Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Samuel S. Gaines Academy	District Name: St. Lucie County
Principal: Carolyn Wilkins	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Eileen Ripoli	Date of School Board Approval: October 9, 2012

Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
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

Highly Effective Administrators

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

List your school's highly effective 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	Carolyn N. Wilkins	BS in Elementary Ed, and Early Childhood Ed. MS in Educational Leadership, Certification in; School Principal Elementary Education (1-6) ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement Gifted Endorsement	2	10	2003-04 A No AYP, Reading Gains- 78%, L25%-87%, Math Gains- 72% 2004-05 B, 97% AYP, Reading Gains- 68%, L25%- 48%, Math Gains- 66% 2005-06 B, 97% AYP, Reading Gains- 60, L25%- 53%, Math Gains- 68 2006-07 C 90% AYP, Reading Gains- 62%, L 25%- 62%, Math Gains- 54%, L25%- 68% 2007-08 A 95% AYP, Reading Gains- 61%, L 25%- 70, Math Gains- 68%, L25%- 71% 2008-09 A 100% AYP, Reading Gains- 59%, L 25%- 56%, Math Gains- 65%, L25%- 71% 2009-2010 B 85% AYP, Reading Gains- 62%, L 25%- 57%, Math Gains- 54%, L25%- 56% 2010-2011 A 74% AYP, Reading Gains 64%, L25% 67%, Math Gains 68%, L25% 69 % 2012-2012 D AYP not reported, Reading Proficiency 29.3% Math Proficiency 37.10%

Assistant Principal	Roberto A. Bonsenor	Master's of Science Degree Educational Leadership,All Levels Certification in ESOL K-12	4	7	2008-2009 A 100% AYP Reading Mastery 85%,Math Mastery 83%,Writing 94%,Science 64%. 2009-2010 C 64% AYP Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 44%, Writing 79%, Science 22% Proficiency was met in Writing 2010-2011 C 67% AYP, Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 2012-2012 D AYP not reported, Reading Proficiency 29.3% Math Proficiency 37.10%

	Keith Davis	M.S. Ed Leadership (all levels) B.S. Business Administration School Principal- (all levels) Business Education- (grades 6-12)	2	9	2003-2004 A 90% AYP, Reading Mastery 80% % learning gains R-72%, lowest 25% LG R 67% , Math Mastery 75% , % learning gains M-70%, lowest 25% LG R 67% , Writing 82%, Black and SWD did not make AYP in math. 2004-2005 B, AYP 97% Reading Mastery-81%, % making LG in R-64% lowest 25% making LG in R-42% Math Mastery-72% , % making LG in math-72% Writing 69% Total, White, Black, Hispanic, and ED made AYP in reading . Total, White, Hispanic and ED made AYP in math. Black did not make AYP in math. 2005-2006 C , AYP 54% Rea ding Mastery 30% , % making LG in R-43%, lowest 25% making LG in R-50% Math Mastery-54%, % making LG in M-67% , Writing 80% Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in reading. White made AYP in math. 2006-2007 C , AYP 51%, Reading Mastery-33%, % making LG in R-44% , lowest 25% making LG in R 43% Math Mastery-59%, % making LG in M-70% , lowest 25% making LG in M-68%, Writing 79% , Science 33% Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED and SWD did not make AYP in math. White made AYP in math.

					2007-2008 B AYP 90%, Reading Mastery-53% , % making LG in R-61% , lowet 25% making LG in R-68% , Math Mastery-46%, % making LG in M-70%, lowest 25% making LG in M-82% Writing 100% Science 16 % Total, Black, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic and ED did make AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD made AYP in math. 2008-2009 B, AYP 90% Reading Mastery-48% % making LG in R-65% % of lowest 25% making LG in R-62 Math Mastery-63% % making LG in M-77% lowest 25% making LG in M-84% Writing 99% Science 16% Total, Black, ED and ELL did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic made AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic and ELL made AYP in math. 2009-2010 C, AYP 79% Reading Mastery-48% % making LG in R-59%, lowest 25% making LG in R-62% Math mastery-58% % making LG in M-55% lowest 25% making LG in M 55% Writing 89% Science -28% Total, Black, & ED did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic and ELL made AYP in reading. Total, Black, Hispanic, ED and ELL did not make AYP in math. 2010-2011 C AYP 87% Reading Mastery-49% % making LG in R-53%, lowest 25% making LG in R-62%

					Math mastery-62% % making LG in M-69% lowest 25% making LG in M 72% Writing 77% Science -27% Black, Hispanic, ELL & ED did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic and ELL made AYP in reading. 2012-2012 D AYP not reported, Reading Proficiency 29.3% Math Proficiency 37.10%

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective 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 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)

Reading	Jennifer Bozone	B.S. Elementary Education 1-6, M.S. Library of Information Sciences Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement Gifted Endorsement	2	1	2006-07 C 90% AYP, Reading Gains- 62%, L 25%- 62%, Math Gains- 54%, L25%- 68% 2007-08 A 95% AYP, Reading Gains- 61%, L 25%- 70, Math Gains- 68%, L25%- 71% 2008-09 A 100% AYP, Reading Gains- 59%, L 25%- 56%, Math Gains- 65%, L25%- 71% 2009-2010 B 85% AYP, Reading Gains- 62%, L 25%- 57%, Math Gains- 54%, L25%- 56% 2010-2011 A 74% AYP, Reading Gains 64%, L25% 67%, Math Gains 68%, L25% 69 % 2012-2012 D AYP not reported, Reading Proficiency 29.3% Math Proficiency 37.10%
Math	Andrew Webster	Mathematics, (grades 5 - 9) National Board Certified Middle Grades Math	4	0	2008-2009 A 100% AYP Reading Mastery 85%,Math Mastery 83%,Writing 94%,Science 64%. 2009-2010 C 64% AYP Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 44%, Writing 79%, Science 22% Proficiency was met in Writing 2010-2011 C 67% AYP, Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 2012-2012 D AYP not reported, Reading Proficiency 29.3% Math Proficiency 37.10%

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teachers will be interviewed for content area knowledge and instructional experience.	Wilkins, principal	On going	
2. School Administrative Team will have regularly scheduled meetings with new teachers.	Mentoring team	On going	
3. New teachers will be matched to veterans in specific grade level or team for mentoring	Administrators	August 10, 2012	
4. Professional development will be provided to support teachers in learning new pedagogy.	Mentoring team	On going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
Sara Borlaug	ESE k-12, Social Sciences 6-12	8th Grade LA	ESOL
Vanessa Daza	Elementary Ed K-6	4th Grade	ESOL
Jennifer Denise	Elementary Ed K-6	1st Grade	ESOL
Dawn Lamb	Elementary Ed K-6	1st Grade	ESOL
Sherri McCormick	Primary Ed. Ages 3-Grade 3	3rd Grade	ESOL
Ramona Melendez	Elementary Ed K-6, Gen Science 5-9, Social Sciences 5-9	8th Grade SS	ESOL
Lauren Nelson	Elementary Ed K-6, Primary Ed. Ages 3-Grade 3	Middle School Reading	Reading endorsement classes
Jeffery Pierrevil	Social Sciences 6-12	Middle School Reading	Reading endorsement classes, ESOL
Robert Plowden	Social Sciences 6-12	6th Grade	ESOL
Cheryl Salerno	Elementary Ed K-6	3rd Grade	ESOL
Catherine Smith	Educational Leadership Health K-12 PE K-12	5th Grade	ESOL
Gregory Stetz	Elementary Ed K-6	5th Grade	ESOL

Wende Tipton	Elementary Ed K-6	3rd Grade	ESOL
Beth Torresson	Music K-12, Reading Endorsement	Middle School Reading	ESOL
Ciara Trabal	Elementary Ed K-6	1st Grade	ESOL
Robert Wisecup	Elementary Ed, K - 6	5th Grade	ESOL
Jeffery Johnson	ESE K-12, Middle Gr. Integrated 5-9	E2020	ESOL

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
98	20.41% (20)	37.76% (37)	24.49% (24)	17.35% (17)	31.63% (31)		11.22 % (11)	1.02 % (1)	51.02 % (50)

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

Dawn Lamb	Jessica Hutchison	Grade Level	8/10 New teachers and mentors meet, 2nd year teachers who want continued support notify us 8/25 Social Week of 9/10 Deficiency notices, Schedule observations of master teachers Week of 10/21 Grades and Report Cards 11/16 PD Session: Classroom Management, CHAMPS expectations 12/14 Social Week of 1/14 Middle School- E2020 Elementary School- Testing Week of 2/11 Observations/ Evaluations Week of 3/11 Crunch time/ PST primary (retention) 4/12 Social Week of 5/20 Classroom Management/ End of the Year wrap up In addition to planned activities that our District organizes through the SHINE Mentoring program.
Jennifer Denise	Kristin DelFavero	Grade Level	
Jennifer Denise	Chaquisha Hanna	Grade Level	
Tracy Davis	Jaime Herman	Grade Level	

Laura Thoman	Ciara Trabal	Past experience in grade	
Marisa Passarelli	Ashley Steward	Grade Level	
Lenaiah Wood	Amanda Hayes	Grade Level	
Amanda Gooch	Eileen Repoli	Grade Level	
Megan Schwenger	Wende Tipton	Proximity and past experience in grade	
Sherri McCormick	Monique Reed	Grade Level	
Stacy Holder	Michelle Gagnon	Grade Level	
Kimberly Masters	Jessica Marinaccio	Past experience in grade	
Jennifer Bozone	Kelley Hart	Past experience in grade	
Saphir Saint-Louis	Robert Wisecup	Grade Level	
Catherine Smith	Gregory Stetz	Grade Level	
Angelia Moorer	Linda Shields	Same subject area	
Mathew Roy	Sara Borlaug	Same subject area	
Mathew Roy	Greta Wilson	Same subject area	
Jessie Ponzo	Chelsea Hartz	Same subject area	
Becky Goldman	Robert Cimorelli	Same subject area	
Andrew Webster	Susana Dayton	Same subject area	
Jennifer Bozone	Lauren Nelson	Same subject area	
Jennifer Bozone	Erika Holberger	Same subject area	
John Davino	Robert Plowden	Mentor is trained in subject area	
Beth Torresson	Jeffery Pierrevil	Same subject area	
Kristen Register	Melinda Jernigan	Mentor is trained in subject area	

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

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 Allocations to Title 1 Schools provide additional funding for resource teachers, a literacy coach, after school tutorials, software programs, summer programs, and other strategies that support struggling students, bridging the achievement gap, and become proficient in reading, writing and mathematics.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant ID recruiters and the Secondary Advocate provide support to migrant students and families. The students and parents are supported through summer programs and parent involvement.
Title I, Part D Funds support the Detention Center, Pace, and DATA House which are alternative sites for students with issues. Services are coordinated with the district dropout prevention programs.
Title II In coordination with Title 1, Title 111, Title 11 provides professional development that addresses the needs of teachers so that they can meet the needs of their students. Professional development is Continuous and product driven. There are follow-up visits and fidelity checks to make sure the skills taught are being implemented.
Title III ESOL program specialist provides support and professional development to teachers to insure they acquire the strategies that work best with our English Language Learners and immigrant students. These services are provided district wide and are ongoing to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.
Title X- Homeless The Coordinator and Student Services Specialists work to provide resources such as clothing, school supplies, and social service referrals to students who are identified as homeless.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) District SAI funds provide summer school services to level 1 & 2 students.
Violence Prevention Programs District provides the following programs Second Step and Too Good For Drugs.
Nutrition Programs District wide wellness challenges for students and employees were an initiative the district undertook last year. The main emphasis was on how eating healthy and exercise improve health of students.
Housing Programs NA
Head Start NA
Adult Education NA
Career and Technical Education NA

Job Training NA
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Principal, Assistant Principals, Reading coach, Math Coach, Middle School and Elementary School guidance counselors, ESE Specialist, one ESE teacher, and one general education teacher. 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 wellbeing, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. Suggested Members include: ● Administrator(s) ● RTI:B Team Liaison ● School Counselor(s) ● Literacy Coach* ● Math Coach* ● School Psychologist ● School-Based ESE Specialist ● District RTI Specialist Elementary ● K-2 Representative ● 3-5 Representative Secondary ● Teacher Representative(s)

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?

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

Various School Teams
Each school has a variety of teams (Grade levels, SLC's, Departments, Team leaders, Department Chairs, cross-curricular teams, role-alike teams, etc.). These teams meet weekly or monthly depending on the school's schedule. All teams work together within their respective groups to solve Tier 1 (core) problems as identified within the team. At the point in which a team is in need of further support, a representative from the team requesting assistance will present the evidence/data they have collected to a member of the PST.

Group PST
Elementary

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. Decisions such as these must be made with PST members.

Middle

Meetings at this level include members of the Core PST meeting with grade level and/or various school 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. Decisions such as these must be made with PST members.

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. 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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. Training for all administrators along with their Core Team to support the identification of students in need of intervention using data.
2. District RTI Specialists, School Psychologists, and Literacy Coaches will be providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures

Describe 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.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Carolyn Wilkins - Principal Keith Davis - Assistant Principal Roberto Bonsenor - Assistant Principal Jennifer Bozone - Literacy Coach Laura Thoman- Title I Reading Specialist Angella Bennett- teacher Tina Eaker- teacher Matthew Roy- teacher Katie Ludwig-teacher Sara Borlaug-teacher Beth Torresson- teacher Kim Masters- teacher District Instructional Partners
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The Literacy Council will meet once a month. The Literacy Council will work to promote a school wide awareness of literacy development and the members will monitor, advocate, and assess the effectiveness of the Literacy programs and initiatives.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? The Literacy Council will focus on the implementation of research based instruction in grades K-8. The team members will disaggregate data to determine strengths and weaknesses of the different programs. The council will work with grade levels and/or departments to collaborate on providing the appropriate professional development throughout the year.

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.

The pre-k students in our VPK program are transitioned all year because they are on our elementary school campus. They are adjusted to the routine and procedures of the school by being full day students. Students who attend the private provider's sites also have the opportunity for transition into the elementary school environment. The provider at each site makes their own arrangements to visit school sites. All providers complete a strategy checklist on each child going into kindergarten which the Early Learning Coalition sends to the principal of the receiving school to assist in creating kindergarten class roster. Also, a "Welcome to Kindergarten" bag is given to each parent when they enroll their child at school. The bag has kindergarten transition materials included and the school is encouraged to include their own information in the bag also. In March a provider meeting was hosted by the Director of Student Assignment to explain the registration process, with copies of registration forms, which are passed on to the parents.

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

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

Teachers in grades 6-8 follow Instructional Focus Calendars for Reading, Math, Science, Language Arts, and Social Studies. All content area teachers support the Reading Focus Calendar. Reading strategies are embedded throughout all of the classes. The Instructional Focus Calendars include teaching, assessing, re-teaching, and re-assessing to ensure all students reach mastery of standards and benchmarks. Teachers receive ongoing professional development to adjust and extend teaching practices to meet the needs of all of their students.

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. Lack of student background knowledge.	1a.1. Professional Development for teaching background knowledge and vocabulary.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach and Literacy Council	1a.1. Student assessment data for MAZE	1a.1. Easy CBM		
Reading Goal #1a: By June 2013, 28% (202) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Currently, 19.16% (155) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 28% (202) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.					
		1a.2. Teacher experience levels	1a.2. Providing professional development on high yield instructional strategies	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach and Literacy Council	1a.2. Feedback from professional development sessions	1a.2. Mini Assessments, Benchmarks, Easy CBM and teacher made assessments	
		1a.3 Students need cognitive training	1a.3. Thinking Maps, Write from the Beginning and Write For The Future, Response to Literature	1a.3. Principal, District trainers	1a.3. Classroom observation	1a.3. Easy CBM, Benchmarks, FCAT	

		1a.4. Teachers need continued training on a variety of teaching strategies	1a.4. Florida Reading Conference	1a.4. Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist, 5 five teachers.	1a.4. Classroom observation, teacher created professional development	1a4. Benchmarks, Easy CBM	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	1b.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	1b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1 Collaborative planning with teachers in the Autism units	1b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools		
Reading Goal #1b: By June 2013, 40% (*) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	30% (*) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA Reading Test	By June 2013, 40% (*) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test					

		1b.2. *Discerning relevant details from a passage using auditory processing.	1b.2. *Daily read aloud practice to process and coach students based on appropriate access points.	1b.2. District Support Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher.	1b.2. The teacher will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment. IEP team will review as needed to develop and/or revise plan.	1b.2. Teacher generated assessment based on IEP goals Brigance Assessment	
		1b.3. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details	1b.3. Use read alouds, auditory tapes, and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols.	1b.3. Reading Coach Administration Teacher.	1b.3. Students' written or oral responses	1b.3. Student performance tasks on teacher made assessments Teacher observation. Brigance 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 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 reading.	2a.1. Limited amount of time spent on reading	2a.1. Provide independent reading opportunities at home and school using 100 Book Challenge	2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach and Literacy Council	2a.1. Student reading logs and class charts	2a.1. Easy CBM, Mini Assessments, Benchmarks, and Teacher Made Assessments		
Reading Goal #2a: By June 2013, 19% (120) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	By June 2013, 10.14% (82) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 19% (120) of students in grades 3 through 8 will score at Level 3 on the FCAT test.					
		2a.2. Low motivation	2a.2. Sunshine State Reader Program, guest readers	2a.2. Principal, Literacy Coach, Media Specialist	2a.2. Students check out Sunshine State books, exit surveys	2a.2. Easy CBM, Benchmarks, FCAT	2a.2.
		2a.3 Lack of challenging work for these students	2a.3 Critical Thinking classes, identified gifted for elementary	2a.3 Principal, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselors	2a.3 Enrollment in classes	2a.3 Easy CBM, Benchmarks, FCAT	2a.3

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	2b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1 Collaborative planning for teachers in the Autism units	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Reading Goal #2b: By June 2013, 26% (*) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18% (*) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	By June 2013, 26% (*) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.					

		2b.2. Limited schema with fiction, nonfiction, and informational texts	2b2. Students will be exposed to fiction, nonfiction, and informational text and be taught to identify the differences using Thinking Maps.	2b.2. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.2. Observation of DQ 3 Element 18	2b.2. Feedback using Frameworks FAA	
		2b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	2b.3 Research based strategies to enhance vocabulary and effectively utilize context clues should be explicitly taught to students (e.g.: pictures accompanying print; pictures should be faded for long-term comprehension and retention.).	2b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	2b.3 Teacher made assessments FAA	
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. Teachers need continued training in reading interventions.	3a.1. Provide training in Journeys, Plugged In, 100 Book Challenge, CIS, Thinking Maps and SIMS for all teachers	3a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist	3a.1. Easy CBM, Benchmarks	3a.1. Classroom observation, ERO		
Reading Goal #3a: Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who make learning gains from 44% (307) students in 2010 to 51%(358) by June 2013 .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Currently, 44% (307) of students in grades 3 through 8 made learning gains on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 51% (358) of students in grades 3 through 8 will make learning gains on the FCAT test.					
		3a.2.	3a.2. Learning Tier II and Tier III strategies	3a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist	3a.2. Easy CBM, Mini Assessments, Benchmarks, Teacher Made Assessments	3a.2. Student Reading Logs, Class Charts, School Wide monitoring, School pace	
		3a.3.	3a.3. School wide student recognition	3a..3. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist	3a.3. Benchmarks, Easy CBM, Earobics	3a.3. MTSS meeting discussions	

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Reading Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 50% (13) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% (13) of the students in grades 3-8 made learning gains on the FAA Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 60% (14) of the students in grades 3-8will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test					

		3b.2. Limited teacher training on rubric interpretation and effective instructional strategies to achieve levels of proficiency	3b.2. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities to gain a higher level of understanding of the rubrics and how to interpret the data to drive instruction.	3b.2. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.2. Bi-monthly collaborative meetings to review student data to design effective instructional strategies to support student deficits.	3b.2. Teacher generated assessments and data collection tools FAA	
		3b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	3b.3 Vocabulary should be introduced to students with pictures and print. Pictures should be faded for long-term comprehension and retention. Direct instruction of context clues.	3b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	3b.3 Teacher generated assessments Brigance Assessment FAA	
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		
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4a.1. Many students are below level in reading	4a.1. Title 1 Reading Interventionist is working with elementary students who are in need	4a.1. Principals, Assistant principals, Title 1 Reading Interventionist	4a.1. Analysis of MTSS data for students who are two or more years behind	4a.1. Easy CBM, Earobics		

Reading Goal #4a: Our goal is to increase the percentage of students who make learning gains from 19% (34) students in 2010 to 21% (37) by June 2013 .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Currently, 19% (34) of students in grades 3 through 8 made learning gains on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 21% (37) of students in grades 3 through 8 will make learning gains on the FCAT test.					
		4a.2. Professional development for teachers to continue learning the core program in Journeys, Plugged In and 100 Book Challenge	4a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist, teachers	4a.2. Feedback from professional development sessions	4a.2. Easy CBM, Mini Assessments, Benchmarks, Teacher created assessments.	4a.2. Professional development for teachers to continue learning the core program in Journeys, Plugged In and 100 Book Challenge	
		4a.3. Plugged In reading materials in Middle School	4a.3. Administration, teachers	4a.3. Classroom Observations, Ongoing Progress Monitoring and Student Work	4a.3. Mini Assessments, Benchmarks, Easy CBM	4a.3. Plugged In reading materials in Middle School	

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4b.1. Students are performing at one or more grade levels below 3rd grade requiring support in phonics and phonemic awareness strategies.	4b.1. The teacher will provide access to low tech and high tech assistive technology for support to provided differentiated instruction as written in the IEP supporting the student through access points.	4b.1. Teacher ESE Specialist AT Specialists (as deemed necessary by the IEP Team) Administration	4b.1. The teacher will differentiate instruction by providing daily opportunities for identified student to utilize the assistive technology to increase understanding of effective use of phonics and phonemic awareness.	4b.1. Teacher observation Data Collected from use of Assistive Technology Brigance Assessment FAA		
Reading Goal #4b: By June 2013 43% (*) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29% (*) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FAA Reading.	By June 2013 43% (*) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Reading.					

		4b.2. Due to the severity of an individual student's disability, limited vocabulary restricts students from communicating and understanding expressive language.	4b.2. Students will be given the opportunity to make choices using concrete objects, real pictures, and symbols paired with words to accommodate the individual's identified disability.	4b.2. Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b.2. The teacher will provide daily opportunities to use expressive language to communicate connections between words objects and symbols.	4b.2. Data Collection Teacher Observation Brigance assessment FAA	
		4b.3 Due to the severity of an individual student's disability, limited abilities to identify basic sight words provide processing challenges within text.	4b.3. Students must have continuous repetition/ practice when learning reading concepts.	4b.3. Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b.3. Students will be provided sight word lists reflecting text that they will practice for continuous repetition to increase word recall fluency.	4b.3. Data Collection Teacher Observation Brigance Assessment FAA	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 45% of the students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Assessment	**In June of 2012, 30% (202) of the students were proficient in reading decreasing 15% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 47% (322) of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 17% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2014, 54% of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 61% of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 67% of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 6% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 73% of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 6% from the previous year.**
Reading Goal #5A: **In June of 2013, 47% (322) of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 17% from the previous year.**							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. Students lack of ability to attend to longer and more difficult passages/ questions; Lack of stamina; Lack of rich learning experiences to increase vocabulary and schema; limited experiences with various genres	5B.1. Implementation of SLC Literacy Plan, Direct Explicit, Instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Structures, Kids at Hope, Student feedback, Scheduling,	5B.1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher School Renewal DA Members	5B.1. Collaborative data analysis; Classroom observations	5B.1. *AIMS Web Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment. SRI; Benchmarks; ORF		

Reading Goal #5B: By June 2012, (Data not available as of 10/1/2012 from DOE) % of students will by proficient increasing from the previous year 10%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data not available.	By June 2012, (Data not available as of 10/1/ 2012 from DOE) % of students will by proficient increasing from the previous year 10%					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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 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. Teachers without ESOL experience or endorsements	5C.1. The ESOL department will train teachers in working with ELL students	5C.1. J. Novotni, M. Time and administration	5C.1. We will monitor the ELL students' progress on benchmark tests and classroom performance.	5C.1. Grade book and Benchmark scores		
Reading Goal #5C: Our goal is to increase the percentage of ELLstudents who make learning gains from 9% (8) students in 2010 to 20%(19) by June 2013 .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Currently, 9% (8) of the ELL students in grades 3 through 8 made learning gains on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 20% (19) of the ELL students in grades 3 through 8 will make learning gains on the FCAT test.					
		5C.2. Lack of time for ELL specific instruction	5C.2. Imagine Learning English Software	5C.2. J. Novotni	5C.2. We will monitor the ELL students' progress on benchmark tests and classroom performance	5C.2. Grade book, benchmarks and Imagine Learning monitoring software	
		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 reading.	5D.1. Teachers are not comfortable with differentiating instruction in the general education classroom.	5D.1. ESE Push-in services	5D.1. ESE Specialists, teachers, ESE teachers	5D.1. We will monitor the SWD progress on benchmarks, classroom performance and attainment of IEP goals	5D.1. Classroom grades and benchmark tests		
Reading Goal #5D: Our goal is to increase the percentage of students with disabilities who make learning gains from 19% (17) students in 2010 to 29%(26) by June 2013 .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Currently, 19% (17) of the students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 made learning gains on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 29% (26) of the students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 will make learning gains on the FCAT test.					
		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 reading.	5E.1. Lack of understanding of children from poverty	5E.1. Ruby Payne Strategies	5E.1. Administrators	5E.1. Classroom observation	5E.1. Benchmarks, Easy CBM, lesson plans		

Reading Goal #5E: Our goal is to increase the percentage of theeconomically disadvantaged students who make learning gains from 44% (278) students in 2010 to 51% (354) by June 2013 .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Currently, 44% (278) of the economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 8 made learning gains on the FCAT test.	By June 2013, 51% (354) of the economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 8 will make learning gains on the FCAT test.					
		5E.2. Children have a low vocabulary	5E.2 Vocabulary training, Vocabulary Instruction in every classroom	5E.2. Administrators, teachers, Literacy Coach	5E.2. Classroom observations	5E.2. Easy CBM, FCAT	
		5E.3 Lack of Parental Support	5E.3 100 Book challenge at home reading and conferencing, Kids At Hope	5E.3 Administrators, Literacy Coach, Title 1 Reading Interventionist	5E.3 Classroom Observations, reading logs	5E.3 Schoolpace data	

Reading 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan	K-8	District	Identified teachers	August 2012	Classroom visits	Administrators
AVID	6-8	K. Register	Middle School teachers	Monthly	Site facilitators	K. Register and Administrators
Ruby Payne	K-8					
CIS	6-8	D. Worthington	Middle School teachers	October 2012	Classroom visits	D. Worthington
100 Book Challenge	K-8	J. Bozone	New teachers	September 2012	Classroom visits	J. Bozone
Plugged In	6-8	J. Bozone	Reading Teachers	September 2012	Classroom visits	J. Bozone
Journeys	K-5	J. Bozone	Elementary Teachers	On going	Classroom visits	J. Bozone
Easy CBM	K-5	R. Husbands	All K-5 Teachers	September 2012	Monitoring EasyCBM site	J. Bozone and Administrators
Earobics	K-2	J. Bozone	K-2 Teachers	September 2012	Monitoring Earobics data	J. Bozone
Thinking Maps	K-8	C. Wilkins	Non-trained teachers	September 2012	Classroom visits	C. Wilkins
SIMS	5th grade	FDLRS	All 5th grade teachers	Augusts 2012	Classroom visits	J. Bozone, S. Bittle

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Plugged In	Books	Title I	$2, 000
Thinking Maps	Training	Title I	$1,500
Classroom Libraries	Books	Title I	$1,500
SIMS Strategies	Books	None	No charge
Odyssey of the Mind	Membership	Media Internal Account	$35

100 Book Challenge	Online monitoring, books	Title I	$5000
Sunshine State Reader Program	Books, incentives	Media Internal Account	$2000
Subtotal:$12,035			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Earobics	Computer software	District	
Destination	Computer software	District	
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SIMS Strategies	Books	FDLRS	0
AVID strategies	WICR instructional strategies	Title I	$3000
Earobics	Computers	District	0
Easy CBM	Computers and copies	District	0
Kagan	Kagan strategies	District	$2000
Ruby Payne	Books	Title I	$500
CIS	Training	Title I	$1500
Thinking Maps	Training	Title I	Included above
Literacy Coach		Title I	$83296
Additional Reading Teacher		Title I	$60944
Reading Interventionist		Title I	$56305
AVID Teacher		Title I	$64818
Subtotal:$272,363			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$284398			
Total:			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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	Per
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. Adm Tea Ele teac
CELLA Goal #1: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 32% (84) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 39% of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA.***	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 32% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.***		
		1.2.	1.2. Tea lear the can inclu talki thro

		1.3.	1.3 Gr Stu int mi
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	P
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 Ad Te Ele tea
CELLA Goal #2: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 15.3% (39) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 24% 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, 15.3% of ELL students were proficient in Reading.***		
		2.2.	2.2 Re the lite

		2.3	2.3 Vo
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	P
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	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. 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.	2.1 Ad Te Ele tea
CELLA Goal #3: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 22.4% (57) of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 30% of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLA.***	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 22.4% of ELL students were proficient in Writing.***		

		2.2.	2.2 Gra
		2.3	2.3 Ru for per qua acc use pro

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
Imagine Learning	Computer software	Title II (paid last year)	0
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Imagine Learning	Computers	We already have	0
Rosetta Stone	Computers	We already have	0
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 presents an alignment challenge for K-2, and 3-5 teachers have a new Scope and Sequence format that must be reconciled with textbook pacing and content.	1a.1. -Teachers will work together to analyze the Scope and Sequence and write performance scales. -Math planners will work with the math coach to align assessments with the standards.	1a.1. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional Partners	1a.1. –review lesson plans -common assessments -observations	1a.1. -common assessment results -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 25% (60) 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:*					
	16.5% (50) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 ONLY FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 25% (60) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.					
		1a.2. New performance scales articulate the need for high expectations and high complexity tasks.	1a.2. -design assessments to match the complexity required by standards -teachers use real-life applications and word problems	1a.2. -teachers -math planners -math coach -administrators -Instructional Partners	1a.2. –review lesson plans -common assessments -observations	1a.2 -common assessment results -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction .	

		1a.3. New teachers are unfamiliar with the Go Math! series and Think Central resources.	1a.3. -experienced teachers will offer training to new teachers -instructional partners and coaches will assist with using the Go Math! Materials.	1a.3. -experienced teachers -Instructional Partners -math coach	1a.3. -classroom observations -team meetings -coaches meet with teachers	1a.3. -teacher feedback -classroom observations	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	1b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1 Collaborative Planning with teachers from the Autism Units	1b.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1b: By June 2013, 30% (*) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (*) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.	By June 2013, 30% (*) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.					
		1b.2. Students are challenged to complete proper steps to solve a problem.	1b.2. Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using basic math vocabulary, manipulatives visuals, number lines, and assistive technology.	1b.2. Teacher ESE specialist Administration	1b.2. Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking for problem solving.	1b.2. Teacher generated assessment Teacher observations as students solve the problems. FAA	

		1b.3. Based upon individual student's abilities as indicated in their IEP, the student's cognition, and background knowledge impedes acquisition of skills to apply to high level mathematical equations.	1b.3 Using research based strategies and materials, the students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long-term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	1b.3. Teacher ESE specialist Administration	1b.3. The students will participate in daily work stations with accountability measures to support rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	1b.3. Teacher generated accountability pieces at each station with data collection in place. Teacher observation Bragance Assessment FAA	
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. Because students performing above grade level are in the minority, classroom instruction may not be directed towards the needs of advanced students.	2a.1. -Teachers will differentiate regularly to include enrichment and extension activities through high level math centers.	2a.1 -teachers -math planners -Instructional Partners -math coach	2a.1. -review lesson plans -classroom observations -common assessments -Benchmarks	2a.1. -classroom observations -assessment results		

Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 18% (36) 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:*					
	9.87% (30) 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, 18% (36) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		2a.2. There are limited enrichment opportunities for advanced students.	2a.2. -Math Bowl -school-wide math contests/ challenges	2a.2. -Instructional partners -math coach	2a.2. -Math Bowl meetings -contest/challenge participation	2a.2. -Math Bowl competition -contest/challenge entries	
		2a.3 Common assessments will include high complexity items.	2a.3 -math planners supplement Go Math! assessment materials with high complexity sample items as needed	2a.3 -math planners -math coach	2a.3 -review common assessments -assessment results	2a.3 -common assessments -Benchmarks	

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	2b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1 Collaborative Planning with teachers from the Autism Units	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Mathematics Goal #2b: By June 2013, 9% (*) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	7% (*) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	By June 2013, 9% (*) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.					
		2b.2. Background knowledge may be limited to support review and require further instruction in DQ 2.	2b2. Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	2b.2. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.2. *Students will participate in academic games supporting review of concepts. Additionally, students will participate in learning stations focused on individual concepts with accountability measures correlated to the access points to determine level of mastery in each concept. *Administrative walkthrough to observe lesson design	2b.2. Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. FAA	

		2b.3 Due to the nature of the individual's Disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts.	2b.3 Using researched- based strategies and materials students must have explicit instruction and continuous repetition/ practice when learning math concepts.	2b.3 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.3 Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to demonstrate understanding.	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Students possess a broad range of prior knowledge and skills.	3a.1. -Teachers will differentiate regularly using "Hot" questions or learning checks to form groups. -Cooperative learning (ex. Kagan structures…)	3a.1. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional Partners -administrators	3a.1. –review lesson plans -classroom observations -assessment results	3a.1. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		

Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 46% (319) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	39% (271) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013 46% (319) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		3a.2. Students need various levels of timely remediation.	3a.2. -Teachers will track assessment data and adapt centers to respond to evident needs. -Instructional Partners and math coach will pull small groups to remediate after unit assessments.	3a.2. -teachers -math coach -Instructional Partners -administrators	3a.2. -track and review common assessment data -classroom observations	3a.2. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction	
		3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a..3.	3a.3.	

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	3b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.1 Collaborative Planning with teachers from the Autism Units	3b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Mathematics Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 32% (*) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29% (*)of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 32% (*) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.					
		3b.2. Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged to effectively communicate their thought processes through written and/or oral language.	3b.2. The students will be provided with research-based strategies and visual choices to support mathematical thinking to solve problems.	3b.2. ESE Specialists Administrative Team Teacher	3b.2. Students will provide a variety of visuals to support their thinking through problem solving of equations.	3b.2. Teacher generated tests Teacher observation Brigance Assesssment FAA	

		3b.3 Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts.	3b.3 Students must have continuous repetition/ practice when learning math concepts.	3b.3 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.3 Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to demonstrate understanding.	3b.3 Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. FAA Brigance 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 group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4a.1. Students lack prerequisite skills from previous years.	4a.1. -Incorporate prerequisite skills in launches and centers. -Instructional partners and math coach will identify struggling students to provide extra support.	4a.1. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional partners	4a.1. -review lesson plans -track assessment data school-wide to monitor the lowest 25%	4a.1. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Mathematics Goal #4a: By June 2013 14% (39) students in grades 3-8 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:*					

	14% (39) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013 34% (131) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments.					
		4a.2. Some students may not learn at the same pace or with the same learning style as others.	4a.2. -Use a variety of manipulatives and technology during instruction. -Utilize support staff (ESE teachers, paras…)	4a.2. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional Partners -ESE Dept. -administration	4a.2. -review lesson plans -classroom observations	4a.2. -SLC framework for quality instruction -classroom observations -assessment data	
		4a.3 Factors outside of the classroom may affect a student's ability to concentrate or attend class regularly.	4a.3. -Social workers will use attendance data to intervene when appropriate. -Guidance counselor, deans, and support staff will respond to potential issues. -Check in/ Check out program	4a.3. -attendance clerk -social workers -teachers -guidance counselor -deans -administration	4a.3. -behavior data -attendance data -mentor/mentee meetings	4a.3. -school-wide behavior, attendance and assessment data	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	4b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	4b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	4b.1 Collaborative Planning with teachers from the Autism Units	4b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		

Mathematics Goal #4b: By June 2013 75% (25) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Mathematics test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	70% (30) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FAA Mathematics test.	By June 2013 75% (25) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Mathematics test.					
		4b.2 Limited abilities to apply basic facts and concepts provide processing challenges when problem solving.	4b.2. Students must have continuous repetition/ practice when learning math concepts.	4b.2 Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b.2 Students will be provided fact lists reflecting facts that they will practice for continuous repetition to increase math fluency. Students will be provided problems and given opportunities to demonstrate their understanding with oral or written explanations of math concepts.	4b.2 Data Collection Teacher Observation FAA Brigance Assessment	
		4b.3. Students are performing at one or more grade levels below 3rd grade requiring support in basic facts and number concepts.	4b.3. The teacher will provide access to assistive technology for support to with differentiated instruction as written in the IEP supporting the student through access points Students will be provided opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives, visuals and assistive technology.	4b.3. Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b.3 The teacher will differentiate instruction by providing daily opportunities for identified student to utilize the assistive technology to increase understanding of basic facts and number concepts..	4b.3. Teacher generated tests. Observation of use of the assistive technology. Brigance Assessment FAA	

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 46% of the students (elementary and middle) were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Assessment	**In June of 2012, 35% (202) of the students were proficient in math decreasing 11% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 47% (322) of the students will be proficient in math increasing 12% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2014, 54% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 61% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 67% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 6% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 73% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 6% from the previous year.**
Mathematics Goal #5A: **In June of 2013, 47% (322) of the students will be proficient in reading increasing 12% from the previous year.**							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Instruction may lack cultural diversity.	5B.1. -multi-cultural teaching materials and assessment items. -Ruby Payne strategies	5B.1. -teachers -administrators - Instructional Partners and coaches	5B.1. -classroom observations -review lesson plans and common assessments	5B.1. -observations -lesson plan and assessment reviews		
Mathematics Goal #5B: **By June 2013, Data not available from DOE. All subgroups will make at least a 10% increase.**	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2. Student and teacher relationships could be damaged by misunderstandings arising from cultural differences.	5B.2. -teachers work together within teams and with support staff to understand students with varying backgrounds. -Ruby Payne strategies	5B.2. -teacher teams -behavior techs -deans -administration	5B.2. -classroom observations -discussions with students and teachers when misunderstandings occur	5B.2. -SLC framework for quality instruction -interviews/ conferences	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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 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. Language barriers affect student understanding of the curriculum.	5C.1. -use ESOL instructional strategies -encourage ESOL endorsement as needed -utilize ESOL and bi-lingual staff	5C.1. -teachers -ESOL Dept. -administrators	5C.1. -classroom observations -interview students to assess needs	5C.1. -SLC framework for quality instruction -assessment data		
Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013, 31 % (29) 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:*					
	24% (22) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 31% (29) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		5C.2. Language barriers affect the ability of parents and staff to communicate.	5C.2. -Use staff translators regularly to contact parents and in conferences -translate school correspondence and translate at parent events	5C.2. -teachers -administrators -bi-lingual staff members	5C.2. -check parent contact logs -parent response and attendance at school functions	5C.2. -parent contact and conference logs	
		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. Insufficient time and personnel.	5D.1. Extended time for classroom based assessments, and district/state assessments. Inclusion Support of SWD in General Ed. Classrooms. Professional Development and training of staff members.	5D.1. ESE Specialist ESE Teachers and General Education Teachers.	5D.1. Progress monitoring. Annual Goal Progress Reports (4.5 weeks)	5D.1. Benchmark Data, classroom based assessments, and progress toward IEP goals.		

Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 30% (28) 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:*					
	20% (18) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 30% (28) of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		5D.2. Insufficient financial resources.	5D.2 Use of grant funds for technology and resources.	5D.2. ESE Specialist, school based, and ESE Specialist, district.	5D.2. Progress monitoring, Annual Goal Progress Reports (4.5 weeks)	5D.2. Benchmark Data, classroom based assessments, and progress toward IEP goals. Pre- and Post- assessment.	
		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. Students may have varying levels of support or resources at home.	5E.1 -21st Century after-school program -parent involvement initiatives -parent nights	5E.1. -21st century staff -administrators -teachers and instructional coaches	5E.1. -21st Century enrollment -parent night and open house attendance	5E.1. -performance data -enrollment and attendance data		
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 47% (298) 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:*					
	40% (254) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 47% (298) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment					

		5E.2. Students may have varying degrees of background knowledge or preparedness.	5E.2 -field trips -assemblies -Thinking Maps	5E.2. -teachers -administrators	5E.2. -plan enrichment events -observe Thinking Maps in use	5E.2. -permission slips -assembly materials -lesson plans	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.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)).

Middle School 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. New performance scales articulate the need for high expectations and high complexity tasks.	1a.1. -Teachers will work together to analyze the Scope and Sequence and write performance scales. -Teachers will collaborate to design common assessments that match the complexity level required by each standard. -Teachers will collaborate together and with the math coach to plan a variety of rich tasks for each unit.	1a.1. -teachers -math coach -Instructional Partners	1a.1. -review unit planning documents -review lesson plans -common assessments -classroom observations	1a.1. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 33% (148) of students in grades 6-8 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24.6% (122) of the students in grades 6-8 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 33% (148) of students in grades 6-8 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.					

		1a.2. Teachers need more instructional strategies.	1a.2. -AVID PD on instructional strategies -collaborative planning by grade level -math coach and Instructional Partners model strategies. -peer observations during common planning period	1a.2. -math coach -Instructional Partners -teachers	1a.2. -review unit planning documents -review lesson plans -teachers conference with math coach after lessons are modeled -peer observation discussions.	1a.2. -PD records -lesson plans -SLC framework for quality instruction -peer observation documentation	
		1a.3. Many students have tested below grade level in previous years and may lack prerequisite skills and knowledge.	1a.3. -Teachers will differentiate regularly. -Students will use cooperative learning strategies. -Teachers will design remediation based on formative assessment data. -Incorporate prerequisite skills in launches and embedded in new content.	1a.3. -teachers -math coach -Instructional partners	1a.3. -formal and informal assessment -tracking and responding to data -review lesson and unit plans	1a.3. -assessment data -SLC framework for quality instruction.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1b.1. Training of teachers	1b.1. Provide training for teachers in math content	1b.1. Math coach, ESE specialist	1b.1. Classroom observations, classroom assessments	1b.1. Data collection toward IEP goals		

Mathematics Goal #1b: By June of 2013, 22% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 4, 5,6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	63% (*)of the students in grades 6-8 were proficient at level 4, 5,6 on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 22% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 4, 5,6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.					
			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 mathematics.	2a.1. Because students performing above grade level are in the minority, classroom instruction may not be directed towards the needs of advanced students.	2a.1. -include enrichment activities for students who have mastered the grade level standard -project-based learning -differentiate with advanced students in mind.	2a.1. -teachers -math coach -Instructional Partners	2a.1. -review lesson plans -classroom observations -monitor assessment data	2a.1. -SLC framework for quality instruction. -assessment data		
Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 15% (74) of students in grades 6-8 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:*					
	12.5% (62) of the students in grades 6-8 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 15% (74) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		2a.2. Students in advanced math courses need more time and support to be successful.	2a.2. -schedule students in double math periods for advanced math classes. -AVID students receive math support and participate in tutorials	2a.2. -AVID teacher -data specialist -math coach	2a.2. -schedule students based on available data and teacher recommendations -interview students for AVID starting in the 5th grade.	2a.2. -assessment data	
		2a.3 There are limited enrichment opportunities for advanced students.	2a.3 -Math Bowl -school-wide math contests/ challenges	2a.3 -Instructional partners -math coach	2a.3 -Math Bowl meetings -contest/challenge participation	2a.3 -Math Bowl competition -contest/challenge entries	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2b.1. Skill level of the teachers for working with students with disabilities	2b.1. Training on access points and math content	2b.1. Math coach and ESE specialists	2b.1. Gradebooks, IEP goals	2b.1. Data collection for IEP goals		
Mathematics Goal #2b: By June of 2013, 15% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	13% (*)of the students in grades 6-8 were proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 15% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.					

		2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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. Students possess a broad range of prior knowledge and skills.	3a.1. -Teachers will differentiate regularly using formative date. -cooperative learning and peer tutoring	3a.1. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional Partners -administrators	3a.1. –review lesson plans -classroom observations -assessment results	3a.1. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 (data not available) 60% of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Data not available.	By June 2012, 60% of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		3a.2. Students need various levels of timely remediation.	3a.2. -Teachers will track assessment data and adapt instruction to respond to evident needs. -Teachers will use test corrections as a means of providing timely feedback. -Instructional Partners and math coach will pull small groups to remediate after unit assessments.	3a.2. -teachers -math coach -Instructional Partners -administrators	3a.2. -track and review common assessment data -review lesson plans -classroom observations	3a.2. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction	
		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: By June of 2013, 59% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (*)of the students in grades 6-8 were proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 59% (*) of the students in grades 6-8 will be proficient at level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.					
		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		

4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4a.1. Students lack prerequisite skills from previous years.	4a.1. -Incorporate prerequisite skills in launches and embedded in new content. -Instructional partners and math coach can identify struggling students to provide extra support.	4a.1. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional partners	4a.1. -review lesson plans -track assessment data school-wide to monitor the lowest 25%	4a.1. -common assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Mathematics Goal #4a: By June 2013 70%students in grades 6-8 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:*					
	Data not available.	By June 2013 70% students in grades 6-8 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		4a.2. Some students may not learn at the same pace or with the same learning style as others.	4a.2. -Use a variety of manipulatives and technology during instruction. -teach to a variety of learning styles -Utilize support staff (ESE teachers, paras…)	4a.2. -teachers -math planners -math coach -Instructional Partners -ESE Dept. -administration	4a.2. -review lesson plans -classroom observations	4a.2. -SLC framework for quality instruction -classroom observations -assessment data	
		4a.3 Factors outside of the classroom may affect a student's ability to concentrate or attend class regularly.	4a.3. -Social workers will use attendance data to intervene when appropriate. -Guidance counselor, deans, and support staff will respond to potential issues. -Check in/ Check out program	4a.3. -attendance clerk -social workers -teachers -guidance counselor -deans -administration	4a.3. -behavior data -attendance data -mentor/mentee meetings	4a.3. -school-wide behavior, attendance and assessment data	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		

Mathematics Goal #4b: xx .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	xx	xx					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 46% of the students (elementary and middle) were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Assessment	**In June of 2012, 35% (202) of the students were proficient in math decreasing 11% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 47% (322) of the students will be proficient in math increasing 12% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2014, 54% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 61% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 7% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 67% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 6% from the previous year.**	**In June of 2013, 73% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 6% from the previous year.**

Mathematics Goal #5A: **In June of 2013, 73% of the students will be proficient in math increasing 6% from the previous year.**							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Instruction may lack cultural diversity.	5B.1. -multi-cultural teaching materials and assessment items. -Ruby Payne strategies	5B.1. -teachers -administrators -coaches and Instructional Partners	5B.1. -classroom observations -review lesson plans and common assessments	5B.1. -observations -lesson plan and assessment reviews		
Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, ?% (?) of white students, ?% (?) of Hispanic students, and ?% (?) of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					

		5B.2. Student and teacher relationships could be damaged by misunderstandings arising from cultural differences.	5B.2. -teachers work together within teams and with support staff to understand students with varying backgrounds. -Ruby Payne strategies	5B.2. -teacher teams -behavior techs -deans -administration	5B.2. -classroom observations -discussions with students and teachers when misunderstandings occur	5B.2. -SLC framework for quality instruction -interviews/ conferences	
		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. Language barriers affect student understanding of the curriculum.	5C.1. -use ESOL instructional strategies -encourage ESOL endorsement as needed -utilize ESOL and bi-lingual staff	5C.1. -teachers -ESOL Dept. -administrators	5C.1. -classroom observations -interview students to assess needs	5C.1. -SLC framework for quality instruction -assessment data		
Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013, ?% (?) 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:*					

	?% (?) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, ?% (?) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		5C.2. Language barriers affect the ability of parents and staff to communicate.	5C.2. -Use staff translators regularly to contact parents and in conferences -translate school correspondence and translate at parent events	5C.2. -teachers -administrators -bi-lingual staff members	5C.2. -check parent contact logs -parent response and attendance at school functions	5C.2. -parent contact and conference logs	
		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. Insufficient time and personnel.	5D.1. Extended time for classroom based assessments, and district/state assessments. Inclusion Support of SWD in General Ed. Classrooms. Professional Development and training of staff members.	5D.1. ESE Specialist ESE Teachers and General Education Teachers.	5D.1. Progress monitoring. Annual Goal Progress Reports (4.5 weeks)	5D.1. Benchmark Data, classroom based assessments, and progress toward IEP goals.		

Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, ?% (?) 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:*					
	?% (?) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, ?% (?) of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		5D.2. Insufficient financial resources.	5D.2 Use of grant funds for technology and resources.	5D.2. ESE Specialist, school based, and ESE Specialist, district.	5D.2. Progress monitoring, Annual Goal Progress Reports (4.5 weeks)	5D.2. Benchmark Data, classroom based assessments, and progress toward IEP goals. Pre- and Post- assessment.	
		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. Students may have varying levels of support or resources at home.	5E.1 -21st Century after-school program -parent involvement initiatives -parent nights	5E.1. -21st century staff -administrators -teachers and instructional coaches	5E.1. -21st Century enrollment -parent night and open house attendance	5E.1. -performance data -enrollment and attendance data		
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, ?% (?) 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:*					
	?% (?) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, ?% (?) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment					

		5E.2. Students may have varying degrees of background knowledge or preparedness.	5E.2 -field trips -assemblies -Thinking Maps	5E.2. -teachers -administrators	5E.2. -plan enrichment events -observe Thinking Maps in use	5E.2. -permission slips -assembly materials -lesson plans	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra 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. Deficiencies may exist in prerequisite skills and knowledge.	1.1. Students who required waivers will receive Algebra support in the AVID elective class, including tutorials and focus lessons. All Algebra students receive two periods of math. Teacher will use assessment data to drive differentiation and remediation.	1.1. -Algebra teacher -AVID elective teacher -math coach	1.1. -classroom observations -review assessment data	1.1. -assessment data -SLC framework for quality instruction		
Algebra Goal #1: By June 2013,96% (36) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	94% (34) of the students enrolled in Algebra I were proficient at level 3 or above on the Algebra I EOC.	By June 2013, 96% (36) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.					

		1.2. Students may not take the time or have the support at home to study hard and complete homework with the regularity necessary to master the honors curriculum.	1.2. All Algebra students receive two periods of math. The AVID teacher will monitor grades closely and intervene as needed. Students will have access to laptops at school to use pearsonsuccess.net	1.2. -Algebra teacher -AVID elective teacher -math coach	1.2. -monitor assessment data and homework completion -communication with parents	1.2. -assessment data -student grades	
		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 Algebra.	2.1. Students may be content to pass rather than to master the material.	2.1. -Teacher will reiterate the importance of having a strong Algebra foundation for higher level math. -Teacher and coaches monitor performance formally and informally. -Teaching and interventions are geared towards mastery.	2.1. -Algebra teacher -AVID teacher -math coach	2.1. -review assessment data -monitor grades	2.1. -assessments -Benchmarks -SLC framework for quality instruction		

Algebra Goal #2: By June 2013, 54% (20) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48% (17) of the students enrolled in Algebra I are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-12 Algebra I EOC assessment.	By June 2013, 54% (20) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.					
		2.2. The students are taking a demanding course with lots of standards to master at a young age.	2.2. Students who required waivers will receive Algebra support in the AVID elective class, including tutorials and focus lessons. All Algebra students receive two periods of math. Teacher will use assessment data to drive differentiation and remediation.	2.2. -Algebra teacher -AVID elective teacher -math coach	2.2. -track performance data -AVID tutorials -classroom observations	2.2. -assessment data -SLC framework for quality instruction	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra Goal #3A: **NA**							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**	3B.1. White: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Black: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Hispanic: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Asian: N/A American Indian: N\A	3B.1. -Teacher will use real-world examples and tasks that are accessible to students with multi-cultural backgrounds. -Extra support is offered through the AVID elective class. -Assessments will be aligned to the EOC Test Specifications	3B.1. -Algebra teacher -AVID teacher -math coach -administrators	3B.1. -monitor assessment data and respond accordingly. -review lesson plans -classroom observations	3B.1. -assessment data (including Benchmarks) -SLC framework for quality instruction		

Algebra Goal #3B: By June 2013, ?% (?) of white students, ?% (?) of Hispanic students, and ?% (?) of black students will be proficient on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	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.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		

Algebra Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	N/A	N/A					
		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.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
Algebra Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	N/A	N/A					
		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.	3E.1. Students may not have sufficient time or resources at home to study and complete assignments.	3E.1. All Algebra students receive two periods of math. Students in the AVID elective class will participate in tutorials and focus lessons Teacher will communicate with parents to develop solutions as needed.	3E.1. -Algebra teacher -AVID teacher -math coach	3E.1. -review performance data -monitor grades and assignment completion	3E.1. -parent contact logs -assessment data -student grades		
Algebra Goal #3E: By June 2013, ?% (?) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	?% (?) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC Assessment.	By June 2013, ?% (?) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra EOC assessment.					
		3E.2. Students may not have access to the technology and support materials that are available online.	3E.2 Students will have access to laptops at school to use pearsonsuccess.net	3E.2 -Algebra teacher -AVID teacher -math coach	3E.2. -monitor pearsonsuccess.net for student use	3E.2. -pearsonsuccess.net allows teacher to monitor usage	
		3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Mathematics 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
AVID Instructional Strategies	6-8	Andrew Webster	Middle school math teachers	8-14-12	Teachers will continue to collaboratively plan instructional strategies for each unit	Andrew Webster

Math Department Meetings	6-8	Andrew Webster	Middle school math teachers	Monthly	Monthly meetings/ discussions	Andrew Webster
Elementary Planning Meetings	K-5	Andrew Webster	K-5 teachers	Monthly	Monthly meetings/ discussions	Andrew Webster
Data Analysis Meetings	K-8	Andrew Webster	K-8 teachers	Weekly- middle school Monthly- elementary	Discussions and planning	Andrew Webster
Thinking Maps	K-8	Wilkins	Non-trained teachers	September 2012	Classroom visits	C. Wilkins
Math Academy	Identified	District	Identified participants	August 2012	Classroom visits	Andrew Webster
Common Core Training	K-8	Contacts at School	K-8 teachers	Ongoing	Discussions	Administration
Learning Scales Training	K-8	District	K-8 teachers	Ongoing	Discussions/ classroom visits	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
Sunshine Math Program	Copies of weekly sheets	Title I	$300
Subtotal:$300			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math Department Meetings	Discussion and planning	Title I	$1000
Math Coach		Title I	$50314

E202 Teachers		Title I	$63569
Subtotal:$51314			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Florida Council of Math Teachers Conference	Conference materials	Title I	$2500
Subtotal:$2500			
Total:$117683			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Lack of multiple resources to meet the science NGSSS standards	1a.1. Provide common planning time for team collaboration on various instructional strategies.	1a.1. Grade Group Chair	1a.1. Team Meeting Data Elements	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation Framework		

Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 36% (19) 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:*					
	28%(19) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	36%(26) 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. Implement and train teachers on the 5e lesson model as the standard for science instruction.	1a.2. Science Committee/ District	1a.2. Professional development surveys	1a.2. Teacher Evaluation Framework	

		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 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.	1a.3. Science Teachers/Science Chair/ Administration	1a.3. Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/labs addressing the necessary benchmarks. Monitor the use of nonfiction writing (e.g., Power Writing/Lab Reports, Conclusion writing, Current Events, etc.) 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 Writing prompts Benchmark Assessments Science Fair Projects	

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	1b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1. Collaborative planning for teachers in the Autism Units	1b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Science Goal #1b: By June of 2013, 5% (*) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4,5,6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0%(*) students achieved a Level 4, 5or 6 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment	5%(*) students will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.					
		1b.2. Opportunities for students to learn the language of science	1b.2. Teachers will use a variety of data to plan science instruction and use teaching strategies that will enhance the instruction	1b.2. Teacher Administration	1b.2. Review FAA data and review data on teacher made tests	1b.2. FAA Teacher made assessments	

		1b.3. Poor foundational skills in Reading and math affect the success of students in the science curriculum.	1b.3. Analyze Reading data to provide appropriate leveled science text and materials for struggling students.	1b.3. Teacher Administration ESE Specialist	1b.3. Review and monitoring of classroom assessments, teacher made tests, class work and FAA scores.	1b.3. Curriculum based assessments, review of lesson plans, classroom observations	
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. Elementary Science Teachers do not have a depth of Science background knowledge.	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 to stress the importance of the New Generation SS Standards. Use of Science Fusion and all included resources	2a.1. PLC Science Teacher Leaders	2a.1 PLC Meeting Data, Student Data from Formative Assessments	2a.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT		
Science Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 13% (7) 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:*					

	3%(4) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/ 2012 FCAT assessment.	13%(7) 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	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	2.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1. Collaborative Planning for the teachers in the Autism Units	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Science Goal #2b: By June of 2013, 15% (*) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	14%(*) students achieved a Level 7 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment.	15%(*) students will achieve a Level 7 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment					

		2b.2. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details that will limit their abilities to be to sequence steps in an experiment	2b.2. Use research- based strategies and methodologies to explicitly teach targeted identified deficit skills	2b.2. Teachers Administrators ESE Specialist	2b.2 Review of individual students pre/post test data FAA .	2b.2. Data collection sheets Teacher made assessments FAA Teacher observation using a rubric	
		2b.3 Students have decoding challenges that will limit their processing and comprehension of Science information	2b.3 Use research- based strategies and methodologies to explicitly teach targeted identified deficit skills	2b.3 Teachers Administrators ESE Specialist	2b.3 Review of individual students pre/post test data FAA .	2b.3 Teacher made assessments FAA	

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

Instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry-based learning in Physical, Earth Space, and Life Sciences	Elementary	T. Barenborg	5th grade and other elementary teachers	Monthly feedback	Observations, meeting notes, etc…	Administration
Implement and train teachers on the 5e lesson model as the standard for science instruction	Middle	Steve Shotola	8th grade and middle school science	Monthly feedback	Lesson plans, observations	Administration
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	Elem/Middle	District	School-wide	Quarterly	Science Fair Projects/monthly hands-on labs	Teachers
Thinking Maps	Non-trained	C. Wilkins	Non-trained teachers	September 2012	Classroom observations	C. Wilkins
AVID Strategies	Middle school	K. Register	Middle School teachers	Monthly	Classroom observations	K. Register
Reading in the Content Areas						

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
MS Inquiry and targeted Labs	Dr. Larry Chew	Title I	
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Think Central /Science Fusion	Barenborg(Science /HMH)	District	0
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Thinking Maps	Training	Title I	Included in reading budget

Reading in the Content Areas	CIS	Title I	Included in reading budget
Department Meetings	Discussion and planning	Title I	$1000
Subtotal:$1000			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Florida Association of Science Teachers Conference	Conference Materials	Title I	$2000
Field Trips and guest speakers	Buses/ admission/ speaker fees	Title I	$12275
Subtotal:$2000			
Total:$15275			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

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. Deficiency in prerequisite writing skills	1a.1. Conduct grade level specific professional development to deepen understanding of Writing curriculum and expectations from k-8	1a.1. Administration, Literacy Coaches, Literacy Council,	1a.1. Classroom Observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3, and DQ4, progress on monthly writing prompts, and student work samples	1a.1. Monthly Writing Prompts		
Writing Goal #1a: By June 2013, 66% (160) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In grades 4 and 8, 61.54% (152) scored 3.0 and higher on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	In grades 4 and 8, 66% (160) will score 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing Assessment, by February 2013.					
		1a.2. Teacher content knowledge about the writing process. Students' appropriate use of conventions of writing and use of details that include high levels of vocabulary	1a.2. Provide professional development to K-5 teachers on Write from the Beginning and 6-9 teacher on Write for the Future. Classroom instructors will utilize Appendix C from CCSS ELA to model exemplars in writing.	1a.2. Administration, Literacy Coach, District Professional Developer	1a.2. Classroom observations, modeling, co-teaching sessions. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.2. Monthly Writing Prompts SLC Framework documentation	

		1a.3. New writing expectations include spelling and conventions for K-8. Appropriate implementation according to the research supporting Write From the Beginning and Write for the Future.	1a.3. Colts Magic After School Writing Program. School wide grammar initiative. Schoolwide grammar initiative.	1a.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Identified Teachers	1a.3. Writing Samples and Pre and Post Assessment Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.3. Writing Prompts and conferencing with students on progress monitoring accompanied by lesson study documentation and reflection tools.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1b.1. Knowledge of the Anchor Standards for Writing as outlined in the CCSS for K – 5. Deficiency in prerequisite writing skills	1b.1. Conduct grade level specific professional development to deepen understanding of Writing curriculum and expectations from k-8	1b.1. Administration, Literacy Coaches, Literacy Council	1b.1. Classroom observations, progress on monthly writing prompts, and student work samples	1b.1.		
Writing Goal #1b: By June 2013 55%(*) students will achieve a proficient level on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50%(*) students achieved a proficient Level on writing on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment.	55%(*) students will achieve a proficient level on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment					
		1b.2. Lack of consistency in writing instruction. Lack of consistency in writing instruction	1b.2. Monthly writing prompts	1b.2. Administrator, LA chair, District Writing coach	1b.2. Classroom observations, teacher recording sheets	1b.2. Monthly writing prompts	

		1b.3. Teacher content knowledge about the writing process	1b.3. Colts Magic After School Writing Program	1b.3. Administration, Literacy Coach, Identified Teachers	1b.3. Writing Samples and Pre and Post Assessment	1b.3. Writing Prompts and conferencing with students on progress monitoring.	

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps: Write From the Beginning and Beyond	Grades K-5	Instructional Partners	K-5 Teachers	August and September 2012, ongoing	Modeling and Coteaching at least 4 Visits	Literacy Coach and Administration
Write for the Future	Grades 6-8		6-8 Teachers		Modeling and Coteaching at least 4 Visits	Literacy Coach and Administration
Professional Learning Community for Writing	Middle School Teachers		Sixth through Language Arts Teachers	September through February	Modeling, Demonstration, Peer Observation, and Data Driven Instruction.	Literacy Coach and Administration
Rubric Training	4th and 8th Grade teachers		4th and 8th grade Language Arts teachers	September through February, monthly	Teachers will visit each other's classrooms watching model lessons and will participate in follow up discussions	Instructional Partners

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
Write from the Beginning and Beyond	Books/ training	Title I	0 (already own)
Write for the Future	Training	Title I	0 (already own)
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write from the Beginning and Beyond	Training for writing	Title I	$3000
Thinking Maps Colloquium	Training for TM	Title I	$2000
Subtotal:$5000			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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. Student reading ability	1.1. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. Provide activities that allow students to interpret primary and secondary sources of information. Provide opportunities for students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of issues. Provide opportunities for students to utilize print and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched. Provide opportunities for students to participate in project-based learning activities, including Project Citizen.	1.1. Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies using the SLC Framework.	1.1. School and district assessments will be administered to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	1.1. Pre and interim assessments SLC Civics final exam SLC Framework. FCAT reading.		

Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 50% of students (83) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	By the end of the year, 50% of students (83) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.					
		1.2. Teachers' effective use of instructional strategies	1.2 All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. Emphasis on appropriate elements from DQ1, DQ2 and DQ3. Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Provide classroom activities which help students develop an understanding of the content-specific vocabulary taught in government/civics.	1.2. Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies using the SLC Framework.	1.2. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework Administrative/teacher conferencing	1.2. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework. Individual class Project Citizen portfolio including 5-step process and student writing samples.	

		1.3. Student background knowledge	1.3. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. DQ2 Elements 6, 8, 12, and 15 for teachers to establish background knowledge. In the long-term, have teachers in grades 3-5, utilize District-recommended lesson plans with assessments aligned to identified Civics benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master content.	1.3. Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies using the SLC Framework.	1.3. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework Administrative/teacher conferencing	1.3. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework.	
		1.4. Students have limited understanding of civic engagement.	1.4. Students will participate in the research-based program "Project Citizen." Emphasis will be on an in-depth understanding of citizen engagement in a public policy issue. DQ4 Elements 21, 22, and 23.	1.4. Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies using the SLC Framework.	1.4. School and district assessments will be administered to monitor student progress along with evaluation of the Project Citizen portfolio as determined by use of the common rubric.	1.4. Pre and interim assessments SLC Civics final exam SLC Framework. Individual class Project Citizen Portfolio including 5-step process and student writing samples.	
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. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant.	2.1. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. DQ5 Elements 25, 29, and 32. Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues; assist students in developing well-reasoned positions on issues. Provide opportunities for students to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.	2.1. Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the identified strategies using the SLC Framework.	2.1. School and district assessments will be administered to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	2.1. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework. Individual class Project Citizen portfolio including 5-step process and student writing samples.		

Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, 50% of students (84) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	By the end of the year, 50% of students (84) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.					
		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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Use of Civics Item Specs and CCSS	Grade 7	Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Grades 3-5 Civics Benchmarks	Grades 3-5 and 7	Grade/Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Civics DBQ Project/ CIS	Grade 7	DBQ Trainer	Grade level	September-March	Follow-up training, student work samples	Administration
Project Citizen	Grade 7	PC Trainer	Grade level	August-January	Portfolio	Administration

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
Civics DBQ/CIS	Class set of materials and teacher resources	Title I/Title II	$650/set
Subtotal:$1300			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
DBQ	Training	Title I	$1000
Subtotal:$1000			
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance**						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Getting parents to understand the importance of attending school daily.	1.1 Organize an attendance hearing committee to be held once a month, requesting a meeting with identified student and parent..	1.1. Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselors, Administration, School Deans, and School Social Worker	1.1. Monitor the attendance monthly	1.1 On-going data review of attendance..		
Attendance Goal #1: Our goal is to increase average daily attendance to 95% during the 2012-2013 school year.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	Average Daily Attendance 93.48%	95%					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
		1.2. Lack of student motivation to attend school and get to class on time.	1.2 Attendance incentives will be given for identified students..	1.2. Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselors, Administration, and School Deans.	1.2. Monitor the attendance monthly	1.2 On-going data review of attendance..	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

Attendance Training	All	Assistant Principals	All teachers	September 25, 2012	Monthly meetings	Assistant Principals

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
Attendance Rewards	Certificate Paper	Title I	$500
Subtotal:$500			
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. There are limited opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior.	1.1. Create incentives through school-based Positive Behavior Supports and/or MTSS/RTI to recognize and reward positive compliance on St. Lucie County Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	1.1. Monitor behavior incident report and BIR monthly.	1.1. PBS incentives log of attendance for students who are recognized for complying with SLC Student Code of Conduct along with monthly BIR/ Skyward data reports.		
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	#778	#700					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					

	#244	#220					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	#567	#510					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	#233	#210					
		1.2.	1.2. Deans and/or Guidance Counselor will make contact with parents or students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the SLC Student Code of Conduct.	1.2. Deans/Counselor	1.2. Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on in/ out of school suspension.	1.2. Parent Contact Log, Parent sign in/ out log	
		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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS	K-8	Assistant Principals	School wide	Monthly	Classroom walkthroughs	Assistant Principals
Bully Prevention	K-8	C. Wilkins	School wide	Monthly	Classroom walkthroughs and visits	C. Wilkins
CHAMPS	K-8	K. King	School wide	August and ongoing	Classroom visits	Administrators/ K. King

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
		PBS budget	
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
Behavior Technician	Personnel	Title I	$31864
Subtotal:31864			
Total:$31864			

End of Suspension Goals

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 Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1. Parents may not have transportation	1.1 Open House	1.1. Administration	1.1. Increase attendance over last year	1.1. Sign in sheets		
Our goal is to increase our parent involvement in SAC from 1 parent in 2011-2012 to 10 parents in 2012-2013.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	1 parent attended monthly meetings	***10 parents will attend monthly meetings***					

		1.2. Language Barriers	1.2. Parent /Teacher meetings	1.2. Teachers	1.2. Increase in parent participation at meetings including ESE, PST and ESOL	1.2. Signature pages	
		1.3. Parents may not have transportation	1.3. Parent Resource Room	1.3. Parent Liason	1.3. Increase use of materials	1.3. Guest book	

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Title I parent involvement training	All	Wilkins	All	October 2012	Parent meetings	Administrators

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)

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

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:	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.

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

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)

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

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: NA	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 and Schedules (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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:$284398
Mathematics Budget
Total:$117683
Science Budget
Total:$15275
Writing Budget
Total:$5000
Attendance Budget
Total:$500
Suspension Budget
Total:$31864
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:

Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total:$454,720

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

- ***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.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount