

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: SOUTHPORT MIDDLE SCHOOL

District Name: St. Lucie

Principal: Lydia Martin

SAC Chair: Joey Cueto

Superintendent: Michael Lannon

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# 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	Lydia Martin	BS-Biology Education-West Chester University. Florida Professional Certificate: Biology 6-12 Middle Grades Science M.Ed, Florida Atlantic University-Professional Certificate School Principal Educational Leadership	2	6	Principal, Southport Middle School: School Grade A. Mastery: Reading 64%, Math 61%, Writing 77% and Science 52%. AYP: 72% criteria met. Assistant Principal ,2008-2009, Palm Pointe Educational Research School, Grade A, Mastery: 78% Reading, 72% Math, 93% Writing. 97% of AYP met, Black and FRL students did not meet AYP in Math: Assistant Principal 2007-2008, Opened Palm Pointe, no student data available. Assistant Principal 2006-2007 St. Lucie West K8, School Grade A, Mastery: 66% Reading, 68% Math, 95% Writing, 92% of AYP criteria met, Black and ESE students did not meet AYP in Reading and Black students did not meet AYP in Math. Assistant Principal 2005-2006, St. Lucie West Middle, Grade A, Mastery: 78% Reading, 72% Math, 93% Writing, 95% of the criteria met for AYP, ESE students did not meet the criteria in Reading or in Math
		BS Education -			

Assis Principal	Nicole Telese	East Carolina University Professional Certificate: ESE K-12, Middle Grade Integrated Curriculum, ESOL M.Ed, Florida Atlantic University-Professional Certificate: Educational Leadership	5		
-----------------	---------------	--	---	--	--

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and 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)	# of Years at Current School	# 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	Mary Kurtz-Seiden	MA degree with Reading Endorsement; BA in Elementary Education	19	4	Served as reading coach during the past two years when Southport achieved an "A" rating; learning gains have been made for lowest quartile students in reading 2010-2011 school year. School Grade 2010-2011 64% of reading students at or above grade level, 61% of math students at or above grade level, 77% of students in writing are at or above grade level, 52% science students at or above grade.
Math	Kathleen Manchester	Math Certification	9		No Prior data as a coach

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Use the district Skyward Fast Track hiring system to screen qualified candidates.	Principal	July 31, 2012	
2	Interview and hire teachers based on their experience, certification, and interest in the middle school child.	Principal	July 31, 2012	
3	Establish a mentoring program for new teachers and meet monthly as a team to discuss areas of need and support.	Principal, New Teacher Mentors	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1.4% (1)	Ongoing PD relative to quality teaching.

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
68	4.4%(3)	25.0%(17)	29.4%(20)	41.2%(28)	27.9%(19)	0.0%(0)	16.2%(11)	1.5%(1)	22.1%(15)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Mary Kurtz-Seiden	Linda Colebrook	Linda Colebrook is a second year teacher who is currently teaching 7th grade Reading. Mary Kurtz-Seiden is our Literacy Coach and very strong in content knowledge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Christine Richards	Bobbi Booth	Bobbi Booth is a first year teacher who is currently teaching 8th grade Read 180. Christine Richards is a 6th grade Reading teacher who supported Bobbi through her student teaching experience. She also has experience teaching 8th grade Read 180.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher.

John Barry	Adolpho Diaz	Adolpho is a seventh grade science teacher who is returning to the district but has experience teaching at the highschool and middle school level. John Barry is a strong eighth grade science teacher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Eric Johnson	Jessica Allen	Jessica Allen is teaching 7th grade science for the second year in our district and has previous experience teaching out of district. Eric Johnson is also a 7th grade science teacher who has served as a science department chair in years past.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Tammy Altizer	Allison O'Connor	Allison O'Connor is returning to St. Lucie County School District as a School Based ESE Specialist. She has experience as an ESE teacher, Co-teacher, and ESE Department Chair. Tammy Altizer is a Speech-Language Pathologist with a wide-variety of experience related to ESE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support

Anthony Cusa	Andrea Levin	<p>Andrea Levin is a second year teacher in St Lucie County, but has experience teaching English overseas (Japan). This is her first year teaching Civics at the middle school level.</p> <p>Anthony Cusa is the Social Studies Department Chair and is also teaching Civics.</p>	<p>driven by targets specific for each new teacher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Kathleen Manchester	Jenna Woods	<p>Jenna Woods is a 1st year teacher who is teaching 6th grade math.</p> <p>Kathleen Manchester is our Math Coach and has strong experience with instructional strategies and math content, and she previously taught 6th grade math here at Southport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Lisa Pietrick	Michelle Wear	<p>Michelle Wear is a 1st year teacher in St Lucie County, but has experience teaching private school in the Florida Keys. Mrs. Pietrick is a 6th grade math teacher as well.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team)

Karen Allen	Kelly Lunt	<p>Kelly Lunt is a second year 8th grade science teacher. Karen Allen is the Science Department Chair and has a strong background in instructional planning, data analysis, and science content.</p>	<p>meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.
Kim Nicholas	Morgan Kellogg	<p>Morgan Kellogg is a 1st year 6th grade language arts teacher. Kim Nicholas teaches 7th grade language arts and is a member of our Common Core team, but also has experience teaching 6th grade language arts.</p>	<p>• Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/activities on log.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through high-quality classroom instruction which differentiates learning for all students. Money will support a reading coach and before and after-school tutorial programs as well as additional reading and math programs. Southport will also coordinate with Title II and IDEA to ensure staff development opportunities are provided based on teacher's needs to meet student targets. The district coordinated with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. These funds will be used to ensure opportunities for professional growth. Monies will be used for consultants, teachers' attendance in conference and workshops and stipends for PD on non-school days.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

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

Our members include: Administrator, MTSS/RtI Coach, School Psychologist, Guidance, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, ESE Dept. Chair, and Speech/Language Pathologist

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 Core team meets at least 3-4 times a year to review universal screening data and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1 – Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic/behavioral targets.

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

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

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?

The Core Team collaborated with the School Advisory Council (SAC) utilizing data from the 2011-2012 school year. The Team helped facilitate a discussion on how to increase academic rigor, particularly in Intensive Reading and Math classes (6-12), and with Tier 1 behavioral instruction.

Utilizing the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets we will identify and then focus attention on deficient areas will be discussed.

Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:

- FCAT scores and the lowest 25%
- AYP and subgroups
- Strengthens and weaknesses of intensive academic/behavioral programs
- Mentoring, tutoring, and other services

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.

- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)
- FCAT Writes
- Curriculum Based Measurement
- St. Lucie County Benchmarks
- Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
- Office Discipline Referrals
- Retentions
- Absences

The data will be triangulated and analyzed to determine students who need additional instruction with evidence based interventions.

The following databases will be utilized:

- Skyward
- PMRN
- Performance Matters
- RTI Database

Additional data will be available through the following:

- Program Specific Reports
- AimsWeb
- Behavior Incident Reports (BIR)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

- Positive Behavior Support (PBS)
- CHAMPS
- Literacy Routines/Framework
- Math Routines/Framework
- Behavior Framework
- AimsWeb
- Performance Matters

- RtI Database
- USF/FLDOE Problem Solving/Response to Instruction and Intervention Tier 1, 2, and 3
- Progress Monitoring and Graphing

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS leadership team has built weekly meetings into the calendar, during which the team will meet with grade level departments to review a variety of data sources and identify the student's response to their instruction. These meetings will also be used to help them problem solve and to identify necessary TierI and TierII interventions for students based on their needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

School Speech Language Pathologist
 LA Dept Chair
 Reading Coach
 Media Specialist
 Principal
 Assistant Principal
 Math Dept Chair
 Science Dept Chair
 Social Studies Department Chair

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

Our school based LLT meets once a month to evaluate and plan school wide literacy programs and activities.

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

LLT team members will share their visions of what the ultimate middle school literacy program would look like and then establish a literacy vision for SPMS.
 The team will assess the needs of our school and establish goals for the 2012-2013 school year.
 Members of the team will help assess classroom libraries and plan/work on ways to grow them such as our "Shoot for Literacy Basket Ball Games" and the "Donate a Book Contest" we have had in the past.
 Two school wide read alouds will be implemented with fun student activities and motivating contests.
 The Sunshine State Reader's Award program will be promoted as well as taking part in the Florida Department of Educations', "Celebrate Literacy Week."
 This year, we hope to participate in the book trailer video contest that is held through the DOE as well as participate in Saint Lucie County's Young Author's Contest.
 The team will also look at professional development activities that match the school's literacy vision and needs.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 8/31/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

Reading is taught across all content areas at SPMS. The Reading Coach provides on going coaching and modeling to ensure that reading strategies are incorporated into daily lessons. The Literacy Coach will be supporting all teachers in their ability to identify text sources of appropriate text complexity that support their individual content areas. The SIP plan is developed by teachers across content area and is reviewed and monitored with all teachers throughout the school year.

*High Schools Only

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

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

*

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

*

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

*

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 59% (555)of our students to be proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 54% (508)are proficient in reading as measured by FCAT2.0.	Our goal is for 59% (555)of our students to be proficient as measured by FCAT2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher resistance in following the District Literacy Plan with fidelity	Coach the teacher on the implementation of the District Literacy Plan in each Reading Class with Fidelity. This plan includes a focus on differentiation to meet the individual needs of each student. Provide continued support through the process of observation with focused feedback.	Literacy Coach and Principal	Classroom observations and Innovation Configuration Maps	SLC Benchmark Tests, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations, Innovation configuration maps
2	Instructional Rigor	Daily collaborative planning for grade level departments supported by Instructional Coaches.	Literacy Coach/Math Coach and Administration	Administration will monitor the development of common assessments, common units/lessons, and increase in instructional rigor using systematic observation and the teacher evaluation tool.	Results of SLC Benchmark Assessments as well as the SLC Framework for Quality Instruction.
3	Lack of Training/Understanding	Weekly instructional development sessions targeting the use of research-based practices coupled with ongoing observation/feedback cycles from the Instructional Coaches.	Literacy Coach/math Coach and Administration	Review of observation data and feedback from teachers regarding their continued pd needs.	SLC Benchmark Assessments as well as the SLC Framework for Quality Instruction, and Innovation Configuration Maps

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

*		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 27% (223) students to score level 4 or 5 on the FCAT test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently we have 22% (183) of our students scoring level 4 and 5.	Our goal is for 27% (223) students to score level 4 or 5 on the FCAT test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Staffing - We do not have a staffing allocation that allows us to offer Advanced Reading to our high performing students. Many of these students do not have a reading class scheduled, but instead receive instruction for reading through their English/Language Arts class.	Teaching reading across the curriculum with the use of increasingly complex texts. In addition, we will be designing enrichment for these students through their Research class.	Literacy Coach and Principal	Monitor the progress of these students on the SLC Benchmark Assessments and ultimately the FCAT2.0.	SLC Benchmark Assessment, classroom walk-throughs/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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

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

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 69% (649)students to make learning gains on the FCAT2.0 test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Our current level of performance is 64% (602)made learning gains on the FCAT2.0.	Our goal is for 69% (649)students to make learning gains on the FCAT2.0 test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of teacher training on how to differentiate lessons based on data.	Regular analysis of data among grade level departments utilizing Performance Matters (a leading and lagging data management system) to pinpoint areas of weakness for each student. Instructional coaches will support teachers in making instructional decisions based on this data to include flexible differentiated groups.	Literacy Coach, Principal	SLC Benchmark Tests results	SLC Benchmark Tests, PD Rosters, Meeting Logs
2	Lack of fidelity of implementation of District Literacy Plan.	Implement the SLC District Literacy Routine in all reading classes.	Literacy Coach and Principal	Classroom observation and fidelity checks	SLC benchmark Tests, Innovation Configuration (IC) Maps/Coaching Guides and SLC Observation Forms

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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, 69% (162) of the lowest 25% to make learning gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently, 64% (150) of the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading.	Our goal is for 69% (162) of the lowest 25% to make learning gains in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support/participation in the student's educational experience.	Implement a Literacy Night 3 times a year (beginning, middle and end of year) to try to help parents become more aware of ways that they can help their child develop their literacy skills.	Literacy Coach and Administrator	Monitor the quality of student homework assignments, projects, reading logs, etc.	Event sign-in sheets, student and parent feedback from surveys, as well as grading rubrics for home assignments.
2	Broad range of knowledge and ability to implement research based practices.	Daily collaborative planning for Intensive Reading teachers supported by Instructional Coaches.	Literacy Coach and Administration	Monitoring targeted data from SLC Benchmark Assessments, AIMSWeb, and formative assessments.	Benchmark Test, AIMS Web, Minibats, Formative Assessments.
3	Insufficient time for instruction in this area	Lowest quartile students will be identified and enrolled in Before/After School tutoring designed to target areas of skill deficit.	Before/After school Coordinator and MTSS/RtI Core Team	Monitor Benchmark data for these students.	SLC Benchmark Assessment

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment, the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 or above will increase to 69% (649).					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54	53	58	62	66	

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making	
--	--

satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Our goal is for White 61% (356), Black 52% (103), Hispanic 55% (91) to make AYP in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Our current data shows that White: 62% (302), Black 47% (88), Hispanic 50% (87) made AYP in Reading.	Our goal is for White 61% (356), Black 52% (103), Hispanic 55% (91) to make AYP in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher resistance and Lack of Training	Implement the SLC District Literacy Routine focusing on small group differentiated instruction.	Literacy Coach and Principal	Classroom observation and fidelity checks	SLC Benchmarks and FAIR, Innovation Configuration (IC) Maps/Coaching Guides and Marzano Observation forms
2	Teachers training and time	Utilize Performance Matters to identify these students in each class. Closely monitor their progress throughout the year and provide intervention when necessary.	Teachers, RTI core Team	Data	SLC Benchmarks and teacher made assessments, PD Rosters, Meeting Logs

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not enough personnel	Schedule all ELL students in an ESOL Language Arts class and provide support for them by an ESOL paraprofessional in all Reading classes.	ESOL Guidance Contact	SLC Benchmark Tests	SLC Benchmark Assessments, teacher made assessments
2	Lack of teacher training on how to differentiate lessons based on data.	Use Performance matters to pinpoint area of weakness for each student. Instructional coaches will support teachers in making instructional decisions based on this data to include flexible differentiated groups.	Literacy Coach and administration	SLC Benchmark Test results	SLC Benchmark Tests, PD Rosters, Meeting Logs

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	SWD is an area that we will be focusing on this year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of teacher training to be effective in the co-teacher model.	Increase the number of students who are scheduled into general education classes by providing co-teachers and support facilitation thus exposing them to on grade level rigorous curricula.	ESE Department Chair, Guidance Counselors and Principal	Progress monitor student scores and grades throughout the school year.	SLC benchmark reports, PD Rosters and Student/Teacher Schedules
2	Teacher Training and time	Utilize Performance Matters to quickly identify these students and monitor their progress throughout the year. Provide intervention as soon as necessary.	ESE Dept Chair, Teachers administration	Monitor progress	SLC Benchmark Assessments, PD Rosters, Meeting Logs

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support and transportation	Implement a Before and After School Program Targeting this group of students.	Program Coordinator	Attendance rates of the Before and After School Program and this subgroups' progress on benchmark tests	SLC Benchmark Tests, program attendance rosters
2	Teacher training and time	Utilize Performance matters to identify these students at the beginning of the school year, monitor their progress	Teachers, RTI Core Team and Administration	monitor progress	SLC Benchmark Tests, PD Rosters and Meeting Logs

and provide interventions when necessary

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity	Grades 6-8, All Subjects	Mary Kurtz-Seiden	School-wide	September 2012	On-site coach support	Instructional Coaches
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction	Grades 6-8, All subjects	Lydia Martin, Nicole Telese, and Tim Norfleet	School-wide	Weekly on Wednesdays during planning periods	Observation	Administration
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8, All subjects	Kagan Institute Facilitators/Trainers	School-wide	Two full days, October 15, 2012 and January 18, 2013	On-site coaching/support	Instructional Coaches and Language Arts teacher
Literacy Routines	Grades 6-8, Reading and Language Arts	Mary Kurtz-Seiden	All Reading Teachers	Ongoing	Observation and feedback cycles	Literacy Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Read 180 Next Generation	Computer licenses and books/program materials	Title I	\$16,000.00
			Subtotal: \$16,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cooperative Learning Structures	2 day Kagan Training with Training manual/materials	Title I	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$26,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 30.3% (9) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 35% (10) of our 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, 30.3% (9) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have a limited understanding of English	We are utilizing the language program to help build a strong foundation in English letter/sound/word patterns. We are also providing bilingual support to students in their classes.	Jim Slattery, ESOL Coordinator.	Collecting regular data from the Language Program as well as Oral Reading Fluency data.	Language and ORF

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:		Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 9.1% of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 14% of our 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, 9.1% (1) of ELL students were proficient in Reading.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students do not have sufficient understanding of English sound and word patterns, which prevent them from being able to successfully decode text.	We are using the Language program to help students build foundational Literacy skills.	Language Teacher	Regular Language Assessments	Language - Curriculum based assessment

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:		Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 27.3% of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 32% of our 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, 27.3% (3) of ELL students were proficient in Writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have a limited number of familiar words that they know how to write in English.	Writing across the curriculum	Administration	Analysis of writing samples during regular monthly/benchmark assessments	Writing sample

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of the evidence-based Language program for intensive readers	Curriculum materials	P24	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write for the Future	Write for the Future Curriculum Binder	P24	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,300.00

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By June 2013 49% (461) of our students will be proficient in Math as measured by the 2013 FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Our current level of performance is that 44% (414) of our students are proficient in Math.	Our goal is that 49% (461) of our students will be proficient in Math as measured by the 2013 FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher resistance in following the District Math Routines with fidelity	Coach the teacher on implementation of the District Math Routines in each class. This plan includes a focus on differentiation to meet the individual needs of each student. Provide continued support through the process of observation with focused feedback.	Math Coach and Principal	Classroom observation	Saint Lucie County Benchmark Tests, classroom walkthroughs, and observations
2	Instructional Rigor	Daily collaborative planning for grade level departments supported by instructional coaches	Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Administration	Administration will monitor the development of common assessments, common units/lessons, and increase in instructional rigor using systematic observation and the teacher evaluation tool.	Saint Lucie County Benchmark Test, as well as the SLC Framework for Quality Instruction.
3	Lack of training/understanding	Weekly instructional development sessions targeting the use of best practices coupled with ongoing observation/feedback cycles from the instructional coaches	Literacy Coach, Math Coach, and Administration	Review of observation data and feedback from teachers regarding their continued pd needs.	Saint Lucie County Benchmark Tests, as well as the SLC Framework for Quality Instruction
4	Lack of knowledge with implementing Cooperative groups.	Provide PD for teachers on cooperative learning, specifically Kagan Structures	Administration, Math Coach	Classroom Observation	Observation data

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

*					*
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 23% (229) of students score a level 4 or 5 in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently, 18% (176) of our students scored a level 4 or 5 in Math.	Our goal is that 23% (229) of students score a level 4 or 5 in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many of our students are lacking core foundational skills which prevent them from being successful with problem solving at higher levels.	Implementing math routines with fidelity in order to successfully differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	Math Coach and Administration	Monitor progress of these students on the SLC Benchmark Assessments and ultimately FCAT 2.0	SLC Benchmark Assessment and teacher observation/classroom walkthroughs.
2	Instructional Rigor	Daily collaborative planning for grade level departments supported by instructional coaches.	Math Coach and Administration	Administration will monitor the development of common assessments, common units/lessons, and increase in instructional rigor using systematic observation and the teacher evaluation tool.	Results of SLC Benchmark Assessments as well as the SLC Framework for Quality Instruction

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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3a:	By June 2013, 59% (555) of our students will make learning gains in math as measured by the 2012 FCAT Test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently, 54%(508) of our students made learning gains in math.	Our goal is that 59% (555) of our students will make learning gains in math as measured by the 2012 FCAT Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of teacher training on how to differentiate lessons based on data.	Regular analysis of data among grade level departments utilizing Performance Matters (a leading and lagging data management system) to pinpoint areas of weakness for each student. Instructional Coaches will support teachers in making instructional decisions based on this data to include flexible differentiated groups.	Math Coach and Administration	SLC Benchmark Test results	SLC Benchmark Tests, PD rosters and meeting logs
2	Lack of fidelity of implementation of the District Math routines	Implement the SLC District Math Routine in all math classes	Math Coach and Administration	Classroom observation and fidelity checks	SLC benchmark tests and SLC observation forms

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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 68% of the lowest 25% (160) of our students will make learning gains in math as measured by the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 63% of the lowest 25% (148) of our students made learning gains in math.	Our goal is that 68% of the lowest 25% (160) of our students will make learning gains in math as measured by the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support/participation in student's educational experience	Implement a Math Night to help parents become aware of ways that they can help their child develop foundational math skills.	Math Coach and administration	monitor the quality of student homework assignments, projects etc.	Event sign in sheet, student/parent feedback survey as well as grading rubrics for home assignments.
2	Broad range of knowledge and ability to implement research based practices.	Daily collaborative planning for all math teachers supported by instructional coaches.	Math Coach and administration	Monitoring targeted data from SLC Benchmark Assesments, AIMSweb and formative assessments	Benchmark test, AIMSweb, Minibats and formative asesments.
3	Insufficient time for instruction in this area.	Lowest quartile students will be enrolled in Before/Afterschool tutoring designed to target areas of skills deficit.	Before/Afterschool Coordinator and MTSS/Rti Core Team	Monitor Benchmark data for these students	SLC Benchmark Assessment

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal # On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment, the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or above will increase to 68% (479). 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	64	68	71	74	77	

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	We did not meet the AYP requirements for the following subgroups, White, Black and Hispanic.
--	--

Mathematics Goal #5B:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Currently, White 62% (301), Black 41% (77), Hispanic 58% (101) showed learning gains in math last year.			Our goal for this year is to meet the following Safe Harbor targets: White 64% (311), Black 47% (88), Hispanic 62% (108)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of teacher and parent support	Hold a student led conference night	Administration	Participation rates	Parent, student and teacher feedback and sign in sheets
2	Lack of training with the program and lack of training in differentiation	Utilize Performance Matters (student data analysis tool) to quickly determine mastery for these subgroups and then make instructional decisions based on the data.	Administration	Pre-Test and Post Test Benchmark analysis	SLC Benchmark Tests and PD Rosters
3	Lack of transportation for students and lack of parental support	Offer a Before School and After School program to this targeted group of students.	Program Coordinator	Pre-Test and Post test benchmark analysis	SLC Benchmark Tests and Program Attendance records

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	*
Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	*
Mathematics Goal #5D:	This is a major area of focus for this school year as we need to make significant gains in this subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Currently, 19% (25) of students with disabilities made AYP in Math.	Our goal is to meet the Safe Harbor target of 27% (35) of our students with disabilities will make AYP in Math.
---	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	lack of co-teacher planning time	Increase the number of SWD that participate in General Ed math classes with additional teacher support.	ESE Department Chair, Guidance Counselors, Administration	Analyze Benchmark Pre and Post tests	SLC district Benchmark tests
2	Lack of transportation for students and lack of parental support	Offer a Before and After School program to this targeted group of students with a focus on specific skill based instruction.	Program Coordinator	Analyze Benchmark Pre and Post tests	SLC district Benchmark tests and Program Attendance records

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	We will continue to focus on this subgroup for in this school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently, 50% (324) of our ED students made AYP in Math.	Our goal is that 55% (357) of our ED students will make AYP in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support and Lack of transportation	Implement a Before and After School program targeting this subgroup of students.	Program Coordinator, Administration	Attendance Rates for the Before and After School Program and increased scores on benchmark tests.	SLC Benchmarks and program attendance records

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)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	By June 2013, 96% (35) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
93% (38) of students enrolled in Algebra I scored at a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.	96% (35) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at a level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	This is a very rigorous high school course being taught to middle school students. These students are at times missing foundational Algebraic skills due to not having taken Pre-Algebra prior to taking Algebra I.	Use of the District Math Routines in order to meet with students in small group to address gaps in skills/knowledge and strengthen Algebraic foundation.	Math Coach and Administration	Progress on SLC Benchmark Assessment will be monitored closely as well as results of regular minibats, and ultimately Algebra I End of Course Exam.	Algebra I End of Course Exam

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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	By June 2013, 44% (16) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at a level 4 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (16) of students enrolled in Algebra I scored at a level 4 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.	44% (16) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at a level 4 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	This is a very rigorous high school course being taught to middle school students. These students are at times missing foundational Algebraic skills due to not having taken Pre-Algebra prior to taking Algebra I.	Use of the District Math Routines in order to meet with students in small group to address gaps in skills/knowledge and strengthen Algebraic foundation.	Math Coach and Administration	Progress on SLC Benchmark Assessment will be monitored closely as well as results of regular minibats, and ultimately Algebra I End of Course Exam.	Algebra I End of Course Exam

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # On the 2013 Algebra I EOC, the percent of students scoring at level 3 or above will increase to 96% (35). 3A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	94%	96%	97%	98%	99%	

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	*
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
*		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:		*		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
*		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:		*		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
*		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal #				
	3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	*
Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	*
Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

*		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Routines	Grades 6-8, Math	Math Coach and District Math Support	All math teachers	Ongoing	Observation and feedback cycles	Math Coach
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8, All subjects	Kagan Institute Facilitators/Trainers	School-wide	2 full days, October 15, 2012 and January 18, 2013	On site coaching/support	Instructional Coaches
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction	Grades 6-8, All subjects	Lydia Martin, Nicole Telese, and Tim Norfleet	School-wide	Weekly on Wednesdays during planning periods	Observation	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cooperative Learning Structures	2 full day Kagan Training with Training Manual/Resources	Title I	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$10,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By June, 2013, 57% (171) of our current 8th graders will be proficient in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Currently, 52% (156) of our 8th graders from last year were proficient in Science.	This year, 57% (171) of our current 8th graders will be proficient in Science.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time, materials, lack of teacher training (new teachers)	Each quarter, students will complete 1 common lab to increase the understanding of the nature of science benchmarks.	Science Department Chair, Administration	Analysis of Benchmark tests scores, feedback from teachers and teacher observation of students.	Saint Lucie County Benchmark Tests, PD Rosters
2	Parental support and student interest	Hold a curriculum night focused on science (for example...CSI or Curriculum Night)	Science Department Chair and Administration	Attendance rates and student/parent survey feedback	Parent, teacher and student feedback
3	Teacher training on new materials	Implementation of Science Fusion aligned to NGSSS	Science Department Chair and administration	Classroom Walk throughs and observation	Student performance on the science benchmark and on Science FCAT (grade 8)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 19% (57) of our students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in Science, as measured by the FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently, 14% (40) of our students scored a level 4 or 5 in Science.	19% (57) of our students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in Science, as measured by the FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited enrollment in Advanced Science course.	Provide proficient students with Science enrichment through their Resource class period.	Science Department Chair and Administration	Use of formative assessments and observation of labs/projects	Quality of student work/problem solving processes.

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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal # 2b:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Test Item Specifications	Grades 6-8, Science Teachers	Science Department Chair	All Science Teachers	Monthly during Department Mtgs.	Review of units/lessons and common assessments developed by grade level departments	Science Department Chair and Administration
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction	Grades 6-8, All teachers	Lydia Martin, Nicole Telese, and Tim Norfleet	All teachers	Weekly during common planning instructional development sessions	Classroom observation with focused feedback	Administration
Kagan Structures	Grades 6-8, All	Kagan Trainers	All teachers	2 full days, October 15, 2012 and January 18, 2013	Classroom walkthroughs and observations	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cooperative Learning Structures	2 full days of Kagan Training with Training Resources	Title I	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Labs	Lab resources	Science Budget	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$11,000.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		By June 2013, 76% (243) of our students to be proficient in writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Currently 71% (227) of our students were proficient in writing.		Our goal for this year is for 76% (243) of our students to be proficient in writing.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited time for scored writing to give feedback to students	Implementation of Language Arts routines with fidelity in each LA class, including the use of weekly small group or individual conferences with students to target their unique needs.	Department Chair and administration	Monitor student progress and mastery on the SLC Benchmark tests and the common teacher made assessments	SLC Benchmark, Common teacher made assessments FCAT rubrics for scoring
2	Lack of understanding on how to use Write for the Future	Provide training to teacher on how to use Write for the Future.	Administration, department chair	Monitor lesson plans and collect data during observations.	lesson plans checklist, 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	*
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
*	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Routines and Components for Middle School Language Arts	Grade 6-8, Language Arts teachers	Literacy Coach	Language Arts teachers	September 2012	Observation with focused feedback	Literacy Coach and Administration
Write for the Future	Grades 6-8, Language Arts teachers	Thinkings Maps Trainer	Language Arts teachers	August 2012	Observation with focused feedback	Literacy Coach and Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write for the Future	Teacher Resource Binder	P24	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Grand Total: \$800.00			

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)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	*
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
no data available	*

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	By June 2013, we will have an attendance rate of 96%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Our current attendance rate for 2012 was 93%.	Our goal is that of our students will attend school on a daily basis and we will increase our attendance rate to 96%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

Currently, we have 120 students with excessive absences.	Our goal is to reduce the number of students with excessive absences to 96 (20% reduction).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Currently, we have 10 students who have excessive tardies.	Our goal is to reduce the number of student with Excessive Tardies to 8 (20% reduction).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Late start time, students getting themselves off to school	Follow up immediately with parents of students who are absent more than 2 days	Attendance clerk, HR teachers	Analysis of 2013 Attendance Data	Attendance Data
2	none	Recognize students at the end of each nine weeks who have achieved perfect attendance at the Honor Roll Assembly	Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselors	Analysis of 2013 Attendance Data	Attendance Data
3	none	Add an attendance incentive to our monthly PBS goals and recognize the HR with the best attendance rate for the month	PBS Core Team	Analysis of 2013 Attendance Data	Attendance Data

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	By June 2013, we will not have more than 526 in-school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
Last year we had a total of 585 in school suspensions.	This year, our goal is to have no more than 526 (10% reduction) in-school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
Last year, we had 221 students suspended in school.	This year our goal is to have no more than 199 (10% reduction) students suspended in school.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
Last year we had 317 out of school suspensions.	This year, we want to have no more that 285 (10% reduction) out of school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
Last year, we had 151 students suspended out of school.	Our goal this year is to have no more than 136 (10% reduction) students suspended out of school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time, new untrained members on core team	Rewrite and revisit current PBS plan	PBS Core Team	We will look at the suspension and BIC rates	Suspension and BIC data
2	Teacher buy in, lack of training	Implement CHAMPS at the classroom level school wide	Administration	We will look at the suspension and BIC rates	Suspension and BIC data
	Lack of teacher training	Train teachers on how	Dean	We will look at	Suspension and

3		to provide behavior interventions in the classroom		suspension and BIC rates.	BIC data
4	Weak and or negative peer relationships	School-wide Bullying Curriculum	All teachers of Research and Intensive Math	Feedback from student surveys	Survey, bullying report data

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Leadership Bootcamp	Grades 6-8, varied subjects	Lydia Martin and Nicole Telese	Team Leaders, Department Chairs, Deans, and Guidance Counselors	August 7 & 8, 2013	data collection and analysis with further focus during Leadership Meetings	Administration
CHAMPS	New Teachers	Sandy Akre	New Teachers	August 10, 2013	observation with feedback	Administrations

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School-wide bullying curriculum	Student books	Title I	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement	

Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	The number of parents having a positive interaction with the school each year has increased over recent years. We would like to see significant growth in this area.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
The percent of parents who have participated in more than one positive experience with the school last year was 50%.	We would like to see 75% of our parents participate in a positive event this year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support	Incorporate the following events this year: Family Multicultural Night Family Reading Club NJHS Events Honor Roll Student of the Month School Musicals (2) Band and Choral Concerts (2) Parent Workshops (3 times a year) Student Led Conference (spring) PTO SAC Spaghetti Dinner Student Mini Museum	Various	use sign-in sheets to record parent participation	Compare this years sign-in sheets with last years sign in sheets

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal:			\$0.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

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 (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Engage and challenge students in STEM inquiry based learning.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher lack of familiarity with the STEM initiative	As a science department, we will work to create common STEM inquiry-based labs that are engaging and challenging.	Science Department Chair and Administration	Observation of student performance	FCAT Science

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Lab Resources	Variety of material resources needed to develop and execute common labs	Science budget	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:		*		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

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

No Data Submitted

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

School Culture Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. School Culture Goal School Culture Goal # 1:			We need to increase the number of staff member who report that SPM has a positive school culture.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
70% of staff member report that the school has a positive climate or culture.			90% of staff members report that SPM has a positive school culture.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	participation	continue the Sunshine Committee created last year to recognize faculty and staff on a regular basis and to provide events for staff and faculty to get to know one another.	Sunshine Committee Chair and administration	Sunshine membership lists, feedback from staff	Meeting logs and sign in sheets, results from staff surveys

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of School Culture Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Read 180 Next Generation	Computer liscenses and books/program materials	Title I	\$16,000.00
CELLA	Use of the evidence-based Language program for intensive readers	Curriculum materials	P24	\$2,500.00
Writing	Write for the Future	Teacher Resource Binder	P24	\$800.00
				Subtotal: \$19,300.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Cooperative Learning Structures	2 day Kagan Training with Training manual/materials	Title I	\$10,000.00
CELLA	Write for the Future	Write for the Future Curriculum Binder	P24	\$800.00
Mathematics	Cooperative Learning Structures	2 full day Kagan Training with Training Manual/Resources	Title I	\$10,000.00
Science	Cooperative Learning Structures	2 full days of Kagan Training with Training Resources	Title I	\$10,000.00
				Subtotal: \$30,800.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Common Labs	Lab resources	Science Budget	\$1,000.00
Suspension	School-wide bullying curriculum	Student books	Title I	\$1,000.00
STEM	Common Lab Resources	Variety of material resources needed to develop and execute common labs	Science budget	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,000.00
				Grand Total: \$53,100.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

St. Lucie School District SOUTHPORT MIDDLE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	61%	77%	52%	254	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	63%	69%			132	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	75% (YES)	69% (YES)			144	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					530	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

St. Lucie School District SOUTHPORT MIDDLE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	60%	84%	49%	260	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	70%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	71% (YES)	67% (YES)			138	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					537	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested