Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Frances K. Sweet Elementary School	District Name: St. Lucie County
Principal: Juanita Wright	Superintendent: : Mike Lannon
SAC Chair: Marla Liberatore	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)

Principal	Juanita Wright	BS – Elementary Education Bishop College Master of Science, Educational Leadership NOVA University Principal Certification-State of Florida ESOL Endorsement	5	9	**Principal of Frances K. Sweet in 2011-2012- Grade "A" Reading Mastery –73% Math Mastery – 72% Science Mastery- 74% Writing Mastery- 89% Principal of FK Sweet in 2010-2011 - Grade "A" Reading Mastery - 90% Math Mastery - 90% Science Mastery - 58% Writing Mastery - 99% Met AYP – no 2009-2010 Grade A Reading Mastery: 89% Math Mastery:86% Science Mastery: 68% Met AYP- Yes 2008-2009 Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 88%. Math mastery, 89%, Science Mastery: 60%, Met AYP: Yes 2007-2008: FKS Grade: A, Reading Mastery, 88%, Math Mastery, 87%, Science Mastery, 66% , Met AYP: Yes 2006-2007 Floresta: Grade: A Reading Mastery :Grade 3: 76%; Grade 4: 65%; Grade 5: 62%; Math Mastery: Grade 3: 70%; Grade 4: 63%; Grade 5: 47%; Science Mastery: 31% Met AYP:Yes 2005-2006 Floresta Elementary: Grade : B,**

					Reading Mastery: Grade 3: 75%; Grade 4: 73%' Grade 5: 68%; Math Mastery: Grade 3: 66%; Grade 4: 59%; Grade 5: 48%; Met AYP: Yes, Provisional **2004-2005: Floresta Elementary , Grade: B, Reading Mastery: Grade 3: 66%; Grade 4: 82%; Grade 5: 63%; Math Mastery: Grade 3: 69%; Grade 4: 60%; Grade 5: 48% Met AYP: Yes, Provisional** **2003-2004: Floresta Elementary, Grade: B, Reading Mastery: Grade 3:69% Grade 4: 56%, Grade 5: 54%; Math Mastery: Grade 3: 67%, Grade 4: 50%, Grade 5: 42% Met AYP: Yes, Provisional**
Assistant Principal	Jane Cox	Educational Specialist Nova Southeastern University Master of Science Education Walden University Bachelor of Science Education Slippery Rock University Certification – State of Florida ESOL Endorsement Elementary K-3 Elementary 1-6 Educational Leadership	0	0	

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
	N/A				

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	On-Going
2. Partners new teachers with veteran staff/ National Board Certified Teachers.	Principal	On-Going
3. Utilization of District Skyward	Personnel Department	On-Going
4. Soliciting referrals from current employees/ and or other Principals.	Principal	On-Going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	O% (0)	12% (5)	49% (21)	40% (17)	28% (12)		2.3% (1)	11.6% (5)	67% (29)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
N/A			

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

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Principal – Juanita Wright Assistant Principal – Jane Cox Speech Pathologist – Teresa Tierney School Psychologist – Anetra Bonner Guidance Counselor – Gary Bush Exception Student Education School Based Specialist – Melissa King Classroom Teacher – Donna Hellums Classroom Teacher – Kimberly Fossett-Yoder

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

MTSS is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention

The purpose of the Core PST is to review school wide data for the purpose of strengthening the Core learning environment.

Activities of the Core PST include:

- Determining school-wide learning and development areas in need of improvement
- Identifying barriers which have or could prohibit school from meeting improvement goals
- Developing action plans to meet school improvement goals (e.g., SIP)
- Identifying resources to implement plans
- Monitoring fidelity and effectiveness of core, tiered support & ESE instruction
- Managing and coordinating efforts between all school teams
- Supporting the problem solving efforts of other school teams

RtI Core PST Chair	● Schedules and prepares agenda for Core PST meetings three to four times a school year ● Sends invitations and meeting agenda to all members and/or invitees ● Confirms that personnel responsible for presentations are prepared prior to the meeting ● Facilitates collegial conversation and consensus building while using the ***data driven "problem-solving"*** model. ● Keeps conversation on task and focused
Data Keeper	● Provides school-wide data in specialty area for all members to view ● Communicates curriculum, program, procedural or policy concern ● Initiates discussion of the interpretation of the data
Time Keeper	● Provides periodic updates to team member regarding the amount of time left to complete a given task
Recorder	● Responsible for taking notes for the purpose of capturing important discussions and outcomes of meetings ● Forwards minutes of the meeting, including attendee names, to each member of the Core Team and building principal for approval ● Following administrative approval and when appropriate, shares minutes with the school staff

Core team meets at least 3-4 times a year to review universal screening data and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments.

After determining that effective Tier 1 – Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic/behavioral targets.

Based on the data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support and will provide that information to the Problem Solving Teams (PST). The core team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each Interventionist will have support documented in the intervention plan, and the interventionist and the support person will report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

The team will collaborate with the Building Level Planning Team, SAC, PBS team, and school literacy team. Core team members will serve as members of smaller PST and schedule PST meetings (weekly). Core teams will communicate with parents/community to facilitate the understanding of Response to Instruction/ Intervention.

Group PST

Meetings at this level include members of the Core PST meeting with grade level teams to review data, finalize identification of intervention groups, and/or review response of students receiving interventions. Teachers alone should not be making identification and intervention placement decisions.

Individual PST

Individual PST meetings occur upon a student being identified as needing more intensive Tier 3 intervention, a parent request, or for severe behavioral/academic needs whereas immediate action must take place in order to maintain safety or meet the Free and Appropriate Public Education requirements (FAPE).

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.
4. The leadership team will consider the end of year data.

MTSS 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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
- create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed data will include:

Academic

- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- EasyCBM Benchmark Assessments
- Journeys Benchmark Assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

Behavior

- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to special education programs

Tiered intervention data will be housed in Performance Matters and progress monitoring data in EasyCBM.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided to the faculty on designated professional development days and through job embedded professional development. These in-services will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Positive Behavior Support (PBS)
- Literacy Routines/Framework
- Math Routines/Framework
- Behavior Framework
- Easy CBM
- Performance Matters
- RtI Database
- USF/FLDOE Problem Solving/Response to Instruction and Intervention Tier 1, 2, and 3
- Progress Monitoring and Graphing

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). -Principal – Juanita Wright -Assistant Principal/Data Person – Jane Cox -Speech Pathologist – Teresa Tierney -School Psychologist - Anetra Bonner -Guidance Counselor – Gary Bushby -Exceptional Student Education School Based Specialist– Melissa King -Classroom Teacher – Morgan Haupt -Classroom Teacher- Courtney Kline -Classroom Teacher- Traci Lott -Classroom Teacher - Nardi Routten -Classroom Teacher- Julia Melville -Classroom Teacher- Christy Nuccio -Classroom Teacher – Jodie Steele
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The purpose of the LLT is to address reading concerns throughout the school. The team will analyze data and collaborate on strategies such as differentiation and the effectiveness of core instruction. The LLT will also identify professional development activities that will help teachers create an enriching learning environment. The LLT will ensure that teachers are using effective research based techniques and encourage students to be active participants in their education.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The major initiatives of the LLT consists of: -Supporting the implementation of the St. Lucie County literacy routines -Ensuring that teachers are using effective research based strategies -Evaluating the effectiveness of core instruction -Creating a professional learning community on the Daily 5

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1a.1 Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	1a.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the required minimum Civics content for grades 3 – 5.	1a.1. District Professional Development Team Administration Teachers	1a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1 SLC Framework Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 31% (90) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	26% (75) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 3 on the FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, 31% (90) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0.					
		1a.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	1a.2. District Professional Development Team Administration Teachers	1a.2. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. Teacher lesson design reflecting of SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework). *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	1a.2. SLC Framework Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		1a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understandings.	1a.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	1a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.	
		1a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading was Reporting Category 2:Reading Application	1a.4. * Emphasize using a variety of strategies to comprehend text suitable for the grade level. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a.4. *The administration and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

Reading Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	2a. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	2a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	2a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #2A: By June of 2013, 53% (154)) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	48% (138) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test	By June of 2013, 53% (154) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0.					
		2a.2. * A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshops, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	2a.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	2a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	2a.2 .*SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on using Thinking Maps and to design reflective questions to analyze student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.3. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3 *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.	
		4a.4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	4a.4. Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources derived from informational text. * Journeys core advanced materials will be used to support enrichment instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery of enrichment instruction.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4a.4. *The administration and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	4a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of above target goal– Level 4.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Reading Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity. Common teacher planning time for ongoing support for collaboration among grade level teams.	3a.1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #3A: By June of 2013, 76% (132) of the students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	71% (123) of the students in grades 4-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading	By June of 2013, 76% (132) of the students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading					

		3a.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshops, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	3a.2. District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.2. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	3a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided Thinking Map training. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.	

		3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	3a.4. Students will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts to support assessment deficiencies. Journeys core will provide opportunities to make text-to-self connections combined with evidence from the text to draw conclusions and make inferences. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.4. *The administration and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	3a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Reading Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	4A.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	4A1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4A.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #4: By June 2013 65% (29) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	60% (26) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading	By June 2012 65%(29) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading					
		4a.2A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. District Professional Development Team Administration	4a.2. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/ Teacher conferencing.	4a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		4a.3. Teachers lack the time to become familiar with the data analysis system.	4a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided continuous professional development in various ways to use performance matters for data analysis. *Instructional and peer coaching.	4a.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work through data meetings.	4a.3. *Benchmark assessment *Classroom observations	
		4a.4. *The students come to school with limited background knowledge.	4a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys toolkit to support background knowledge deficits. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will support background knowledge through read aloud.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4a.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated Assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 78% (215) of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading	In June 2012, 73% (213) of students were proficient in Reading decreasing from the previous year by 5%.	By June 2013 82% (238) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 9%	By June 2014 84% (244) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 2%.	By June 2015 85% (247) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 1%.	By June 2016 87% (252) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 2%	By June 2017 89% (258) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 2%.
<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013, 82% (238) of students will be proficient in reading increasing from the previous year by 9%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5B.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5B1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5B. By June 2013, 62% (74) Black, 81% (31) Hispanic, 91% (96) white, 100% (11) Asian students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	June 2012, 57% (68) Black, 76% (29) Hispanic, 86% (90) white, 100% Asian (11) students made satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, 62% (74) Black, 81% (31) Hispanic, 91% (96) white, 100% (11) Asian students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.					

		5B.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5B.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5B.2. District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5B.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		5B3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5B.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	5B.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5B.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.	

		5B.4. *Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 3: Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	5B.4. Students will practice identifying, analyzing, and applying knowledge of the elements of a variety of literary texts, both fiction and nonfiction Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	5B.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Student think alouds will provide evidence to support their ability to make inferences and draw conclusions.	5B.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. .	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity	5c.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5c1. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration	5c1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5c1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5C: **By June of 2013, 72% () of ELL students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	67% ( ) of students in grade 3-5 made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	**By June of 2013, 72% () of ELL students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.**					

		5C.2A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5c.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5c2. *District Professional Development Team Administration	5c.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5c.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		5C.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	5c.3. * District Professional Development Team Teacher Administration	5c.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5c.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale. .	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5d.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5d.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5d1. 1.District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration	5d1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5D: By June of 2013, 62% () Students with Disability students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% () Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 made satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0	By June of 2013,62% () Students with Disability students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.					

		5d.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support continued professional development.	5d2. *District Professional Development Team Administration	5d.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5d.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		5d.3.*The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5d.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	5d.3. * District Professional Development Team Teacher Administration	5d.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5d.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale. . .	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5E.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5E1. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration	5E1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5E1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #5E: By June of 2013, 67% (109) Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (102) in grades 3-5are making satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	By June of 2013, 67% (109) Econo mically Disadvanta ged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0					

		5E.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff	5E.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5E2. *District Professional Development Team Administration	5E.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5E.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		5E.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5E.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching	5E.3. District Professional Development Team Teacher Administration	5E.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5E.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.	

		5d.4. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT2.0 reading test was REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5d.4. 1. Teachers will utilize Journeys in conjunction with Thinking Maps to increase understanding of text structure. 2. The students will participate in literacy routines each day to deepen knowledge and provide practice with identifying components of literary analysis.	5d.4. District Professional Development Team Teacher Administration	5d.4. *Student created Thinking Maps will serve as a discussion processing tool. *Summaries will be written based on evidence from text.	5d.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Easy CBM progress monitoring *Journeys unit assessments *FCAT 2.0	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration

SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Jan- May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Write From the Beginning	K-5	District Professional Development Team	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	
EasyCBM Assessment	K-5	District Professional Development Team	School wide	On-going Aug – May	Assessment Data	

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: Learning Communities	Professional Library Books	School Funds	$309.20
Subtotal:$309.20			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop.	Train the Trainer Workshop for Teacher Leader Kagan Cooperative Learning Books	Title II Grant Funds	$10,000
Instructional staff members will be provided Thinking Map training.	Thinking Map Notebooks	School Funds	$1,475. 00
Subtotal: :$11.475.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: :$11,784.20			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. ELL students need to learn both English as core content and social/spoken English in order to communicate effectively.	1. Language Experience Approach Utilize a Language Experience Approach were students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	1.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	1.1. Teachers provide on-going formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	1.1. CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 55.3% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 60% of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					

	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 55.5% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.					
		1.2. Modeling Teachers demonstrate to the learner how to do a task, with the expectation that the learner can copy the model. Modeling includes thinking aloud and talking about how to work through a task.	1.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	1.2. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. CELLA	1.2.
		1.3. Cooperative Learning Group Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	1.3. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	1.3. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.3. CELLA	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1. The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge.	2.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. Formative Assessment	2.1. CELLA	

CELLA Goal #2: Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 39.5% of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 43% of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 39.5% of ELL students were proficient in Reading					
		2.2. Reading aloud to students helps them develop and improve literacy skills.	2.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Timed Student Reading	2.2. CELLA	2.2.
		2.3 Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Formative Assessments	2.3 CELLA	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	3.1 The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	3.1. A dialog journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialog journals provide a communicative context for language and writing development.	3.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	3.1. Journals	3.1. CELLA	
CELLA Goal #3: Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 36.8% of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 40% of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLLA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 36.8% of ELL students were proficient in Writing.					
		3.2. Graphic Organizers	3.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	3.2. Student Work	3.2. CELLA	3.2. CELLA

		3.3 Rubrics provide clear criteria for evaluating a product or performance on a continuum of quality. They are task specific, accompanied by exemplars, and used throughout the instructional process.	3.3 Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	3.3 Student Writing Samples	3.3 CELLA	3.3. CELLA

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1a.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1a.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	1a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #1A: By June 2013, 37% (107) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32% (94)) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	By June 2013, 37% (107) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 math test					
		1a.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1a.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		1a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	1a.3. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		1a4. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 1 – Grade 3:Number: Operations, Problem, and Statistics, Grade 4-Number: Operations and Problems, Grade 5-Number: Base Ten and Fractions	1a4. * Increase opportunities for students to use number concepts and computation skills to solve real-world problems; create, analyze, and represent patterns and relationships; and construct and analyze data displays and graphs. * GoMath! Core materials will be used for instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a4. * Administrators * Teachers	1a4. * Results of weekly assessments will be reviewed by grade level teams and leadership to ensure progress. * Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed.	1a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #1B: **N/A**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	2a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #2A: By June 2013, 45% (130) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	40% (115) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 45% (130) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration * Teacher	2a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	2a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		2a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	2a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	2a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration	2a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	2a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
		2a4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices	2a4. * Go Math! Grab-N-Go and Enrichment materials will be utilized for differentiated instructional * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the students are learning	2a4 * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration	2a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	2a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	3a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	3a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #3A: By June 2013, 73%(127) of the students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	68% (118) of the students in grades 4-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	By June 2013, 73% (127) of the students in grades 4-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		3a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3a.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	3a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Administration	3a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	3a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		3a4. *Teachers lack of use of manipul atives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.	3a4. * Go Math! Grab-N-Go materials * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results, including in problem situations.	3a4. * Teachers * Administration	3a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	4a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	4a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #4: By June 2013, 71% (31) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	66% (29) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	By June 2013 71% (31) students in grades 4-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments.					
		4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	4a.3. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	4a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
		4a4. *Students lack the foundation of number sense.	4a4. * GoMath! RtI Support * Think Central Strategic Intervention * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a4 * Teachers * Administration	4a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	4a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 73% (212) of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math	In June 2012, 72% (209) of students were proficient in Math decreasing from the previous year by 1%.	By June 2013 80% (232) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 8%	By June 2014 82% (238) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 2 %.	By June 2015 84% (244) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 2 %.	By June 2016 86% (244) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 2%.	By June 2017 88% (255) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 2%
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 80% (232) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 8%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1 *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5B.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	5B.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5B.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5B.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, 86% (90) of white students, 87% (33) of Hispanic students, 100% (11) Asian students and 61% (72) of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	81% (86) of white students, 87% (33) of Hispanic students, 100% (11) Asian students and 55% (66) of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 86% (90) of white students, 87% (33) of Hispanic students, 100% (11) Asian students and 61% (72) of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		5B.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5B.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5B.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5B.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5B.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5B.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5B.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5B.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5B.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		5B.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was Reporting Category 1: Numbers and Operations in base 10.	5B.4. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices	5B.4. * Teachers	5B.4. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5B4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 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. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5c.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5c.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5c.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5c.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5c.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013, 88% () of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	83% () of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 88% () of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		5c.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5c.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5c.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5c.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5c.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5c.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5c.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5c.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5c.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5d.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5d.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5d.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5d.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5d.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 59% () of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	54% () of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 59% () of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		5d.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2 * District professional development tea * Administration	5d.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5d.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5d.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5d.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5d.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5d.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5d.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5e.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5e.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice.	5e.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5e.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 67% (109) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	62% (102) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 67% (109) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment					

		5e.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities that include Kagan Cooperative Learning Workshop, learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5e.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5e.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5e.3. The daily expectation of student written and oral responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5e.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5e.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5e.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5e.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		5e.4. Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.	5e.4. Use literature in mathematics to provide the meaning necessary for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and make connections with real-world situations.	5e.4. *Teachers	5e.4. *Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral language.	5e.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #2B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		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. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		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. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.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		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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		

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: ***Enter narrative for the goal in this box.***							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Geometry Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.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		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.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		

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Geometry Goal #3D: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.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		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Jan- May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1a.1. Time and funding for professional development	1a.1. Implement and train teachers on the 5e lesson model as the standard for science instruction.	1a.1. Science Committee District Professional Development Team Teachers	1a.1. Professional development surveys Classroom Observations	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation Framework Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects		

Science Goal #1A: By June of 2013, 40% (32) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	35% (28) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	40%(32) of students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment					
		1a.2. Time and Funding for professional development.	1a.2 Instructional staff will develop and implement rigorous STEM-infused science curricula in grades K-5. Instructional staff will integrate the quality instruction framework in Elementary Classrooms.	1a.2 Science Committee District Professional Development Team Teachers	1a.2 *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.2 Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects	

		1a.3. Opportunities for students to express their learning in regards to science content	1a.3. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical, Life, Earth Space, and Nature of Science. *Ensure that instruction includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, ad explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion. *Provide opportunities for teachers to apply mathematical computations in science contexts such as manipulating data from tables in order to find averages or differences. *Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and	1a.3. Science Teachers Administration	1a.3. Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/ labs addressing the necessary benchmarks *After each assessment (Interim or Quarterly Science Benchmark Assessments), conduct data analysis to identify students' performance within those categories and develop differentiated instructional activities to address individual student needs. *Conduct mini-assessments and utilize results to drive instruction. * Monitor students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work.	1a.3. Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects	

			reading science. *Instruction in grades K-5 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.				
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Science Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2a.1. Time and funding for professional development	2a.1. Develop Professional Learning Communities (PLC) of elementary science teachers in order to research, collaborate, design, and implement instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry-based learning in Physical, Earth Space, and Life Sciences. The PLC should include vertical and horizontal alignment within the school in order to ensure continuity of concepts taught and	2a.1. PLC Science Teacher Leaders	2a.1 PLC Meeting Data, Student Data from Formative Assessments	2a.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT		

		to stress the importance of the New Generation SS Standards. ● Use of Science Fusion and all included resources					
Science Goal #2A: By June of 2013, 44% (35) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	39%(31) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/ 2012 FCAT assessment.	44%(35) students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2012/ 2013 FCAT assessment.					

		2a.2. Students need to master informational reading and nonfiction writing.	2a.2. Infuse Science into the Literacy Block.	2a.2. Classroom Teachers	2a.2. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	2a.2. Writing Samples, FCAT Writing, Formative/ Summative Assessments	
		2a.3 Providing enrichment activities in the area of science	2a.3 Instructional staff will utilize computerized science program. Instructional staff will invite community resources to present science content.	2a.3 Technology Teacher Classroom Teacher	2a.3 Classroom observation Science Assessment	2a.3 *Benchmark Assessment *Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Science Fair Projects	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Science Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem						

	ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology 1 Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Jan- May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Science 5E	K-5	District Professional Development Team	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1a.1. Knowledge of the Anchor Standards for Writing as outlined in the CCSS for K – 5.	1a.1. Conduct grade level specific professional development to deepen understanding of Writing curriculum and expectations.	1a.1. CCSS Site-based Grade Level Representative Team Member and Assistant Principal	1a.1. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.1. SLC Framework documentation		

Writing Goal #1A: By June 2013, 94% (89) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 89% (84) of the students scored 3.0 or higher as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	By June 2013, 94% (89) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.					
		1a.2. Students' appropriate use of conventions of writing and use of details that include high levels of vocabulary	1a.2. Classroom instructors will utilize Appendix C from CCSS ELA to model exemplars in writing.	1a.2 Administrative Team	1a.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.2. SLC Framework documentation	

		1a.3. Appropriate implem entation according to the research supporting Write From the Beginning	1a.3. K-5 Teachers will attend Write From the Beginning Training.	1a.3. Teacher Leader District Professional Development Team	1a.3. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1a.3. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Anchor Standards	K – 5	Grade Level CCSS Rep.	Classroom Teachers	August 2013	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write From the Beginning	K - 2	District Trainer	New teachers in K - 2	September 2013	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Thinking Maps	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On-going Jan- May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
K-5 Teachers will attend Write From the Beginning Training.	Write From the Beginning Notebooks	School Funds	$1,000.00
Subtotal:$1,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: :$1,000.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Undetected chronic absenteeism and tardiness in the classroom.	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MSTT/ RTI team for intervention services. Contact parents when a child has excessive tardies or absences. Referral made for a home visit by the social worker. Information sent to the courts for mediation when necessary.	1.1. MTSS Team Classroom Teacher Administrative Team	1.1. Monitor Bi-weekly attendance and tardy reports.	1.1. Truancy logs and attendance rosters.		

Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 98% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated by June 2013. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 10% by June 2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	FKS Current Attendance Rate is 97%.	**The expected attendance rate for school year 2013 is 98%.**					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					

	111 students have 10 or more absences.	Excessive absences will decrease by 10% (100) next school year.					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	186 students have 10 or more tardies.	Excessive tardies will decrease by 10% (167) next school year.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Health and Wellness	Physical Education and Health	District staff Coordinator of Health and Wellness and school health/ nurse	PE/Health teachers, resource teachers		Create a wellness council to monitor implementation of program recommended by the District Health/Wellness Coordinator	Administrators, School Nurse/ Health Aide, and wellness council

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:			

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	1.1. Consistent implementation of the PBIS system.	1.1. Use PBIS to reinforce school wide expectations in all areas of the school as well as the school bus.	1.1 PBIS Team and Administrators	1.1 Monthly data sharing with faculty.	1.1. Referral data.		

Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for this year is to decrease the number of suspensions by creating a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty follow the school wide Positive Behavior Plan by June 2013. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with referrals by 10% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	FKS total number of In-School suspensions for 2012 school year was 5.	FKS total expected number of In-school suspensions for 2013 school year will be 4.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	FKS had 5 students that had In-School suspension for the school year 2012.	FKS total expected number of In-School suspensions for 2013 will be 0					

	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	FKS had 1student suspended Out- of- school in school year 2012.	FKS will have 0 Out-of-School Suspensions for the 2013 school year.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	1 student was suspended out- of- school for school year 2012	0 students will be suspended Out- of- school for the 2013 school year.					
		1.2. Sufficient time to learn about the resources available for behavioral interventions.	1.2. Provide professional development in resources available Second Step, FLIP, and Behavior Education Program.	1.2. PBS Core Team Administration	1.2. Monthly PD with Faculty.	1.2. Office discipline data	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Training: RtI:B	K-5	PBS Core Team	School-Wide	Ongoing throughout the school year.	Staff Surveys	PBS Core Team
Bullying and Sensitivity Training	K-5	PBS Core Team Administrators	School-Wide	Ongoing throughout the school year.	Staff Surveys Student Surveys Administrators	PBS Core Team

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:			

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	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: N/A *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					

	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement**						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Parents have limited or no time available.	1.1. Adjust meeting schedules and time to accommodate parents.	1.1. *SAC Committee *Parent Teacher Organization *Staff	1.1. Parent Survey	1.1. Sign-in sheets at each event. Participation data in the form of minutes and /or agendas		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: At FKS we would like to increase our parent involvement by 10% for the 2012-2013 school years	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

	2012 school year we had 75% parental involvement	2013 school year we would like to increase the parental involvement to 85%.					
		1.2. Parents are not aware of how to be involved in child's school life.	1.2 Recruit and organize activities to help and support parents. Train parents to monitor students' progress.	1.2. SAC Committee *Parent Teacher Organization *Staff	1.2. Parent Survey	1.2 . Sign-in sheets at each event. Participation data in the form of minutes and /or agendas	
		1.3. Parents don't understand their importance as partners in education to foster success.	1.3. Communicate with parents concerning students' academic and behavioral progress.	1.3. SAC Committee *Parent Teacher Organization *Staff	1.3. Parent Survey	1.3. Sign-in sheets at each event. Participation data in the form of minutes and /or agendas	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
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 Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM 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
STEM Goal #1: Develop and implement rigorous STEM-infused science curricula in grades K-5.	1.1. Time and funding for Professional development.	1.1. Integrate the quality instruction framework in K-5 classrooms.	1.1 *District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1.1 . Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	1.1. Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects
	1.2. Providing enrichment activities in the area of science	1.2. Provide students exposure to real-world STEM applications through field trips, presentations, guest speakers, and virtual experiences.	1.2 . District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1.2. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	1.2 . Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects
	1.3. Time and funding for Professional development.	1.3. Engage and challenge students in STEM inquiry based learning. Students actively participate in both hands-on and virtual inquiry labs.	1.3. District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1.3. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	1.3. Classroom Observations of student work during labs *Benchmark Assessments *Science Fair Projects

STEM Professional Development

Professional						

Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM Initiative	K-5	District Professional Development Team	Educators will become aware of the STEM Initiative through District Science and Math department.	On-going throughout the school year.	Include information of resources and professional development opportunities through weekly and monthly newsletters.	Administrators

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a						

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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: :$11,784.20
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total: :
Writing Budget
Total: $1,000.00
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

Grand Total: :$12,784.20

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		
▫Priority	▫Focus	▫Prevent

Are you reward school? ▫Yes ▫No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

▫ Yes ▫ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of Frances K. Sweet Magnet School. Listed below are some of the functions of the SAC.

- The SAC members meet monthly to make decisions regarding programs and activities that impact student achievement at Frances K. Sweet.
- The SAC makes recommendations regarding the school's programs and outreach to the community.
- The SAC assists in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and the school's annual budget.
- The SAC assists in the organization of school family events.
- The SAC assist the school to create and analyze school climate surveys for parents and students.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount