

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2011-2012

2011 – 2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| School Name: Edward W. Bok Academy | District Name: Polk County School Board/Lake Wales Charter Schools |
| Principal: Damien Moses | Superintendent: Jesse Jackson |
| SAC Chair: | Date of School Board Approval: |

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window. .

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

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

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

Highly Qualified Administrators

List your school’s highly qualified administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|--------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Damien Moses | BS in PE from South Carolina State University; MS in Sports Health Science from Life University; Educational Specialist Degree in | 1 | 10 | 06-07: School Grade “B” – AYP 92% 07-08: School Grade “A”: - AYP 95% 08-09: School Grade “A” – AYP 100% 09-10: School Grade “A” – AYP 90% 10-11: School Grade “A” – AYP 79% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern | | | |
| Assistant Principal | Debbie Hunt | | 1 | 8 | 06-07: School Grade "B" – AYP 92% 07-08: School Grade "A": - AYP 95% 08-09: School Grade "A" – AYP 100% 09-10: School Grade "A" – AYP 90% 10-11: School Grade "A" – AYP 79% |

Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches

List your school’s highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| N/A | | | | | |

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. Lake Wales Charter School handles the job posting for all LWCS. In addition, Bok Academy advertises on its website as well. Bok gives teachers responsibility and freedom; that construct is an attractor for many educators. The expectations are very high for Bok employees and improving student achievement is at the forefront of the work. The administration clearly articulates the expectations before a staff member is hired, and he/she is also informed about the benefits of teaching in a charter situation. A small group of teachers founded this school and, that, speaks volumes to excellent educators. | LWCS Community Involvement Director Designated Bok Staff Member Administration | 2011-2012 | |

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 |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Anderson, Roxanne | Guidance (Pre-k v-12), Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (Grades 5-9), Political Science (Grades 6-12), Exceptional Student Education (K-12) | Adv. Social Studies | ESOL competency completion classes |
| Butcher, Stacey | English (6-12) | Language Arts | ESOL competency completion classes |
| Johnson, Chandra | Educational Leadership (All Levels), Elementary Education (K-6) | Intensive Reading | ESOL competency completion classes |
| O’Neill, Lita | Biology (Grades 6-12), General Science (5-9), Middle Grades General Science (Grades 5-9), | Adv. Science | ESOL competency completion classes |
| Fell, Joshua | Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum (Grades 5-9), | Adv. Science | ESOL competency completion classes |

Staff Demographics

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

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

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

8/15

| 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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 35 | 1 out of 35-3% | 15 out of 35-43% | 14 out of 35-40% | 4 out of 35-11% | 11 out of 35-31% | 35 out of 35-100% | 4 out of 35-11% | 1 out of 35-3% | 9 out of 35-26% |

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 |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Andrea Baker | Jennifer Lambeth Pamela Smith Michael Richards-first year teacher | Dean of reading will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, modeling, support |
| Allison Hunter | Elizabeth Sebring | Dean of language arts will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, modeling, support |
| Alicia Linder | Stephanie Wilson | Dean of math will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, modeling, support |
| Colby Pike | Roxanne Anderson Michael Richards | Dean of social studies will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, modeling, support |
| Lita O’Neill | Robert Kochanowski Richele Floyd-first year teacher | Dean of science will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, modeling, support |
| Lindsay Woods | Richele Floyd-first year teacher | Mentor will facilitate our goal of increasing achievement level for all students. | On-going meetings |
| Debbie Hunt Dr. Yvonne Morrow | New Teachers | Assistant Principal will help all new teachers adjust to the culture of Bok and requirements of new teachers. | On-going meetings, lesson plan review, support |
| Dr. Yvonne Morrow | New Teachers | Provides a mentoring program through the LWCS for new teachers. | On-going meetings |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|---|
| <p>Title I, Part A – Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Edward W. Bok Academy. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, may include but not limited to support to provide after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents. Title I, Part A will also be used to implement and expand the Acaletics program in order to raise Math scores.</p> |
| <p>Title I, Part C- Migrant - Migrant students enrolled in Edward W. Bok Academy will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.</p> |
| <p>Title I, Part D – Title I, Part D, provides Transition Facilitators to assist students with transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school. The Transition Facilitators communicate with the Guidance Counselors at schools to facilitate the transfer of records and appropriate placement.</p> |
| <p>Title II - Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. Edward W. Bok Academy will provide training for the staff as outlined in the LWCS Title II application.</p> |
| <p>Title III - Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, as well as professional learning opportunities for school staff. Edward W. Bok Academy will provide training for the staff as outlined in the LWCS Title III application.</p> |
| <p>Title X- Homeless - The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Title I, Part C.</p> |
| <p>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) – N/A</p> |
| <p>Violence Prevention Programs – Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying, gang awareness, gun awareness, etc.</p> |
| <p>Nutrition Programs NA</p> |
| <p>Housing Programs NA</p> |
| <p>Head Start NA</p> |
| <p>Adult Education NA</p> |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Career and Technical Education NA |
| Job Training NA |
| Other NA |

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

| School-Based RtI Team |
|---|
| <p>Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.</p> <p><u>Principal:</u> The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision –making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of PS/RtI; ensures that the school-based team is implementing PS/RtI; conducts assessment of PS/RtI skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support PS/RtI implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of PS/RtI schoolwide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based PS/RtI plans and activities.</p> <p><u>Assistant Principal/Educational Operations:</u> Assists Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision- making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of PS/RtI, further assists the principal in the assessment of PS/RtI skills, implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning, and communication with parents concerning PS/RtI plans and activities.</p> <p><u>Selected General Education Teachers:</u> – Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2/3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.</p> <p><u>Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers:</u> Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials/ instruction in tiered interventions; collaborates with general education teachers.</p> <p><u>Academic Support Coordinator/Guidance/Assistant Principal:</u> Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk,” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p> <p><u>Guidance Counselor:</u> Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. Communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students’ academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.</p> <p><u>School Psychologist/PS/RtI Behavior Representative (PBS):</u> Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities; support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns.</p> <p><u>Speech Language Pathologist:</u> Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systematic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.</p> <p><u>Technology Specialist:</u> Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display.</p> |

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 PS/RtI Leadership Team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model. The PS/RtI Leadership Team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- o Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently if new data is available.
- o Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, student improvement.
- o Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- o Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring. Intervention teams also foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, promote the use of evidence-based interventions, and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

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 PS/RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

RtI Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior. Baseline data is gathered through August and September. FAIR data is processed through the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN). Third through Tenth Grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year’s FCAT scores and IDEAS. Progress Monitoring data is gathered mid-year and toward the end of the year. FAIR data is processed twice more through the PMRN. Progress Monitoring data is collected as needed for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, Quick Reads, Fluency checks, etc. Diagnostic Assessment data is gathered through the FAIR. End of Year data is gathered through FAIR & FCAT. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the PS/RtI Leadership Team Meetings.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI. Professional learning will be provided during sessions throughout the year and further discussed during department meetings. The PS/RtI Overview will be provided in mid-August/September. The District has five other mini-modules that will be provided throughout the year. The PS/RtI Leadership Team will evaluate additional staff Professional Learning needs during the monthly PS/RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

| |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Edward W. Bok Academy LLT includes: administration, academic support coordinator, reading dean, and IR & CT/R teachers. |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). Ongoing meetings will implement strategies to address the needs identified by our state assessments. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? – To monitor the student progress and make individual academic and instructional adjustments to address the needs of students in order to achieve AYP. |

NCLB Public School Choice

- **Notification of School in Need of Improvement (SINI) Status**
Upload a copy of the Notification of SINI Status to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.
- **Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**
Upload a copy of the CWT Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.
- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

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

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

***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.

Teachers are using a variety of instructional reading strategies in all core and keystone subjects. The reading department will use faculty meetings to train faculty in reading strategies students are directly being directly taught in reading classes such as Take 5.

****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?

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

April 2011

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| READING GOALS | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading | | | 1.1. New faculty | 1.1. Single Gender Classes Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 1.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 1.1. Teacher anecdotal notes Reading Specialist Diagnosis Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations | 1.1. SRI | |
| Reading Goal #1: | | <u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u> | | | | | | <u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> |
| By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 Achievement Level 3 students will increase by 3% as reported by the INDV report. | | 36% (181) | | | | | | 39% (196) |
| | | | 1.2. Lack of interest in reading | 1.2. Student interest classroom texts | 1.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 1.2. Classroom observations Student/teacher dialogue | 1.2. SRI Student responses | |
| | | | 1.3. ESOL Students | 1.3. Direct Instruction | 1.3. Andrea Baker, Reading | 1.3. Teacher anecdotal notes | 1.3. SRI | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | Dean Administration Team | Reading Specialist Diagnosis | |
| 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. New faculty | 2.1. Single Gender Classes Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 2.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 2.1. Teacher anecdotal notes Reading Specialist Diagnosis Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations | 2.1. SRI |
| Reading Goal #2: By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 Achievement Level 4-5 students will increase by 3% as reported by the INDV report. | | <u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 40% (202) | <u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 43% (216) | | | |
| | | 2.2. Lack of interest in reading | 2.2. Student interest classroom texts | 2.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 2.2. Classroom observations Student/teacher dialogue | 2.2. SRI Student responses |
| | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading | | 3.1. New faculty | 3.1. Single Gender Classes Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 3.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 3.1. Teacher anecdotal notes Reading Specialist Diagnosis Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations | 3.1. SRI |
| Reading Goal #3: By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 students will increase in Reading Learning Gains by 3% as reported by the School Grades report. | | <u>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 69% (340) | <u>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 72% (355) | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. Lack of interest in reading | 3.2. Student interest classroom texts | 3.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 3.2. Classroom observations Student/teacher dialogue | 3.2. SRI Student responses |
| | | | 3.3. ESOL Students | 3.3. Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 3.3. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 3.3. Teacher anecdotal notes Reading Specialist Diagnosis | 3.3. ESOL Students |
| 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. New faculty | 4.1. Single Gender Classes Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 4.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 4.1. Teacher anecdotal notes Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations Reading Specialist Diagnosis | 4.1. SRI |
| <u>Reading Goal #4:</u> | | | | | | | |
| By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 Lowest Quartile Reading students will increase in Learning Gains by 3% as reported by the School Grades report. | | | | | | | |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 64% (74) | 67% (78) | | | | | |
| | | | 4.2. Lack of interest in reading | 4.2. Student interest classroom texts | 4.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 4.2. Classroom observations Student/teacher dialogue | 4.2. SRI Student responses |
| | | | 4.3. ESOL Students | 4.3. Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 4.3. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 4.3. Teacher anecdotal notes Reading Specialist Diagnosis | 4.3. ESOL Students |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the applicable subgroup(s): | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5A:</u></p> | <p>Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)</p> | | <p>5A.1. New faculty</p> <p>White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>5A.1. Single Gender Classes</p> <p>Direct Instruction</p> <p>Small Group Instruction</p> <p>Tiered Vocabulary</p> <p>Data Driven Lesson Plans</p> | <p>5A.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean</p> <p>Administration Team</p> | <p>5A.1. Teacher anecdotal notes</p> <p>Department Meetings discussing strategies</p> <p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Reading Specialist Diagnosis</p> | <p>5A.1. SRI</p> |
| <p>By the Spring of 2012, the White and Hispanic subgroups will increase by the percentage necessary to make AYP through Safe Harbor.</p> | <p>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>5A.2. Lack of interest in reading</p> <p>5A.3. ESOL Students</p> | <p>5A.2. Student interest classroom texts</p> <p>5A.3. Direct Instruction</p> <p>Small Group Instruction</p> <p>Tiered Vocabulary</p> <p>Data Driven Lesson Plans</p> | <p>5A.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean</p> <p>5A.3. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean</p> <p>Administration Team</p> | <p>5A.2. Classroom observations</p> <p>Student/teacher dialogue</p> <p>5A.3. Teacher anecdotal notes</p> <p>Department Meetings discussing strategies</p> <p>Classroom observations</p> <p>Reading Specialist Diagnosis</p> | <p>5A.2. SRI</p> <p>Student responses</p> <p>5A.3. SRI</p> |
| | <p>White: 81% (259) Black: Hispanic: 67% (80) Asian: American Indian:</p> | <p>White: 83%(SH) (266) Black: Hisp.: 70%(SH) (84) Asian: American Indian:</p> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| <p>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:</p> | | | <p>Anticipated Barrier</p> | <p>Strategy</p> | <p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p> | <p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p> | <p>Evaluation Tool</p> |
| <p>5B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5B:</u></p> | <p>Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)</p> | | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> | <p>5B.1.</p> |
| | <p>2011 Current Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>2012 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> <p>5B.3.</p> | <p>5B.2.</p> <p>5B.3.</p> |
| | <p>N/A</p> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
| 5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading <u>Reading Goal #5C:</u> | Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD) | | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 | | 5D.1. New faculty | 5D.1. Single Gender Classes Direct Instruction Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | 5D.1. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean Administration Team | 5D.1. Teacher anecdotal notes Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations Reading Specialist Diagnosis | 5D.1. SRI |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 70% (207) | 73% (SH) (216) | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. Lack of interest in reading | 5D.2. Student interest classroom texts | 5D.2. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 5D.2. Classroom observations Student/teacher dialogue | 5D.2. SRI Student Responses |
| | | 5D.3. ESOL Students | 5D.3. Direct Instruction | 5D.3. Andrea Baker, Reading Dean | 5A.3. Teacher anecdotal notes | 5D.3. SRI | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---|--|
| | | | Small Group Instruction Tiered Vocabulary Data Driven Lesson Plans | Administration Team | Department Meetings discussing strategies Classroom observations Reading Specialist Diagnosis | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---|--|

| 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 |
| Reading in the Content Areas | 6-8; All | Admin/Dean/Coodinator | School-wide | Fall/Winter 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |
| Take 5 Reading Strategies | 6-8; All | Admin/Dean/Coodinator | School-wide | Fall/Winter 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |
| LFS Review | 6-8; All | Admin/Dean/Coodinator | School-wide | Fall/Winter 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide support with the implementation of literacy goals | Decoding and Comprehension Workbooks | General Funds | 3704.46 |
| Provide support with the implementation of literacy goals | Weekly Readers | General Funds | 5646.50 |
| Provide support with the implementation of literacy goals | Vocabulary Workshop Books | General Funds | 5860.80 |
| | | | Subtotal: 15207.76 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide high interest texts to all readers | Nooks; e-reader | General Funds | 8100.00 |
| Provide another intervention tier for struggling readers | Fast ForWord Lab | General Funds | 4500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: 12,600.00 |

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: 27,807.76 |

End of Reading Goals

Mathematics Goals

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

| MATHEMATICS GOALS | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| In the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding 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 |
| s achieving proficiency (Level 3) in mathematics s Goal #1: of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 level 3 students will as reported by the | | | 1.1. New Faculty | 1.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok’s math program | 1.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean | 1.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year | 1.1. Classroom Observations |
| | | | | Teacher observations | Administration Team | Walk throughs | |
| | | | | Acaletics training/observations | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Second year of standard changes | 1.2. Use of Acaletics | 1.2. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean | 1.2. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 1.2. Acaletics-benchmark assessments FCAT |
| | | | | FCAT Level Grouping | Administration Team | | |
| | | | | PearsonSuccessnet | | | |
| | | | 1.3. | DOE Updates | | | 1.3. |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| In the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Students achieving above proficiency level 5) in mathematics</p> <p>Strategic Goal #2:</p> <p>By the end of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 level 4-5 students will increase by 2% as reported by the</p> | | | 2.1. New Faculty | 2.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok's math program Teacher observations Acaletics training/observations | 2.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 2.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year Walk throughs | 1.1. Classroom Observations |
| 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
| 40% (201) | 43% (216) | | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. Lack of enrichment to maintain 4 and above proficiency | 2.2. Enrichment opportunities based on student performance level | 2.2. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 2.2. Kids College-Learning Through Sports | 2.2. Kids College Reports |
| | | | 2.3. Second year of standard changes | 2.3. Use of Acaletics FCAT Level Grouping PearsonSuccessnet DOE Updates | 2.3. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 2.3. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 2.3. Acaletics-benchmark assessments FCAT |
| | | | <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Principles" identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p> | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| <p>Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics 9th grade; learning gains will not be available for this year</p> <p>Strategic Goal #3:</p> <p>By the end of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 level 4-5 students will increase by 2% as reported by the</p> | | | 3.1. New Faculty | 3.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok's math program Teacher observations Acaletics training/observations | 3.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 3.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year Walk throughs | 3.1. Classroom Observations |
| 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
| 73% (357) | 75% (367) | | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. Second year of standard changes | 3.2. Use of Acaletics FCAT Level Grouping PearsonSuccessnet DOE Updates | 3.2. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 3.2. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 3.2. Acaletics-benchmark assessments FCAT |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. |
| | | | <p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Principles" identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:</p> | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |

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

| In the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding 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 |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Age of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in 2012 Goal #4: In 2012, FTE 2 and 3 grade Math students will be making Gains by 2% as reported in the School Grades report. | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | 4.1. New Faculty | 4.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok’s math program Teacher observations Acaletics training/observations | 4.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 4.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year Walk throughs | 4.1. Classroom Observations |
| | 71% (85) | 73% (88) | | | | | |
| | 4.2. Lack of enrichment to maintain 4 and above proficiency | | | | | | |
| 4.3. Second year of standard changes | | 4.3. Use of Acaletics FCAT Level Grouping PearsonSuccessnet DOE Updates | 4.3. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 4.3. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 4.3. Acaletics-benchmark assessments FCAT | | |
| In the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding s”, 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 |
| It subgroups not equate Yearly (YP) in 2012 Goal #5A: In 2012, the White and subgroups will increase by necessary to make AYP in 2012. | Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) | | 5.1. New Faculty All subgroups | 5.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok’s math program Teacher observations Acaletics training/observations | 5.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year Walk throughs | 5.1. Classroom Observations |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | White: 81% (258) Black: Hispanic:70% (84) Asian: American Indian: | White: 83% (SH) (265) Black: Hispanic: 73%(SH) (88) Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| 5A.2. Lack of enrichment to maintain 4 and above proficiency | | 5A.2. Enrichment opportunities based on student performance level | 5A.2. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5A.2. Kids College-Learning Through Sports | 5A.2. Kids College Reports | | |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | 5A.3. Second year of standard changes | 5A.3. Use of Acaletics FCAT Level Grouping PearsonSuccessnet DOE Updates | 5A.3. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5A.3. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 5A.3. Acaletics-benchmark assessments FCAT |
| in the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding is”, 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 |
| It subgroups not equate Yearly (YP) in s Goal #5B: | Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL) | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |
| in the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding is”, 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 |
| It subgroups not equate Yearly (YP) in s Goal #5C: | Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD) | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | |

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

8/15

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| In the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Strategies”, 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 | |
| of the most academically at-risk subgroups not to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics. | Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged | | 5D.1. New Faculty | 5D.1. On-going meetings to train new teachers in Bok’s math program Teacher observations Acaletics training/observations | 5D.1. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5D.1. Analyzing Acaletics student data through out the year Walk throughs | 5D.1. Classroom Observations | |
| | of 2011, the Disadvantaged subgroup increased 3% to make AYP in 2011. | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | | | | | | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* |
| | 73% (216) | 76% (SH) (225) | | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. Lack of enrichment to maintain 4 and above proficiency | 5D.2. Enrichment opportunities based on student performance level | 5D.2. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5D.2. Kids College-Learning Through Sports | 5D.2. Kids College Reports | |
| | | | 5D.3. Second year of standard changes | 5D.3. Use of Acaletics FCAT Level Grouping PearsonSuccessnet DOE Updates | 5D.3. Alicia Linder, Mathematics Dean Administration Team | 5D.3. Department Meetings discussing strategies | 5D.3. Acaletics-benchmark assessments 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 |
| Math Technology for the classroom; ActiVotes | 6-8; Math | Sarah Buron | 6-8; Math Teachers | Fall 2011 | Lesson development and demonstrations | Sarah Burson/Alicia Linder |
| Acaletics | 6-8; Math | Mike Bell | 6-8; Math Teachers | Fall 2011; on-going | Progress monitoring, lesson plan review | Alicia Linder/Debbie Hunt |

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

8/15

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Kids College-Learning Through Sports | 6-8; Math and Reading | Karen Murphy | 6-8; All Reading and Math Teachers | Fall 2011 | Progress Monitoring | Alicia Linder/Debbie Hunt |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------|

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Provide hands-on learning experience | Math Manipulatives | General Funds | 200.00 |
| Provide ongoing Acaletics math PD and support | Acaletics | Title I | 14,000.00 |
| Provide ongoing Acaletics math PD and support | Acaletics | General Funds | 11,000.00 |

Subtotal: 25,200.00

Technology

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Professional Development

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Provide ongoing Acaletics math PD and support | Acaletics Training and Support | | Included in Acaletics Cost Above |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Other

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Total: 25,200.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Science Goals

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

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

| 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. FCAT 2.0 is being implemented with increased rigor. | 1.1. FCAT scientific vocabulary taught directly and FCAT style questions incorporated into lessons Data driven instruction and curriculum Science FCAT Explorer On-going Dept. Meetings | 1.1. Lita O'Neill, Science Dean Administration Team | 1.1. Teacher monitoring of science vocabulary and classwork Review of science mini-assessments Review of FCAT Explorer data | 1.1. Progress monitoring tests FCAT 2.0 Science assessments |
| <u>Science Goal #1:</u> | | | | | | | |
| By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 students will increase Achievement Level 3 by 3%. | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 36% (58) | 39% (62) | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science | | | 2.1. FCAT 2.0 is being implemented with increased rigor. New Faculty | 2.1. FCAT scientific vocabulary taught directly and FCAT style questions during bell work Data driven instruction and curriculum Science FCAT Explorer On-going Dept. Meetings | 2.1. Lita O'Neill, Science Dean Administration Team | 2.1. Teacher monitoring of science vocabulary and bell work logs Review of science mini-assessments | 2.1. Progress monitoring tests FCAT 2.0 Science assessments |
| <u>Science Goal #2:</u> | | | | | | | |
| By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 students will increase Achievement Level 4-5 by 3%. | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 13% (20) | 16% (26) | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |

| 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 |
| Reading in the Content Areas | 6-8; All | Admin/Dean/Coodinator | School-wide | Fall/Winter 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |
| Take 5 Reading Strategies | 6-8; All | Admin/Dean/Coodinator | School-wide | Fall/Winter 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |
| The 5 E's | 6-8; Science | Dean | 6-8 Science Teachers | Fall 2011 | Walk-throughs; faculty meetings | Administration |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Provide engaging, interactive support of the NGSSS 2.0 Science Standards 6-8 | Kids College-Learning Through Sports | Private Donation | 1,500.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: 1,500.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: 1,500.00 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| WRITING GOALS | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing | | | 1.1. FLDOE increased rigor of scoring using the 6-point writing rubric. | 1.1. Stay informed with FLDOE's memos and updates informing on the upcoming changes. Students will use the writing process daily and growth monitored over time. | 1.1. Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 1.1. Department meetings Administration walk-throughs and periodic reviews of student work | 1.1. Meeting Agendas and notes Student portfolios |
| <u>Writing Goal #1:</u> | | | | | | | |
| By the Spring of 2012, FTE 2 and 3 students will score 90% or higher on AYP Writing. | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 100% (111) | 90% (100) | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. New faculty member in LA department. | 1.2. Professional training in scoring using the FLDOE rubric. | 1.2. Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 1.2. Department scoring clinics | 1.2. Scoring consistency in progress monitoring assessments |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing | | | 2A.1. All Sub Groups: FLDOE increased rigor of scoring using the 6-point writing rubric. | 2A.1. Stay informed with FLDOE's memos and updates informing on the upcoming changes. Students will use the writing process daily and growth monitored over time. | 2A.1. Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 2A.1. Department meetings Administration walk-throughs and periodic reviews of student work | 2A.1. Meeting Agendas and notes Student portfolios |
| <u>Writing Goal #2A:</u> | | | | | | | |
| By the Spring of 2012, the White and Hispanic subgroups will maintain | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| AYP status by scoring 90% or higher. | White: 100% (71) Black: Hispanic:100%(21) Asian: American Indian: | White:90% (64) Black: Hispanic:90% (19) Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. New faculty member in LA department. | 2A.2. Professional training in scoring using the FLDOE rubric. | 2A.2. Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 2A.2. Department scoring clinics | 2A.2. Scoring consistency in progress monitoring assessments |
| | | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2B. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2B: | Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL) | | 2B.1. | 3B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| N/A | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C: | Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD) | | 2C.1. | 2C.1. | 2C.1. | 2C.1. | 2C.1. |
| N/A | 2011 Current Level of Performance:* | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2C.2. | 2C.2. | 2C.2. | 2C.2. | 2C.2. |
| | | | 2C.3. | 2C.3. | 2C.3. | 2C.3. | 2C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 2D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D: By the Spring of 2012, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will score 90% or higher on the AYP Writing assessment. | Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged 2011 Current Level of Performance:* 100%(61) | | 2D.1 FLDOE increased rigor of scoring using the 6-point writing rubric. | 2D.1 Stay informed with FLDOE’s memos and updates informing on the upcoming changes. Students will use the writing process daily and growth monitored over time. | 2D.1 Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 2D.1 Department meetings Administration walk-throughs and periodic reviews of student work | 2D.1 Meeting Agendas and notes Student portfolios |
| | 2012 Expected Level of Performance:* 90% (55) | | 2D.2 New faculty member in LA department. | 2D.2 Professional training in scoring using the FLDOE rubric. | 2D.2 Allison Hunter, Dean of Language Arts Administration Team | 2D.2 Department scoring clinics | 2D.2 Scoring consistency in progress monitoring assessments |
| | | | 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 |
| Language Arts Strategies and FLDOE Updates | 6-8 LA | Debbie Cook | 6-8 LA Teachers | Fall 2011 | Department meeting follow-ups and student writing samples | Allison Hunter, LA Dean |
| Scoring Clinic | 6-8 LA | Allison Hunter | 6-8 LA Teachers | Fall 2011 | Department meeting follow-ups and student writing samples | Allison Hunter, LA Dean All LA Teachers |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Technology

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Provide high interest texts to all readers | Nooks; e-reader | General Funds | 8,100.00 |
| Provide high interest texts to all readers | Overdrive; e-library | General Funds PTO Donations | 2,000.00 2,000.00 |

Subtotal: 12,100.00

Professional Development

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Other

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Total: 12,100.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| ATTENDANCE GOAL(S) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Attendance | | | 1.1. Current economic hardships | 1.1. ConnectEd Informational Calls | 1.1. Damien Moses, Principal | 1.1. Daily Pinnacle Reports | 1.1. Genesis |
| Attendance Goal #1: | | | Distance of school from home | Personal Calls Home Visits | Attendance Committee | Ongoing monitoring of feedback from parents | |
| By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, the attendance rates will be maintained (97.6%) while striving for improvement. Source: Genesis. | 2011 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2012 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
| | 97.6 | 98 | | | | | |
| | 2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 71 | 66 | | | | | |
| | 2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
| 26 | 22 | | | | | | |
| 162 | | | 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 |
| Faculty meeting on attendance importance and attendance committee's role | 6-8; All | Administration | All Faculty and Staff | Fall & Winter 2011 | Faculty meeting discussions | Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: NA | | | |

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| SUSPENSION GOAL(S) | | | Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: By the end of the school, OSS rates will decrease from the previous year. Source: Genesis | | | 1.1. Lack of school/home communication | 1.1. Care Calls to all families at the start of the school year Calls home for warnings including community sanctions Bok Bridges Administration/Deans/Faculty meetings | 1.1. Administration | 1.1. Parent Feedback Monitoring of community sanction and OSS data | 1.1. Genesis Suspension Reports |
| | 2011 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2012 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | 127 | 122 | | | | | |
| | 2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| | 127 | 122 | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
| Middle School Behaviors, Expectations, and Consequences | 6-8; All | Dr. Richard Marshall | School-wide | Fall 2011 | Faculty meeting discussions | Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

| |
|------------------|
| Subtotal: |
| Total: NA |

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| DROPOUT PREVENTION GOAL(S) | | Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2010-2011 school year.</i> | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| N/A | 2011 Current Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| | 2012 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i> | | | | |
| | 2011 Current Graduation Rate:* | 2012 Expected Graduation Rate:* | | | | |
| | <i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i> | <i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i> | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Technology

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Professional Development

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Other

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Subtotal:

Total:

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| PARENT INVOLVEMENT GOAL(S) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| <p>1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p> | | | 1.1. Low teacher participation in PTO | 1.1. Schedule a rotation of teachers to attend PTO meetings | 1.1. Administration | 1.1. Feedback from teachers and PTO members | 1.1. PTO Sign in sheets |
| By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, parent involvement will increase by 3% from the previous year. | 2011 Current level of Parent Involvement:* | 2012 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* | | | | | |
| | 51.4% (279) | 54.4% (296) | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. Topics are not of interest to parents | 1.2. Survey parents of desired topics | 1.2. Administration | 1.2. Feedback from parents | 1.2. Parent feedback, surveys, and sign in sheets |
| | | | 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 |
| Effective Parent/Teacher Conferences/Communication | All | Administration | All | On-going Faculty Meetings | Parent/Teacher Conference Log | Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement Budget

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

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Daily school/home communication | Student Planners/Agendas | Title I | \$4000.00 |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: |
| | | | Total: \$4000.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET (Insert rows as needed)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | Total: 27,807.76 |
| Mathematics Budget | Total: 25,200.00 |
| Science Budget | Total: 1,500.00 |
| Writing Budget | Total: 12,100.00 |
| Attendance Budget | Total: |
| Suspension Budget | Total: |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | Total: |
| Parent Involvement Budget | Total: 4,000.00 |
| Additional Goals | Total: |
| | |
| | Grand Total: 70,607.76 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

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

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

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 the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year. |
| SAC Members will be elected during the open house in October 2011. Edward W. Bok Academy SAC will assist with the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, the annual budget plan for SAC, and approving the spending of the state awarded lottery funds. The SIP will be presented to our SAC in October. The SAC will meet at least four times during the school year to review the school’s progress. |

| Describe projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| | |
| | |
| | |