baseline data to implement mini focus lessons
3. Give students who do not have an FCAT score will be given the Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) to determine whether reading interventions are needed, and to place students in the appropriate reading course.
4. Results from FAIR will be used to implement Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) activities and provide student Lexile levels that can be matched to reading materials.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

NCLB Public School Choice

Notification of School in Need of Improvement (SINI) Status

Attach a copy of the Notification of SINI Status to Parents

Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification

Attach a copy of the CWT Notification to Parents

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Attach a copy of the SES Notification to Parents

**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.

The district Reading Coach will meet with all departments during the monthly meetings to present strategies for reading in the content area. Teachers will share reading strategies during PLC, and the district Reading coach will assist with understanding reading across all content areas. We have good teachers and they know their subject matter, however; getting content across is sometimes a challenge in some classroom. We plan to have faculty learning meetings to ensure that everyone understands all contexts in which teaching and learning occurs. That is, we will all be able to have students and texts in concert. We will discuss all aspects of content literacy instruction while ensuring that everyone understands the relationship between reading and learning. We will use the Before Reading, During Reading and After Reading strategy as one of our guiding strategies.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

**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?

The school offers students elective courses in the fine arts and technology. All IB students are required to identify a sixth subject for advanced knowledge that relates to their major area of study. Teachers in our school come from various professions prior to teaching, thus providing an advantage as they are able to map course-to-world connections.

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?

Each student plans their coursework on our website through a link created by our Guidance Chair. Counselors work with students at course selection time to develop an appropriate course of study designed to help them meet their goals. Students are also encouraged to select courses that will match their major area of interest (MAI).

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

Some of the strategies used to improve student readiness for postsecondary level includes:

- *Stanton funds the taking of the PSAT for 11th grade students
- *Offer International Baccalaureate (IB) diploma program as an IB World School or Honors Advanced Placement track for all students
- *Offer college admission test preparatory courses where tutorial assistance is provided
- *Hosting College Night as well as college interest meeting with admission counselor
- *Offer a course, SLS, through a local university for some of our students

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3)?
 - Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5)?
 - Based on a comparison of 2009 FCAT data and 2010 FCAT data, what was the percent increase or decrease of students maintaining proficiency (FCAT Levels 3, 4, 5)?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students maintaining proficiency (FCAT Level 3) or moving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5) on the 2011 FCAT?
 - For students scoring FCAT Levels 1 or 2, what strategies will be implemented to provide remediation and increase achievement to proficiency (FCAT Level 3)?
 - For students scoring FCAT Level 3, what strategies will be implemented to maintain proficiency and/or increase achievement to above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5)?
 - For students scoring FCAT Levels 4 or 5, what strategies will be implemented to maintain above proficiency and provide enrichment?
-
- What percentage of students made learning gains?
 - What was the percent increase or decrease of students making learning gains?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students making learning gains?
 - What strategies will be implemented to increase and maintain proficiency for these students?
 - What additional supplemental interventions/remediation will be provided for students not achieving learning gains?
-
- What percentage of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains?
 - What was the percent increase or decrease in the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing learning gains in the lowest 25%?
 - What additional supplemental interventions/remediation will be provided for students in the lowest 25% not achieving learning gains?
-
- Which student subgroups did not meet AYP targets?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the number of subgroups making AYP?
 - What strategies will be used to ensure students make AYP?
-
- What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed a decrease in proficiency?
 - How will the Instructional Focus Calendar be created to address area(s) of improvement (clusters/strands)?
 - How will focus lessons be developed and revised to increase proficiency for these clusters/strands?
-
- In addition to the baseline and mid-year assessment, how often will interim or mini-assessments be administered?
 - How often will teachers and the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches) meet to analyze data, problem solve, and redirect the instructional focus based on the academic needs of students?
 - How often will data chats be held at each of the following levels: teacher/student; teacher/administration?
-
- How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to strengthen Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier 1 instruction and differentiation?
 - How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention?
 - How will the Problem-solving Model and ongoing progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 3 intensive intervention?

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

* 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.	1.1. Reading and Writing Labs	1.1. Monitoring Team and teachers based on recommendations	1.1. Classroom teachers will constantly analyze data for common target areas and recommend areas of concern for each student, as well as encourage students to attend the Reading and/or Writing labs for additional assistance	1.1. District Benchmarks and in-school common assessments
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u>							
84% of our FCAT tested population met high standards in Reading. Our target for 2011 is to increase by 1%.	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 26% (241)	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 27%(259)					
			1.2. Students will need a computer at home to access FCAT Explorer	1.2. FCAT Explorer	1.2. Monitoring Team	1.2. PLC will analyze data for common target areas and ensure that the students in this population receive rigorous and more challenging assignments	1.2. District Benchmarks
			1.3.	1.3 Students will demonstrate a mastery of grammar and mechanics necessary for successful completion of PSAT sub-	1.3. Classroom teachers	1.3 PLC will analyze data for common target areas and ensure that the students in this population receive rigorous and more	1.3 PSAT writing section will be used as a diagnostic

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			test: parts of speech functions, active/passive voice and types of sentences		challenging 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 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		2.1.	2.1. Reading and Writing Labs	2.1. Monitoring Team and teachers based on recommendations	2.1. Classroom teachers will constantly analyze data for common target areas and recommend areas of concern for each student, as well as encourage students to attend the Reading and/or Writing labs for additional assistance	2.1. District Benchmarks and in-school common assessments
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u>						
84% of our FCAT tested population met high standards in Reading. Our target for 2011 is to increase by at least 1%.	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	58% (504)	59%(566)				
		2.2. Students will need a computer at home to access FCAT Explorer	2.2. FCAT Explorer	2.2. Monitoring Team	2.2. PLC will analyze data for common target areas and ensure that the students in this population receive rigorous and more challenging assignments	2.2. District Benchmarks
		2.3	2.3 Students will demonstrate a mastery of grammar and mechanics necessary for successful completion of PSAT sub-test: parts of speech functions, active/passive voice and types of sentences	2.3 Classroom teachers	2.3 PLC will analyze data for common target areas and ensure that the students in this population receive rigorous and more challenging assignments	2.3 PSAT writing section will be used as a diagnostic
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

group:					
3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading					
Reading Goal #3:					
75% of our 9 th and 10 th grade students made learning gains in Reading. We will increase this number by 3%.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*	3.1. Due to the sporadic pattern in cluster performance-We will target all clusters throughout the year to ensure that more students make at least a year's growth in Reading.	3.1. Monitoring Team, PLC Team Leaders and Department Head.	3.1. District Benchmark, FAIR, SRI and teacher made tests.
	75% (664)	78% (748)			
			3.2. Some of our students do not have computers at home	3.2. Monitoring Team	3.2. Pre and Post test assessments from the Amsco FCAT practice books.
			3.2. Compass Learning Odyssey and FCAT Explorer	3.2. ---Compass Learning Odyssey: This web-based curriculum offers a customized learning program for the students. The targeted instruction is aligned with state standards, and the student will receive differentiated instruction to meet their	

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					<p>particular needs. They can access this system at home.</p> <p>---FCAT Explorer: The FCAT Explorer will provide practice to help the students make real progress on the skills needed on the FCAT.</p>	
		3.3. Getting all students in this subgroup to attend the sessions	3.3.Extended School day for Reading Lab	3.3. Monitoring Team and teachers	3.3.---Students in this subgroup will attend the sessions and the teachers will identify the need for interventions, the interventions to be used and the timeline to check for effectiveness (RTI problem solving)	3.3.---Teacher-made mini-assessments and District Benchmarks
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. Implementing the program with fidelity	4.1. Read 180	Tia Thomas (Read 180 Teacher)	4.1. Quarterly SRI results with lexile levels and Reading Counts to test for comprehension	4.1.Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and District Benchmarks
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>						
62% of our bottom quartile showed at least one year’s growth on the FCAT Reading. We will increase this number by 4%.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	62% (133)	66% (159)				
		4.2	4.2. Intensive Reading	4.2. Assistant Principal Sonya	4.2. FAIR testing to determine progress made	4.2 Florida Assessments for

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

				Gaiter and Principal Majova-Seane	towards reaching proficiency	Instruction in Reading (FAIR) and District Benchmarks
		4.3	4.3. Great Books	4.3. Assistant Principal Sonya Gaiter and Principal Majova-Seane	4.3. District Benchmarks to be used as baseline data and to monitor progress	4.3. District Benchmarks
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	
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. Due to the sporadic pattern in cluster performance-We will target all clusters throughout the year for these subgroups: Words and Phrases; Compare and Contrast; Main Idea and Reference and Research.	5A.1. Monitoring Team, PLC Team Leaders and Department Heads	5A.1. ---Each PLC will develop focus lessons and modify as needed. The targeted benchmarks will be selected based on noted progress on student work, assessments, and other relevant datum. ---The capstone will be set for each assessment. Student mastery based on that capstone will be the determinate of whether revision is crucial. During PLC, teachers will analyze data and find areas of concern with this in mind; "Did the students learn what was intended?" i.e. did the student reach the capstone? Teachers and the monitoring team will peruse the complexity of the questions to ensure that rigor is evident. The monitoring team will ensure that lessons are retaught as prescribed in PLC notes.	5A.1. District Benchmark, FAIR, SRI and teacher made tests.
The AYP target for reading was to have each subgroup to score at 72% or above grade level in Reading. All subgroups met the target except the Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroup.	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	White: 93% Black:63% Asian:92% Econ. Disadvantage d: 60%	White:79% Black:79% Asian:79% Econ. Disadvantage d: 79%				
		5A.2. Some of our	5A.2.Compass Learning	5A.2. Monitoring	5A.2.---Compass Learning	5A.2.Pre and Post

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		students do not have computers at home	Odyssey and FCAT Explorer	Team	Odyssey: This web-based curriculum offers a customized learning program for the students. The targeted instruction is aligned with state standards and the student will receive differentiated instruction to meet their particular needs. They can access this system at home. ---FCAT Explorer: The FCAT Explorer will provide practice to help the students make real progress on the skills needed on the FCAT.	test assessments from the Amsco FCAT practice books.
		5A.3. Getting all students in this subgroup to attend the sessions	5A.3.Extended School day for Reading Lab	5DA.3. Monitoring Team and teachers	5A.3.---Students in this subgroup will attend the sessions and the teachers will identify the need for interventions, the interventions to be used and the timeline to check for effectiveness (RTI problem solving)	5DA.3.---Teacher-made mini-assessments and District Benchmarks
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.
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in</i>	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*				

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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
5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>	Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)		5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged and Black		5D.1.	5D.1. Due to the sporadic pattern in cluster performance-We will target all clusters throughout the year for these subgroups: Words and Phrases; Compare and Contrast; Main Idea and Reference and Research	5D.1. Monitoring Team, PLC Team Leaders and Department Head.	5D.1.---Each PLC will develop focus lessons and modify as needed. The targeted benchmarks will be selected based on noted progress on student work, assessments, and other relevant datum. ---The capstone will be set for each assessment. Student mastery based on that capstone will be the	5D.1. District Benchmark, FAIR, SRI and teacher made tests.
The AYP target for reading was to have each subgroup to score at 72% or above grade level in Reading. All	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	Economically Disadvantaged	Economically Disadvantaged					

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

subgroups met the target except the Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups	ed: 60% Black: 63%	ed: 79% Black: 79%				determinate of whether revision is crucial. During PLC, teachers will analyze data and find areas of concern with this in mind; "Did the students learn what was intended?" i.e. did the student reach the capstone.? Teachers and the monitoring team will peruse the complexity of the questions to ensure that rigor is evident. The monitoring team will ensure that lessons are retaught as prescribed in PLC notes.	
			5D.2. Getting all students in this subgroup to attend the sessions	5D.2.Extended School day for Reading Lab	5D.2. Monitoring Team and teachers	5D.2.---Students in this subgroup will attend the sessions and the teachers will identify the need for interventions, the interventions to be used and the timeline to check for effectiveness (RTI problem solving)	5D.2.---Teacher-made mini-assessments and District Benchmarks
			5D.3. Some of our students do not have computers at home	5D.3.Compass Learning Odyssey and FCAT Explorer	5D.3. Monitoring Team	5D.3.----Compass Learning Odyssey: This web-based curriculum offers a customized learning program for the students. The targeted instruction is aligned with state standards and the student will receive differentiated instruction to meet their particular needs. They can access this system at home. ---FCAT Explorer: The FCAT Explorer will provide	5D.3.Pre and Post test assessments from the Amsco FCAT practice books.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					practice to help the students make real progress on the skills needed on the FCAT.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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
Highly Qualified Faculty	All Grade Levels	FLIBS and College Board	Core Teachers	Continuous	AP and IB training, followed by transfer of strategies to the classroom	Monitoring Team
Best Practices	All Grade Levels	PLC Leaders	PLC by content area	Early Release Wednesdays	Collaboration during PLC	Monitoring member for each PLC
Best Practices and 'Teach Like a Champion'	All Grade Levels	Department Chairs	School-wide participation	Department Meetings	Collaboration and presentations during Faculty Meetings	Principal

Reading Budget

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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3)?
 - Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5)?
 - Based on a comparison of 2009 FCAT data and 2010 FCAT data, what was the percent increase or decrease of students maintaining proficiency (FCAT Levels 3, 4, 5)?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students maintaining proficiency (FCAT Level 3) or moving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5) on the 2011 FCAT?
 - For students scoring FCAT Levels 1 or 2, what strategies will be implemented to provide remediation and increase achievement to proficiency (FCAT Level 3)?
 - For students scoring FCAT Level 3, what strategies will be implemented to maintain proficiency and/or increase achievement to above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5)?
 - For students scoring FCAT Levels 4 or 5, what strategies will be implemented to maintain above proficiency and provide enrichment?
-
- What percentage of students made learning gains?
 - What was the percent increase or decrease of students making learning gains?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the percentage of students making learning gains?
 - What strategies will be implemented to increase and maintain proficiency for these students?
 - What additional supplemental interventions/remediation will be provided for students not achieving learning gains?
-
- What percentage of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains?
 - What was the percent increase or decrease in the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing learning gains in the lowest 25%?
 - What additional supplemental interventions/remediation will be provided for students in the lowest 25% not achieving learning gains?
-
- Which student subgroups did not meet AYP targets?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the number of subgroups making AYP?
 - What strategies will be used to ensure students make AYP?
-
- What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed a decrease in proficiency?
 - How will the Instructional Focus Calendar be created to address area(s) of improvement (clusters/strands)?

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will focus lessons be developed and revised to increase proficiency for these clusters/strands?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the baseline and mid-year assessment, how often will interim or mini-assessments be administered? How often will teachers and the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches) meet to analyze data, problem solve, and redirect the instructional focus based on the academic needs of students? How often will data chats be held at each of the following levels: teacher/student; teacher/administration?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to strengthen Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier 1 instruction and differentiation? How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention? How will the Problem-solving Model and ongoing progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 3 intensive intervention?

* 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 (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics			1.1. Some of our students do not have computers at home	1.1. Use of FCAT Explorer	1.1. Teachers and Monitoring Team	1.1. Check Points by the teacher and Monitoring Team school-wide data checks	1.1. Benchmark results
Mathematics Goal #1:							
96% of our FCAT tested population met high standards in Mathematics. Our target for 2011 is to move at least 1.5% students to the next level of proficiency.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	11.5% (106)	10% (96)					
			1.2.	1.2. Continuously monitor and analyze data in PLC to look for improvement and pinpoint emerging areas of	1.2. Monitoring Team member	1.2. RTI and other remediation strategies will be discussed and implemented.	1.2. Student grades, FCAT/AP/IB Exams and Benchmark results

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			weakness.			
		1.3	1.3.---Develop cross-curricular math/science teams ---Collaborate with teachers of the other discipline ---Devise strategies to better integrate skills across curriculum	1.3. Monitoring Team member for Mathematics will join vertical teams and PLCs on some early dismissal days to monitor progress	1.3. Mathematics portion of the FCAT; the IB Math Studies, SL, and HL Tests; and the AP Calculus and AP Statistics exams will be analyzed and plans will be formulated	1.3. Benchmark results for mathematics and Science; Results from Mathematics portion of the FCAT; the IB Math Studies, SL, and HL Tests; and the AP Calculus and AP Statistics exams
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 mathematics		2.1.	2.1.Use of FCAT Explorer	2.1. Teachers and Monitoring Team	2.1. Check Points by the teacher and Monitoring Team school-wide data checks	2.1. Benchmark results
Mathematics Goal #2:						
96% of our FCAT tested population met high standards in Mathematics. Our target for 2011 is to increase the number of students scoring at level 4 and 5 by at least 1.5%.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	84.5% (741)	86% (825)				
		2.2.	2.2. Continuously monitor and analyze data in PLC to look for improvement and pinpoint emerging areas of weakness.	2.2.Monitoring Team member	2.2. RTI and other remediation strategies will be discussed and implemented.	2.2. Student grades, FCAT/AP/IB Exams and Benchmark results

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		2.3	2.3.---Develop cross-curricular math/science teams ---Collaborate with teachers of the other discipline ---Devise strategies to better integrate skills across curriculum	2.3. Monitoring Team member for Mathematics will join vertical teams and PLCs on some early dismissal days to monitor progress	2.3. Mathematics portion of the FCAT; the IB Math Studies, SL, and HL Tests; and the AP Calculus and AP Statistics exams will be analyzed and plans will be formulated	2.3. Benchmark results for mathematics and Science; Results from Mathematics portion of the FCAT; the IB Math Studies, SL, and HL Tests; and the AP Calculus and AP Statistics exams
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		3.1. Some of our students do not have computers at home	3.1. Compass Odyssey	3.1. Teachers and Monitoring Team	3.1. Most mathematics students, especially struggling students will be encouraged to use Compass Odyssey	3.1. Compass Odyssey data and teacher generated assessments
<u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u>						
83% of our 9 th and 10 th grade students made learning gains in mathematics. We will increase by at least 2%.		83% (735)	85%(815)			
		3.2.	PLC collaboration - Increase gains in 9th and 10 th grade mathematics by analyzing, planning, delivering and assessing as a means to check for understanding	PLC teachers and Monitoring team	Mini lessons followed by mini assessments and PLC cycle	Benchmarks and common assessments
		3.3. Some of our students	3.3.FCAT Explorer	3.3. Teachers and Monitoring Team	3.3. Use Florida Achieves Assessments to check for	3.3.Benchmarks and common assessments

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		do not have computers at home		member	understanding	
4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics		4.1.	4.1. Schedule in Intensive Mathematics course	4.1. Teacher and Monitoring Team member	4.1. Teacher-made formative assessments will be used as check points and as a means of determining next RTI steps for each student	4.1. Benchmarks and Formative Assessments results
Mathematics Goal #4:						
88% of our FCAT tested population made learning gains in mathematics. We will increase the number of students making learning gains by at least 1%.	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	88% (779)	89% (854)				
		4.2.	4.2 Due to the sporadic pattern in strand performance-We will target all strands throughout the year for all subgroups as prescribed by each benchmark	4.2. Monitoring Team, PLC Team Leaders and Department Head.	4.2. ---Each PLC will develop focus lessons and modify as needed. The targeted benchmarks will be selected based on noted progress on student work, assessments, and other relevant datum. ---The capstone will be set for each assessment. Student mastery based on that capstone will be the determinate of whether revision is crucial. During PLC, teachers will analyze data and find areas of	4.2. District Benchmark, and teacher-made tests.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					concern with this in mind; “Did the students learn what was intended?” i.e. did the student reach the capstone.?Teachers and the monitoring team will peruse the complexity of the questions to ensure that there is rigor. The monitoring team will ensure that lessons are re-taught as prescribed in PLC notes.	
		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
5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics	Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	5A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.
Mathematics Goal #5A:						
All Subgroups made AYP in Mathematics	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.
		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 Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

mathematics						
Mathematics Goal #5B:						
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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
5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics		Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C:						
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			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: Economically Disadvantaged	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Goal #5D:						
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			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
Mathematics Workshops and conferences	All Teachers	District, College Board and FLIBS	School-wide	Continuous	Collaboration among PLCs	Monitoring Team
In-School PLC and Meetings	All Teachers	Teachers and Monitoring Team	School-wide	Continuous	Collaboration and sharing of best practices	Monitoring Team

Mathematics Budget

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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3)?
 - Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5)?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) or above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5) on the 2011 FCAT?
-
- What benchmarks/strands, by grade level, showed non-proficiency?
 - How will the Instructional Focus Calendar be created to address areas of improvement (benchmark(s)/strand(s))?
 - How will focus lessons be developed and revised to increase and maintain proficiency for these benchmarks/strands?
-
- In addition to the baseline and mid-year assessment, how often will interim or mini-assessments be administered?
 - How often will teachers and the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches) meet to analyze data, problem solve, and redirect the instructional focus based on the academic needs of students?
 - How often will data chats be held at each of the following levels: teacher/student; teacher/administration?
-
- How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to strengthen Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier 1 instruction and differentiation?
 - How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention?

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- How will the Problem-solving Model and ongoing progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 3 intensive intervention?

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

SCIENCE GOALS			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science			1.1.	1.1. Continue discovery and inquiry-based instruction in 9-11 th grade Science classes	1.1. Classroom teachers	1.1. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	1.1. District Benchmarks
<u>Science Goal #1:</u>							
47% of our 11 th graders scored at level 3. We will decrease the number of students at level 3 to 44% which in turn will increase the number of students scoring at levels 4 and 5.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	47% (151)	44% (155)					
			1.2. We do not offer a course in Earth Space	1.2. A review of major topics of Earth Space Science	1.2. 11 th Grade Science teachers	1.2. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	1.2. District Benchmarks
			1.3. There is no baseline data pertaining to the current 11 th graders	1.3. Analyze FCAT and AP data, along with teacher-made tests to address areas of weakness	1.3. PLC	1.3. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	1.3. District Benchmarks and teacher-made tests

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science		2.1. We do not offer a course in Earth Space Science	2.1. A review of major topics of Earth Space Science	2.1. 11 th Grade Science teachers	2.1. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	2.1. District Benchmarks
Science Goal #2:						
93% of the 11 th graders scored at proficiency level on the FCAT Science.	2010 Current Level of Performance:*					
	46% (149)	50% (176)				
		2.2. There is no baseline data pertaining to the current 11 th graders	2.2. Analyze FCAT and AP data, along with teacher made tests to address areas of weakness	2.2. PLC	2.2. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	2.2. District Benchmarks and teacher made tests
		2.3	2.3. Science Fair projects	2.3. Classroom teachers	2.3. Teacher generated Formative Assessments	2.2. District Benchmarks and teacher made project 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
PLC Focus on specific topics	9 -11th grade science teachers	PLC Leaders	PLC by subject area	Early Release Wednesdays and monthly department meetings	Continuous monitoring via PLC	Department Head and Principal
Highly Qualified teachers	9 – 11 th grade science	College Board	9 – 11 th grade science teachers	Continuous based on needs	AP Scores	Department Head and Principal

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Raise AP/IB exam scores	Improve reading in the content area Improve writing in the content area Increase exam practice	PLC Collaboration	PLC by subject area	Early Release Wednesdays	AP/IB scores	Department Head and Principal
-------------------------	--	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------

Science Budget

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

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

End of Science Goals

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- Based on 2010 FCAT data, what percentage of students achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) (Levels 3.0 and higher)?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to students achieving AYP on the 2011 FCAT?
 - Which student subgroups did not achieve AYP targets on the 2010 FCAT?
 - What are the anticipated barriers to increasing the number of subgroups achieving AYP on the 2011 FCAT?
 - What strategies will be used to ensure students achieve AYP on the 2011 Writing FCAT?
-
- What types of writing (narrative, expository, persuasive) by grade level, showed a decrease in writing scores?
 - How will the Instructional Focus Calendar be created to address areas of improvement for writing skills (focus, organization, support and conventions)?
 - How will focus lessons be developed and revised to increase and maintain writing scores?
-
- In addition to the baseline and mid-year assessment, how often will interim or mini-assessments be administered?
 - How often will teachers and the leadership team (principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches) meet to analyze data, problem solve, and redirect the instructional focus based on the academic needs of students?
 - How often will data chats be held at each of the following levels: teacher/student; teacher/administration?
-
- How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to strengthen Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier 1 instruction and differentiation?
 - How will the Problem-solving Model and progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 2 supplemental intervention?
 - How will the Problem-solving Model and ongoing progress monitoring be utilized to identify students in need of RtI Tier 3 intensive intervention?

* 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 4.0) in writing			1.1.	1.1. We will continue to focus on drafting and revising for clarity, completeness, and conventions.	1.1. Monitoring Team	1.1. District Writing Prompts	1.1. District Writing Prompts and in-class writing samples
Writing Goal #1:							
Analysis of our	2010 Current Level of Performance:*	2011 Expected Level of Performance:*					

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

writing data shows that consistently 99% of the students met high standards in writing for the past four years.	99% (377)	99% (456)					
			1.2.	1.2 Use FCAT Writing samples in the 9 th and 10 th grade classes	1.2. Classroom teachers and monitoring team	1.2. District Writing Prompts and data analysis, followed by in-class mini lessons	1.1. District Writing Prompts
			1.3.	1.3. Monitor writing instruction through quarterly curriculum reviews and PLC	1.3. Monitoring Team	1.3. Peruse writing sample papers during PLC and create focus lessons for weak areas	1.3. District Writing Prompts and teacher made mini-assessments
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2A:	Writing Goal #2A:		2A.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
	Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)						
	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2B.2.					
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.
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2C.2.					
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.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	2C.3.	

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing	Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged		2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.	2D.1.
Writing Goal #2D:							
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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
Raise AP/IB exam scores	9 -12 th grade	College Board	9 -12 th grade ELA and Reading PLC	Continuous	AP Scores	Monitoring Team
Digging Deeper in Writing	9 th and 10 th grade	District Coach	9 th and 10 th grade ELA and Reading PLC	Continuous	FCAT Writes scores and District Prompts results	Monitoring Team

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1
Writing Budget

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- What was the attendance rate for 2009-2010?
- How many students had excessive absences (10 or more) during the 2009-2010 school year?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of students with excessive absences?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number of students with excessive absences for 2010-2011?

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- How many students had excessive tardies (10 or more) during the 2009-2010 school year?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of students with excessive tardies?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number students with excessive tardies for 2010-2011?

* 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 Attendance Goal #1:			1.1.	1.1. Decrease the number of students with excessive absences- Administrator/Student Conference (after three days)	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. A conference will be held to determine the reason(s) for the absences, and the parent will be notified	1.1. Conference
Our daily attendance rate was 91% and we will monitor tardies and absences to increase this rate for 2011	2010 Current Attendance Rate:*	2011 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	91% (1387)	92% (1497)					
	2010 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2011 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	9% (137)	8% (130)					
	2010 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2011 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
1% (16)	1% (16)						
			1.2.	1.2. Administrator/Parent Conference (After 5 or more days)	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2. A conference will be held to make the parent aware of the consequences of excessive absences	1.2. Conference and interventions
			1.3.	1.3. Attendance Contract (10 or more days)	1.3. Assistant Principal	1.3. An attendance contract will be monitored and Guidance will be involved in this process	1.3. Contract

2010-2011 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

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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			Grand Total:

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- What was the total number of in-school suspensions for 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of out-of school suspensions for 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of students suspended in school in 2009-2010?
- What was the total number of students suspended out of school in 2009-2010?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of suspensions?
- What are the anticipated barriers to decreasing the number of students suspended?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number of suspensions for 2010-2011?
- What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the number of students suspended for 2010-2011?

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

* 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.	1.1. In-School Suspension	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. We will assign students in-school suspension to reduce the number of out of suspension	1.1. Data Collection for In-school suspension
We will reduce the number of outside suspensions so that students can still have an opportunity to get school work completed	<u>2010 Total Number of In-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2011 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</u>					
	2% (35)	1.5% (24)					
	<u>2010 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2011 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<u>2010 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2011 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	5% (80)	3% (49)					
	<u>2010 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2011 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
		1.2.	1.2. ATOSS	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2. We will assign students ATOSS in lieu of outside suspension	1.2. ATOSS numbers	
		1.3.	1.3. Detention	1.3. Assistant Principal	1.3. We will conference with students and/or parents and assign detention in lieu of ISSP	1.3. ISSP numbers	

2010-2011 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

Suspension Budget

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process

- What is the current dropout rate? What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the dropout rate?
- What is the current graduation rate? What strategies and interventions will be utilized to increase the graduation rate?
- What is the total number of students retained at each grade level? What strategies and interventions will be utilized to decrease the retention rate?
- What data warning systems are currently in place to identify students at risk of being retained and/or dropping out of school?
- What school-wide activities, strategies, and/or interventions are in place to support students who are at risk of being retained and/or dropping out?
- How will barriers be addressed to prevent students from experiencing course failure, lack of credit attainment, and behavioral issues impacting student achievement?

* 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 2009-2010 school year.</i>			1.1.	1.1. PMP	1.1. The ARC (Academic Review Committee)	1.1. The ARC (Academic Review Committee) will meet to review student progress and determine next steps	1.1.PMP
We had 100% graduation rate in 2009. The graduation rate for 2010 is pending	2010 Current Dropout Rate:*	2011 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	2010 Current Graduation Rate:*	2011 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
			1.2.	1.2.Tutorials and Remediation	1.2. The ARC Committee	1.2. Struggling students will be encouraged to attend after school tutorials and remediation sessions	1.2.Grades
			1.3.	1.3.Parent Conferences	1.3.The ARC Committee	1.3.Conference with parents to keep them abreast of their student's academic progress	1.3.Grades

2010-2011 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

Dropout Prevention Budget

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Please refer to questions below to guide your responses when completing the goal chart. Specific responses are not required for each question on the template.

Guiding Questions to Inform the Problem-Solving Process
(Title I Parent Involvement Plan may be uploaded)

- Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?
- How will the school correlate the parental involvement activities with student achievement?

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

PARENT INVOLVEMENT GOAL(S) Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
		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.	1.1. Continue to use OnCourse	1.1. STC	1.1. OnCourse codes will be distributed during Open House so that parents can continue checking student progress throughout the school year	1.1.OnCourse
Our parents are very involved	2010 Current level of Parent Involvement:*					
	2011 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
		1.2.	1.2. Stanton website	1.2.Web-Master	1.2. Feedback feature of website	1.2.Website Updates
		1.3.	1.3. PTSA Blast	1.3. PTSA President	1.3. Participation in PTSA and other school events	1.3.Blast updates

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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

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

ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1:							
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2010 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2011 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<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

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

FINAL 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	Available Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			Grand Total:

2010-2011 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Attach school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance

School Advisory Council

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.

Yes

No

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

Describe projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
SAC funds are allocated based on needs	

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year.
Our SAC meets monthly on the third Wednesday of each month. Primary activities include assisting the evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, and initiating activities which generate greater cooperation between the community and the school, providing support to the school, as well as managing the School Improvement Funds.