

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Lakewood Park Elementary	District Name: St. Lucie
Principal: Dianne Young	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Susan Fredrickson	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

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

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dianne Young	Bachelor of Arts Elementary Education Certified Varying Exceptionalities K-12 Endorsed Gifted K-12 Masters Degree Educational Leadership	<1	4	<p>Year School Grade AYP 2011-12 WBE C 79 %Prof Reading %Prof Math %Prof Writing %Prof Science 48 52 82 39 Lowest 25%(R) Lowest 25%(M) %LG (R) %LG(M) 75 53 71 60</p> <p>Year School Grade AYP 2010-11 WBE B 79 %Prof Reading %Prof Math %Prof Writing 59 75 93 Lowest 25%(R) Lowest 25%(M) %LG (R) %LG(M) 59 62 55 55</p> <p>Year School Grade AYP 2009-10 WBE A 100 %Prof Reading %Prof Math %Prof Writing 63 71 90 Lowest 25%(R) Lowest 25%(M) %LG (R) %LG(M) 67 82 65 71</p> <p>Year School Grade AYP 2008-09 WBE C 69 %Prof Reading %Prof Math %Prof Writing 57 56 88 Lowest 25%(R) Lowest 25%(M) %LG (R) %LG(M) 61 68 58 57</p> <p>Year School Grade AYP 2007-08 SLE C 97 %Prof Reading %Prof Math %Prof Writing 61 60 83 Lowest 25%(R) Lowest 25%(M) %LG (R) %LG(M) 52 73 58 66</p>
Assistant Principal	Kisha Bellande-Hinds	BS-Communicative Disorders University of Central Florida Masters in Educational Leadership Florida Atlantic University Certification- State of Florida	<1	2	<p>FK Sweet 2011-2012 Grade “A” Reading Master -73%, Math Mastery- 72%, Science Master-74%, Writing Master-89%. FK Sweet2010-2011 Grade “A” Reading Master – 90%, Math Mastery – 90%, Science Mastery – 58%, Writing Mastery – 99% Met AYP -no</p>

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

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Susan Fredrickson	B.A. – Elementary Education M.Ed – Reading K-12 Early Childhood K-3 Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL Endorsement	3	3	<p>Lakewood Park Elementary 2011-2012 School Grade D 45% of students meeting high standards in Reading 46% of students meeting high standards in Math 73% of students meeting high standards in Writing 33% of students meeting high standards in Science 47% of students making Learning Gains in Reading 30% of students making Learning Gains in Math 42% of lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 18% of lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Math</p> <p>Lakewood Park Elementary-2010-11 School Grade-C 68% of Students Meeting High Standards in Reading 75% of Students Meeting High Standards in Math 80% of Students Meeting High Standards in Writing 39% of Students Meeting High Standards in Science 50% of Students Making Learning Gains in Reading 45% of Students Making Learning Gains in Math 57% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math The following group achieved Annual Learning Gains in Reading: Hispanic No subgroups achieved Annual Learning Gains in Math</p>

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

Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Interview process by administration. Secure quality staff with a similar philosophy	Principal	On-going
2. New teachers attend district orientation.	District/School	Beginning of School Year
3. Monthly scheduled meetings for new teachers.	Principal/Assistant Principal	Monthly
4. Mentor/Team appointed to each new teacher.	Assistant Principal	During New Teacher Induction, On-going
5. Quality instructional training with follow up.	Administration/Literacy Coach	On-going
6. Frequent observations, classroom walkthroughs and feedback	Administration/Literacy Coach	On-going

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
13% (6 Teachers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of progress toward gaining ESOL endorsement • Provide staff with coursework information so they can meet requirements

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]).

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

Total number of Instructional Staff	% of first-year teachers	% of teachers with 1-5 years of experience	% of teachers with 6-14 years of experience	% of teachers with 15+ years of experience	% of teachers with Advanced Degrees	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
41	4.88	21.95	43.90	29.27	36.59	90.24	4.88	0	53.66

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
Rachel Alexander	Alyssa Tretter	Same Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Rachel Alexander	Hayley Illes	Same Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional

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

			<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Anna Babcock	Jessica Franczyk	Experienced in Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
David Whittaker	Dolores Garcia	Same Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log

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

			*Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
David Whittaker	Loretta Humphrey	Same Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Leila Innocent	Isabelle Briand	Same Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Sue Fredrickson	Marisa Hazen	Literacy Coach to help with Writing in Grade Level	*Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each

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

			<p>new teacher.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Sue Fredrickson	Leann Marginean	Literacy Coach to help with Writing in Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Sue Fredrickson	Allison King	Literacy Coach to help with Writing in Grade Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional

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

			liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives
Elizabeth Butterworth	Teresa Cannon	Same Grade Level	*Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel with support geared toward specific needs of each new teacher. *Attend District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. *Observe highly effective teachers *One-on-one coaching provided by mentor and district instructional liaisons *Complete and document target skills and activities on log *Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge of district initiatives

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.
Title I, Part C- Migrant Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure students' needs are met.
Title I, Part D District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention Programs.
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.

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

Title III Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.
Title X- Homeless District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all level 2 students.
Violence Prevention Programs The Positive Behavior Support Program, Bullying and Harassment Policy Information (Pre-K to 5 th grades), and Too Good for Drugs (5 th grade level) address behavior and discourage the use of tobacco, alcohol and drugs. All programs encourage positive choices and a safe and drug free learning/living environment.
Nutrition Programs Lakewood park Elementary provides information to parents via the monthly newsletter. A fresh fruit or vegetable is highlighted each month including not only the nutritional value of the fruit/vegetable, but recipe ideas for families to enjoy.
Housing Programs n/a
Head Start n/a
Adult Education Lakewood Park Elementary provides the opportunity for parents and caregiver to learn strategies to enhance their child(ren)'s reading, math, writing and science instruction. In addition, ESOL parents are provided with information to help them access community services.
Career and Technical Education Lakewood Park students are exposed to various careers through field trips and business partners visiting classrooms to talk about their careers.
Job Training n/a
Other

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

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

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

Suggested members include:

- Administrator(s) Dianne Young, Kisha Bellande-Hinds
- RTI:B Team Liaison – Anna Babcock
- School Counselor – Aida Santana
- Literacy Coach – Sue Fredrickson
- School Psychologist – David Kinkade
- School-Based ESE Specialist – Rachel Smith
- District RTI Specialist – Gina Renna

Elementary

- K-2 Representative – Rachel Alexander
- 3-5 Representative – Ashle Henderson

If school does not have this position, schools should appoint a representative with a strong knowledge base of that area.

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

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

Activities of the Core PST include:

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

<u>RtI Core PST Chair</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedules and prepares agenda for Core PST meetings three to four times a school year • Sends invitations and meeting agenda to all members and/or invites • Confirms that personnel responsible for presentations are prepared prior to the meeting • Facilitates collegial conversation and consensus building while using the <i>“data driven “problem-solving”</i> module. • Keeps conversation on task and focused
----------------------------------	---

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

<u>Data Keeper</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides school-wide data in specialty area for all members to view • Communicates curriculum, program, procedural or policy concern • Initiates discussion of the interpretation of the data
<u>Time Keeper</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides periodic updates to team member regarding the amount of time left to complete a given task
<u>Recorder</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for taking notes for the purpose of capturing important discussions and outcomes of meetings • Forwards minutes of the meeting, including attendee names, to each member of the Core Team and building principal for approval • Following administrative approval and when appropriate, shares minutes with the school staff

Various School Teams

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

Group PST Elementary

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

Individual PST

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

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

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

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
 - Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
 - Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
 - Adjust the allocation of school-based resources
 - Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
 - Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

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

2. Managed data will include:

Academic

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

Behavior

- Suspension/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, CHAMPS walk through data, Code call data per month
- Office referrals per day per month
- School climate surveys
- Attendance data
- Referrals to Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 behavioral interventions, referrals for additional testing if necessary

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from <http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS-Book-ImplComp-012612.pdf>, but not limited to the following:

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will consist of Administrators, Literacy Coach, Exceptional Student Education Chairperson, two Reading Intervention teachers, and six classroom teachers representing primary and intermediate grade levels.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet at least four times per year. The Team meetings will be facilitated by the Literacy Coach. The Literacy Coach will schedule the meetings and be responsible for preparing the agendas for all meetings. The team will have a note taker and time keeper. Each member of the team will be responsible for the monitoring of a specific initiative put in place during the 2012-13 school year.

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

1. Establishing a process to ensure that the SLC Literacy Plan is in place and being implemented with fidelity in every classroom.
 2. Monitoring and review of all student testing and progress monitoring (EasyCBM, ORF, Benchmark, and FCAT).
 3. Implementation, review and monitoring of the Sunshine State Readers Program through the Media Center for all students grades 3-5.
 4. Continue review and monitoring of the 100 Book Challenge within all classrooms.
- Review and monitoring of the status of the Principal's Challenge incentive program for Book Challenge.
-Establishment and monitoring of a mentoring program for all struggling readers utilizing volunteers, teachers and staff

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

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

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

The Pre-K Students in our VPK program are transitioned all year because they are on our elementary school campus. Pre-K students get adjusted to the routine of school by being full day students at an elementary site. However, students who attend the private provider's site also have the opportunity for transition into the elementary school environment. The provider at each site makes their own arrangements to visit school sites. Also, a "Welcome to Kindergarten" bag is given to each parent when they enroll their child at the school. The bag includes kindergarten transition materials, dress code information, and other information specific to our school. In the Spring a provider meeting is hosted by the Director of Student Assignment to explain the registration process, with copies of registration forms which are then passed onto the family. Lakewood Park elementary also provides a Kindergarten Orientation for students and their parents as preparation for their transition.

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

***Grades 6-12 Only** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

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

***High Schools Only**

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.	1a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning.	1a. School Renewal Team District Professional Development Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	1a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	1a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
<u>Reading Goal #1A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, 55% (168) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	45% (137) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June 2013, 55% (168) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	1a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	1a.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	1a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher Collaboration.	1a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			1a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	1a.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	1a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	1a.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection.
			1a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – reading application. In order to enhance reading application, there will be a strong focus on fluency and vocabulary enrichment.	1a.4. *Emphasize reading strategies which help students improve in all areas of reading application and all areas of vocabulary. * Reading coach will train teachers on the use of these strategies throughout content areas.	1a.4. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	1a.4. *Data meetings will take place weekly to review assessment data and plan instruction. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data and make recommendations based on	1a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3.

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

			<p>*Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. *Elements of vocabulary will be used to supplement instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. *Fluency instruction</p>		needs assessment.	<p>*Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Formative assessment for supplemental vocabulary *Formative assessment for fluency strategies *Teacher modeling. *Teacher/ Student conferencing</p>
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>		1b.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	1b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools
<p>Reading Goal #1B: By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>				
	<p>0% (0) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.</p>	<p>By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA Reading Test.</p>				
			1b.2. *Discerning relevant details from a passage using auditory processing.	1b.2. *Daily read aloud practice to process and coach students based on appropriate access points.	1b.2. District Support Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher.	1b.2. The teacher will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment. IEP team will review as needed to develop and/or revise plan.
		1b.3. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details	1b.3. Use read alouds, auditory tapes, and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols.	1b.3. Reading Coach Administration Teacher.	1b.3. Students' written or oral responses	1b.3. Student performance tasks on teacher made assessments Teacher observation. Brigance Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.		2a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	2a.1 1. District Professional Development Team School Renewal team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	2a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	2a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #2A: By June of 2013, 25% (77) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 15% (46) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 25% (77) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.				
		2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	2a.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	2a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	2a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .

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

		4a.4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	4a.4. *Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources derived from informational text. * Journeys core advanced materials will be used to support enrichment instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery of enrichment instruction.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	4a.4. *Data meetings will take place weekly to review assessment data and plan instruction. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	4a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Formative assessment for supplemental vocabulary *Formative assessment for fluency strategies *Teacher modeling.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.		2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	2b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
Reading Goal #2B: By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 100% (3) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.				
			2b.2. Limited schema with fiction, nonfiction, and informational texts	2b.2. Students will be exposed to fiction, nonfiction, and informational text and be taught to identify the differences using Thinking Maps.	2b.2. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.2. Observation of DQ 3 Element 18 Feedback using Frameworks FAA
			2b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	2b.3 Research based strategies to enhance vocabulary and effectively utilize context clues should be explicitly taught to students (e.g.: pictures accompanying print; pictures	2b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately

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

			should be faded for long-term comprehension and retention.).			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	3a.1 1. District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	3a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #3A: By June of 2013, 50% (153) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 15% (47) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 50% (153) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	*Increase implementation of strategies for differentiating instruction.	*Professional development in Journeys core material and SLC literacy routines.			
			3a.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	3a.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	3a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	3a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Literacy Coach Administration	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .

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

			peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	Teacher		
		3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – reading application. In order to enhance reading application, there will be a strong focus on fluency and vocabulary enrichment.	3a.4. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3a.4. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	3a.4. *The reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	3a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.						
Reading Goal #3B:		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>			
By June of 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test.		0% (0) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FAA Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test	3b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team
				3b.1 Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions
				3b.2. Limited teacher training on rubric interpretation and effective instructional strategies to achieve levels of proficiency.	3b.2. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities to gain a higher level of understanding of the rubrics and how to interpret the data to drive instruction.	3b.2. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team
				3b.2. Limited teacher training on rubric interpretation and effective instructional strategies to achieve levels of proficiency.	3b.2. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities to gain a higher level of understanding of the rubrics and how to interpret the data to drive instruction.	3b.2. Bi-monthly collaborative meetings to review student data to design effective instructional strategies to support student deficits.
				3b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	3b.3 Vocabulary should be introduced to students with pictures and print. Pictures should be faded for long-term	3b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration
				3b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	3b.3 Vocabulary should be introduced to students with pictures and print. Pictures should be faded for long-term	3b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately
						3b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
						3b.2. Teacher generated assessments and data collection tools FAA
						3b.3 Teacher generated assessments Brigance Assessment

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

			comprehension and retention. Direct instruction of context clues.	Teacher		FAA
--	--	--	--	---------	--	-----

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. * *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff.	4A.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	4A1 1.District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	4A.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #4: By June 2013 60% (46) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 42% (33) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2012 60%(46) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading	Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar *Increase implementation of strategies for differentiating instruction.	*Professional development in Journeys core material and SLC literacy routines			
			4a. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	4a.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	4a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	4a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	4a.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	4a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	4a.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection.

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

		4a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – reading application. In order to enhance reading application, there will be a strong focus on fluency and vocabulary enrichment.	4a.4. *Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team School renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration Teacher	4a.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in FAA reading.		4b.1. * Student is performing at one or more grade levels below 3rd grade requiring support in phonics and phonemic awareness strategies.	4b.1. Access to low tech and high tech assistive technology for support to provided differentiated instruction as written in the IEP supporting the student through access points.	4b.1 1.ESE Specialist Assistive Technology specialists as deemed necessary by the IEP team Administration	4b.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Differentiated instruction provided daily using assistive technology for the effective use of phonics and phonemic awareness.	4b.1. *Data Collected through use of Assistive Technology *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs Brigance FAA
Reading Goal #4b: By June 2013 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Reading.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	0% (0) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FAA Reading	By June 2013 50% (2 out of 4 students) in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Reading				
		4b2. Due to the severity of an individual student’s disability, limited vocabulary restricts student from communicating and understanding expressive language.	4b2. Student will be given the opportunity to make choices using concrete objects, real pictures, and symbols paired with words to accommodate the individual’s identified disability.	4b2. Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b2. The teacher will provide daily opportunities to use expressive language to communicate connections between words , objects and symbols.	4b2. *Data Collection *Teacher Observation *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

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

		4b.3. Due to the severity of the individual student's disability, limited abilities to identify basic sight words provide processing challenges within text.	4b.3. Students must have continuous repetition and practice when learning reading concepts and strategies.	4b.3. ESE Specialist Administration Teacher	4b.3. Students will be provided sight word lists reflecting text that they will practice for continuous repetition to increase word recall fluency.	4b.3. Data Collection Teacher Observation Brigance Assessment FAA
--	--	---	---	--	--	---

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 68% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In 2011-2012, 45% of students were proficient in Reading a decrease of 23%.	By June 2013, 55% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing by 10% from the previous year.	By June 2013, 63% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing by 10% from the previous year.	By June 2013, 70% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing by 10% from the previous year.	By June 2013, 77% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing by 10% from the previous year.	By June 2013, 84% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing by 10% from the previous year.
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013, 55% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous 45%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.	5B.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	5B.1. District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5B.1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning	5B.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Data Not Available	By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.					
		5B.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-	5B.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development	5B.2. *District Professional Development Team	5B.2. Administration observation of effective implementation with	5B.2. SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom	

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

		based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	opportunities.	School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	Walkthroughs
		5B.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5B.3. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking	5B.3. District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	5B.3. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5B.3. Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .
		5b.4 Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the reporting category 2: Reading Application	5 b.4 Students will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts to support assessment deficiencies Journeys core will provide opportunities to make text-to-self connections combined with evidence from the text to draw conclusions and make inferences.	5b.4 District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	5b.4 Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Student think alouds will provide evidence to support their ability to make inferences and draw conclusions.	5b.4 Journeys unit assessments Common Weekly teacher generated assessments Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal – Level 3 Results from the 2013 FCAT Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5c.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff.	5c.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	5c1. 1.District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5c1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	5c1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5C: By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Data Not Available	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the	Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.				

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

		previous year by 10%.					
			5c. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	5c.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	5c.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5c.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	5c.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			5c.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	5c.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	5c.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5c.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .
			5a.4. * Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the reporting category 1: Vocabulary	5a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys leveled readers for ELL students and implement Journeys suggested lessons to support vocabulary deficiencies. *St. Lucie County literacy routines word work will support instructional vocabulary focus.	5a.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5a.4. *Students' academic language will increase understanding of vocabulary and through authentic writing tasks and oral expression.	5a.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Teacher observation *Easy CBM *FCAT 2.0
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5d.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based	5d.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	5d.1. District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team	5d1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	5d1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013, (as of		<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				

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

<p>10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.</p>	<p>Data Not Available</p>	<p>By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.</p>	<p>questions is unfamiliar.</p>		<p>Literacy Coach Administration</p>	<p>2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.</p>	
		<p>5d.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.</p>	<p>5d.2. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.</p>	<p>5d.2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration</p>	<p>5d.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.</p>	<p>5d.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs</p>	
		<p>5d.3 *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice</p>	<p>5d.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.</p>	<p>5d.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration</p>	<p>5d.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.</p>	<p>5d.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .</p>	
		<p>5d.4. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – reading application. In order to enhance reading application, there will be a strong focus on fluency and vocabulary enrichment</p>	<p>5d.4. *Emphasize reading strategies which help students improve in all areas of reading application and all areas of vocabulary. * Reading coach will train teachers on the use of these strategies throughout content areas. *Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. *Elements of vocabulary will be used to supplement instruction.</p>	<p>5d.4. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration</p>	<p>5d.4. *Data meetings will take place weekly to review assessment data and plan instruction. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data and make recommendations based on needs assessment</p>	<p>5d.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Formative assessment for supplemental vocabulary *Formative assessment for</p>	

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

						fluency strategies *Teacher modeling. *Teacher/ Student conferencing
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5E.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.	5E.1. * Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	5E1. 1.District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5E1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5E1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Data Not Available	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, (as of 10/1/12 subgroup data has not been released by DOE) of students will be proficient in reading, increasing the previous year by 10%.				
		5E.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	5E.2. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities.	5E2. *District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5E.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	5E.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
		5E.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5E.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	5E.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	5E.3. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5E.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .
		5d.4. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the	5d.4. *Emphasize reading strategies which help students improve in	5d.4. * District Professional Development Team	5d.4. *Data meetings will take place weekly to review	5d.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments.

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

		FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – reading application. In order to enhance reading application, there will be a strong focus on fluency and vocabulary enrichment	all areas of reading application and all areas of vocabulary. * Reading coach will train teachers on the use of these strategies throughout content areas. *Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. *Elements of vocabulary will be used to supplement instruction.	School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	assessment data and plan instruction. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data and make recommendations based on needs assessment	*Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Formative assessment for supplemental vocabulary *Formative assessment for fluency strategies *Teacher modeling. *Teacher/ Student conferencing
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	Pre-K - 5	Teacher Leaders Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations/Feedback Coaching/Modeling Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leaders Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations/Feedback Coaching/Modeling Lesson Plans	Administration
Journeys	K-5	Literacy Coach Teacher Leaders Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	On-going Aug -May	Classroom Observations/Feedback Coaching/Modeling Lesson Plans	Administration Literacy Coach

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

Thinking Maps	K-5	Literacy Coach Teacher Leaders Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	On-going Aug -May	Classroom Observations/Feedback Coaching/Modeling Lesson Plans	Administration Literacy Coach
Write from the Beginning	K-5	Literacy Coach Teacher Leaders Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	On-going Aug -May	Classroom Observations/Feedback Coaching/Modeling Lesson Plans	Administration Literacy Coach
Easy CBM	K-5	Literacy Coach Administrators SLC Instructional Partners	School Wide	Aug-Sept.	Data Meetings Graphs	Administration Literacy Coach Reading Intervention Teachers
Reading Comprehension Course offered as a part of Reading Endorsement	K-5	Administrators Teachers	Identified Teachers	January 2013 – May 2013	Student Data Completed Lessons Student work samples	Administrators

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SLC Quality Instruction Framework	District Prof. Development		
LC Bringing Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction	LC will use Bringing Words to Life as a springboard for learning more effective ways to teach vocabulary to our students as well as to enrich the vocabulary of grade level learners	Title 1	200.00
Reading Course on Comprehension	Reading Comprehension course designed as a part of the Reading Endorsement program will provide stipends for teachers to work cooperatively through various projects/learning activities that are a part of coursework completion.	Title 1	6,000.00
			Subtotal:\$6200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Literacy Coach (1)		Title 1	48, 631.67
Reading Intervention Teachers (2)	Tier 2 and Tier 3 Reading Intervention	Title 1	76,583.16
Title I Teacher for Class Reduction	4 th Grade Classroom Teacher	Title 1	42,000.00
			Subtotal: \$167,214.83
			Total: \$173,414.83

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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.	1.1. ELL students need to learn both	1.1. Language Experience Approach	1.1. Administration/Literacy	1.1. Teachers provide on-going	1.1. CELLA

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

<p>CELLA Goal #1:</p> <p><i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 39.7% (10) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 60%(16) of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>	English as core content and social/spoken English in order to communicate effectively.	Utilize a Language Experience Approach were students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	Formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	
	<p><i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 39.7%(10) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.</i></p>	1.2. ELL students need to see as well as hear the directions in order to clearly understand the teacher's expectations for a particular task since English is their second language.	1.2. Modeling Teachers demonstrate to the learner how to do a task, with the expectation that the learner can copy the model. Modeling includes thinking aloud and talking about how to work through a task.	Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. CELLA
		1.3. ELL students often lack social interaction with students who are English speakers and therefore are not always willing to share their ideas with others.	1.3. Cooperative Learning Group Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.3. CELLA
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</p>		2.1. The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge.	Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	Formative Assessment	2.1. CELLA
<p>CELLA Goal #2:</p> <p><i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.6% (14) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 40% (28) of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</u></p>					
	<p><i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.6% (14) of ELL students were proficient in Reading.</i></p>					

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

		2.2.	2.2. Reading aloud to students helps them develop and improve literacy skills.	2.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Timed Student Reading	2.2. CELLA
		2.3.	2.3 Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Formative Assessments	2.3 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: <i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.6% (14) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 40% (28) of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA.</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing : <i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.6% (14) of ELL students were proficient in Writing.</i>	The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	A dialog journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialog journals provide a communicative context for language and writing development.	Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	Journals	CELLA
		2.2. ELL students may have a difficult time organizing their thoughts when preparing to write.	2.2. Graphic Organizers	2.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Student Work	2.2. CELLA
		2.3. ELL students may not have a frame of reference in order to know what is expected for process writing/writing across the curriculum.	2.3 Rubrics provide clear criteria for evaluating a product or performance on a continuum of quality. They are task specific, accompanied by exemplars, and used throughout the instructional process.	2.3 Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Student Writing Samples	2.3 CELLA

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

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1a.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1a.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1a.1. * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher * School Renewal Team	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#1A:							
By June 2013, 60% (183) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	46% (140) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	By June 2013, 60% (183) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.					
			1a.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1a.2. * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher * School Renewal Team	1a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			1a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	1a.3. * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher * School Renewal Team	1a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			1a.4. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 students was Reporting Category 2 –	1a.4. * Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives. Increase the use of writing in	1a.4. * Administrators * Teachers * School Renewal Team	1a.4. * Results of common assessments will be reviewed by grade level teams and leadership to ensure progress. * Adjustments to curriculum	1a.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment

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

		Number: Fractions	<p>mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions.</p> <p>* GoMath! Core materials will be used for instruction.</p> <p>* St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.</p>		focus will be made as needed.	* Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
IB. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		IB.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points.	IB.1. Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	IB.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	IB.1. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	IB.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA	
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #1B:</u></p> <p>By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>33% (1) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.</p>					
			IB.2. Students are challenged to complete proper steps to solve a problem.	IB.2. Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using basic math vocabulary, manipulative visuals, number lines, and assistive technology.	IB.2. Teacher ESE specialist Administration	IB.2. Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking for problem solving.	IB.2. Teacher generated assessment Teacher observation as students solve the problems. FAA
			IB.3. Based upon individual student's abilities as indicated in their IEP, the student's cognition, and background knowledge impedes acquisition of skills to apply to high level mathematical equations.	IB.3. Using research based strategies and materials, the students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long-term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	IB.3. Teacher ESE specialist Administration	IB.3. The students will participate in daily work stations with accountability measures to support rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	IB.3. Teacher generated accountability pieces at each station with data collection in place. Teacher observation Bragance Assessment FAA

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013, 30% (91) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	18% (56) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	By June 2013, 30% (91) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher	2a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	2a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			2a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	2a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	2a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Administration	2a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	2a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			2a4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	2a4. * GoMath! Grab-N-Go and Enrichment materials will be utilized for differentiated instructional * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the	2a4 * Teachers * Administration	2a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	2a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3 and 4.

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

			students are learning				
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department Professional Development opportunities.	2b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
Mathematics Goal #2B: By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 67% (2) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.					
			2b.2. Background knowledge may be limited to support review and require further instruction in DQ 2.	2b.2. Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	2b.2. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.2. *Students will participate in academic games supporting review of concepts. Additionally, students will participate in learning stations focused on individual concepts with accountability measures correlated to the access points to determine level of mastery in each concept. *Administrative walkthrough to observe lesson design	2b.2. Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. FAA
			2b.3 Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts.	2b.3 Using researched- based strategies and materials students must have explicit instruction and continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	2b.3 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.3 Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to demonstrate understanding.	2b.3 Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. Brigance Assessment FAA

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3A: By June 2013 60% (186) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.			3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	3a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
			2012 Current Level of Performance: * 18% (54) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * By June 2013 60% (186) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0	3a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3a.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
					3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	3a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Administration	3a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	3a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
					3a4. *Teachers lack of use of manipulatives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.	3a4. * GoMath! Grab-N-Go materials * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results, including in problem situations	3a4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration	3a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

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

3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.1 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#3B: By June of 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	50% (1) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FAA Math Test	By June of 2013, 50% (2 out of 4 students) students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.					
			3b.2. Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged to effectively communicate their thought processes through written and/or oral language.	3b.2. The students will be provided with research-based strategies and visual choices to support mathematical thinking to solve problems.	3b.2. ESE Specialists Administrative Team Teacher	3b.2. Students will provide a variety of visuals to support their thinking through problem solving of equations.	3b.2. Teacher generated tests Teacher observation FAA
			3b.3 Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts.	3b.3 Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	3b.3 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.3 Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to demonstrate understanding.	3b.3 Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. FAA

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	4a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	4a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #4: By June 2013 50% (38) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0% (0) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013 50% (38) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	4a.3. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	4a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			4a4. *Students lack the foundation of number sense.	4a4. * GoMath! RtI Support * Think Central Strategic Intervention * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a4 * Teachers * Administration	4a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	4a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 60% (186) of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 14%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 77% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math	In June 2012, 46% of students were proficient in Math decreasing from the previous year by 31%.	In June 2013, 60% of students will be proficient in math, an increase of 14% from the previous year.	In June 2014, 68% of students will be proficient in Math, an increase of 10% from the previous year.	In June 2015, 76% of students will be proficient in Math, an increase of 10% from the previous year.	By June 2016 84% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%	By June 2017 89% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, (data not released as of 10/1/12 by DOE) of white students, 60% (80) of Hispanic students, and xx% (xx) of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, by increasing 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* % (Data not available) of white students, % () of Hispanic students, and % of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, (data not released as of 10/1/12 by DOE) of white students, 60% (80) of Hispanic students, and xx% (xx) of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, by increasing 10%.	5a.1 *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

		5a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		5a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5a.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
		5a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was reporting : Numbers and Operations in base 10 and fractions	5a.4. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices and implement into their daily instruction	5a.4. * Teachers	5a.4. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5c.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff. Increasing rigor through close reading and creating text based questions is unfamiliar.	5c.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in text complexity, close reading and text based questioning	5c1. 1.District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	5c1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting rigor and text based questioning.	5c1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> By June 2013, ELL students will increase proficiency by 10% as measured by FCAT 2.0.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *				
	Data is not available.	By June 2013, ELL students will increase proficiency by 10% as measured by FCAT 2.0.				
		5c. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-	5c.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development	5c2. *District Professional Development Team	5c.2. *Administration observation of	5c.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom

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

		based practices within the St. Lucie county literacy routines. *A stronger emphasis on improving the quality of instruction in Tier 1.	opportunities.	School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Administration	effective implementation with feedback. *Support Team/Teacher collaboration.	Walkthroughs
		5c.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5c.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching. *Writing response journals will be used to allow students to demonstrate thinking.	5c.3. * District Professional Development Team School Renewal Team Literacy Coach Teacher Administration	5c.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5c.3. *Student Responses from teacher directed questioning or student reflection. .
		5a.4. * Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the reporting category 1: Vocabulary	5a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys leveled readers for ELL students and implement Journeys suggested lessons to support vocabulary deficiencies. *St. Lucie County literacy routines word work will support instructional vocabulary focus.	5a.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5a.4. *Students' academic language will increase understanding of vocabulary and through authentic writing tasks and oral expression.	5a.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Teacher observation *Easy CBM *FCAT 2.0
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5d.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5d.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5d.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5d.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5d.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
SWD will increase proficiency by 10%	% (Data not available) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the	By June 2013, % (Data not available as of 10/1/12 from DOE) of SWD				

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

	2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment. SWD will increase proficiency by 10%					
			5d.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5d.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5d.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5d.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5d.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5d.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5d.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5d.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			5d.4. Due to the nature and severity of the individual's disability, students have difficulty processing multi-step problems.	5d.4. Using research based strategies, provide explicit instruction in solving multi-step problems and provide students with step-by-step support for problem-solving.	5d.4. * Teachers	5d.4. * Observation of student independently applying step-by-step problem solving	5d.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5e.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff	5e.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on	5e.1. * District professional development team	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with	5e.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom

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

<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, % () of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	% () of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, % () of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	to gain a full understanding of each standard.	Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	* Administration	feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	walkthroughs
			5e.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * Administration * School Renewal Team	5e.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5e.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5e.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5e.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5e.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5e.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5e.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			5e.4. Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.	5e.4. Use literature in mathematics to provide the meaning necessary for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and make connections with real-world situations	5e.4. * Teachers * Instructional Coaches	5e.4. * Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral language.	5e.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.

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

Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

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

			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5E:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Mathematics Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*					
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement
----------------------------	--

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
	Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
							2016-2017

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

<p>3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</p>	<p>Baseline data 2010-2011</p>								
<p>Algebra 1 Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>									
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</p>			<p>3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>	<p>3B.1.</p>		
<p>Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>			<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>	<p>3B.2.</p>
				<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>	<p>3B.3.</p>
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>		
<p>3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.</p>			<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>	<p>3C.1.</p>		

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3C: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>					

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

	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. <u>Geometry Goal #3A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2011-2012				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <u>Geometry Goal #3B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*\br/> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*\br/> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.

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

	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

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

		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SLC Math Routine	K-5	Instructional Partners School Renewal	K-5	August 13, 2012-on going	Classroom Walkthroughs Observation and Reflection	Administrators
Common Core	K-5	Administrators Common Core Conference Participants School Renewal	K-5	August 2012- on going	Grade level lesson planning, Classroom walkthroughs, observations and Reflections	Administrators District Math Liaison

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Writing Across the Curriculum		District Personnel Instructional Partners School Renewal	K-5	October 15- on going	Classroom walkthroughs, Observations and Reflections, Samples submitted	Administrator Literacy Coach
PLC – Student Led Conferences The Leader in Me Book	K-5	Administrators Teacher Leaders	K-5	October 2012 – On going Student Led Conference Observations/Sister School	Model Classrooms/Teachers Hold Student Led Conference Spring 2013 showing progress in math	Administrators PLC Teachers District Math Liaison

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
SLC Math Routine	PD Materials – Printing	Title I	\$50.00
Common Core			
			Subtotal: \$50.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Across the Curriculum	Materials, Substitutes	Title I	\$1000.00
LC – Student Led Conference and Student Goal Setting	The Leader in Me Book, Materials for 10 Substitutes for Teachers to visit Model Schools within the district	Title I	\$650.00
LC – Designing and Teaching Learning Goals and Scales and Objectives by Robert J. Marzano	Teachers will learn how to design and teach specific learning goals and develop scales to match the specific, standard-based learning goal. This book will be used as the springboard for this LC as teachers increase their focus on math skills.	Title 1	\$1400.00
			Subtotal: \$3050.00

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Create Grade level Math Bins	Grade Level manipulatives and games to support grade level skills	Title I	\$1000
			Subtotal:\$1,000.00
			Total: \$4100.00

End of Mathematics Goals

DRAFT

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1a.1. Lack of multiple resources to meet the science NGSSS standards	1a.1. Provide common planning time for team collaboration on various instructional strategies.	1a.1. Grade Group Chairs Administration	1a.1. Team Meeting Data Elements	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation Framework Completed Grade Level Lesson Plans
Science Goal #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June of 2013, 43% (36) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	33%(28) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	43%(36) of students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment.					
			1a.2. Time and funding for professional development	1a.2. Provide planning for grade level representative to work with district Science Coordinator to address grade level expectations	1a.2. Teacher Administration Literacy Coach School Renewal	1a.2. Mini Assessments Benchmark Testing	1a.2. Teacher Evaluation Framework Completed Grade Level Lesson Plans
			1a.3. Opportunities for students to express their learning in regards to science content	1a.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical, Life, Earth Space, and Nature of Science. 	1a.3. Science Teachers Administration	1a.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/labs addressing the necessary benchmarks. Monitor the use of nonfiction writing (e.g., Power Writing/Lab Reports, Conclusion writing, Current Events, etc.) After each assessment (Interim or Quarterly Science Benchmark 	1A.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Observations of student work during labs Writing prompts Benchmark Assessments Science Fair Projects

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

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that instruction includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion. • Provide opportunities for teachers to apply mathematical computations in science contexts such as manipulating data from tables in order to find averages or differences. • Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science. • Instruction in grades K-5 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides. 		<p>Assessments), conduct data analysis to identify students' performance within those categories and develop differentiated instructional activities to address individual student needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct mini-assessments and utilize results to drive instruction. • Monitor students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work. 			
<p>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p>		1b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	1b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
<p><u>Science Goal #1B:</u></p> <p>By June of 2013, 100% (1) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4,5,6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>0%(0) students achieved a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment</p> </td> <td> <p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>100%(1) students will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>0%(0) students achieved a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>100%(1) students will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.</p>					
<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>0%(0) students achieved a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>100%(1) students will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.</p>							

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

		1b.2. Opportunities for students to learn the language of science	1b.2. Teachers will use a variety of data to plan science instruction and use teaching strategies that will enhance the instruction	1b.2. Teacher Administration	1b.2. Review FAA data and review data on teacher made tests	1b.2. FAA Teacher made assessments
		1b.3. Poor foundational skills in Reading and math affect the success of students in the science curriculum.	1b.3. Analyze Reading data to provide appropriate leveled science text and materials for struggling students.	1b.3. Teacher Administration ESE Specialist	1b.3. Review and monitoring of classroom assessments, teacher made tests, class work and FAA scores.	1b.3. Curriculum based assessments, review of lesson plans, classroom observations
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.		2A.1. Elementary Science Teachers do not have a depth of Science background knowledge.	2A.1. Provide Professional Development designed to familiarize and enhance the use of Science Fusion and all included resources.	2A.1 Teacher Leaders Administration.	2A.1. Student Data from Formative Assessments	2A.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT
Science Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
By June of 2013, 30% (25) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	15%(13) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/2012 FCAT assessment.	30%(25) students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2012/2013 FCAT assessment.				
		2a.2. Students need to master informational reading and nonfiction writing.	2a.2. Infuse Science into the Literacy Block.	2a.2. Classroom Teachers	2a.2. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	2a.2. Writing Samples, FCAT Writing, Formative/Summative Assessments
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.		2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	2.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
Science Goal #2B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
By June of 2013, 100% (1) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	100%(2) students achieved a Level 7 in	100%(1) students will achieve a Level 7 in science on				

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

	science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment.	the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.					
			2b.2. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details that will limit their abilities to be to sequence steps in an experiment	2b.2. Use research- based strategies and methodologies to explicitly teach targeted identified deficit skills	2b.2. Teachers Administrators ESE Specialist	2b.2 Review of individual students pre/post test data FAA	2b.2. Data collection sheets Teacher made assessments FAA Teacher observation using a rubric
			2b.3 Students have decoding challenges that will limit their processing and comprehension of Science information	2b.3 Use research- based strategies and methodologies to explicitly teach targeted identified deficit skills	2b.3 Teachers Administrators ESE Specialist	2b.3 Review of individual students pre/post test data FAA	2b.3 Teacher made assessments FAA

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology 1 Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Fusion	K-5	District Science Liaison	School-wide	September 2012 – Ongoing	Classroom Observations Coaching and Modeling, District Liaison Collaborative Planning	Administrators
Science (STEM) Labs	K-5	District Science Liaison	School-wide	October 2012 – Ongoing	Classroom Observations Coaching and Modeling, District Liaison Collaborative Planning	Administrators
Think Central	K-5	District Science Liaison	School-wide	September 2012 – Ongoing	Classroom Observations Coaching and Modeling, District Liaison Collaborative Planning	Administrators

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Across the Curriculum	District Prof. Development		
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Team Planning with District Program Specialist	Science Fusion Materials Substitutes (3 teachers)	Title I	\$500.00
Team Planning with Instructional Partner Building Science into Reading instruction	Science Fusion Materials Substitutes (3 teachers)	Title I	\$500.00
			Subtotal:\$1000.00
			Total:\$1000.00

End of Science Goals

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

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1a.1.	1a.1.	1A.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.
<p>Writing Goal #1A:</p> <p>By June 2013, 90% (96) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.</p>			<p>Knowledge of the Anchor Standards for Writing as outlined in the CCSS for K – 5.</p>	<p>Conduct grade level specific professional development to deepen understanding of Writing curriculum and expectations.</p>	<p>Teachers Administration</p>	<p>Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3, and DQ4 Student prompts given and scored according to anchor papers and writing rubric.</p>	<p>SLC Framework documentation Teacher made prompt assessments FCAT 2.0 Writes</p>
<p>In 2012, 73% (78) of the students scored 3.0 or higher as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.</p>	<p>By June 2013, 90% (86) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.</p>		1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2	1a.2.	1a.2.
			<p>Students’ appropriate use of conventions of writing and use of details that include high levels of vocabulary</p>	<p>Classroom instructors will utilize Appendix C from CCSS ELA to model exemplars in writing.</p>	<p>Administrative Team</p>	<p>Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3, and DQ4</p>	<p>SLC Framework documentation</p>
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.
			<p>Appropriate implementation according to the research supporting Write From the Beginning</p>	<p>K – 2 Teachers will participate in Lesson Study targeting Write From the Beginning lessons.</p>	<p>Reading Coach</p>	<p>Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions</p>	<p>Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools</p>

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1b.1. The student's level of vocabulary and sentence structure to express thoughts hinders their writing.	1b.1. Use oral language skills to practice expressing thoughts in a complete sentence. Expose the student to vocabulary that will enable them to clearly express their thoughts.	1b.1. ESE Teacher	1b.1. Checklist of Oral Language monitoring sentence usage Vocabulary assessments	1b.1. FAA Daily oral language checklist Vocabulary Assessments
Writing Goal #1B: In 2013, 100% (1 student) will participate in and score 4.0 or higher on the Florida alternate Assessment for Writing in Grade 4.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 100% (1) of students scored at 4.0 or higher on the Florida Alternate Assessment for Writing in Grade 4.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* In 2013, 100% (1 student) will participate in and score 4.0 or higher on the Florida alternate Assessment for Writing in Grade 4.					
			1b.2. Formulating thoughts to be written on paper is a barrier to student writing.	1b.2. Use alternate methods such as keyboarding skills or dictation Practice building stamina for writing Help student understand and learn the process of planning for writing.	1b.2 ESE Teacher	1b.2. Sample Prompts	1b.2. FAA Evaluation of sample prompts
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.2.	1b.2.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Anchor Standards	K – 5	Grade Level CCSS Rep.	Classroom Teachers	August 2013-Ongoing	Classroom Observation and Feedback Collaborative Scoring	Administrative Team Literacy Coach Instructional Partners

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

Write From the Beginning	K - 5	District Trainer	Classroom Teachers	September 2013-Ongoing	Classroom Observation and Feedback Collaborative Scoring	Administrative Team Literacy Coach Instructional Partners

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write From the Beginning	Binder of Resources x 10	Title I	\$250.00 x 10
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Consultant	Analyze student work and train teachers providing specific feedback and creating a differentiated plan of instruction based on analysis of student writing.	Title I	\$6000.00
Write Across the Curriculum	Professional Development by Instructional Partners and District Professional Development team Paper and Printing of Materials Substitutes for Training	Title I	\$1000.00
			Subtotal: \$7,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$9,500.00

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

End of Writing Goals

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

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

Civics EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
--	--	------	------	------	------	------

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Subtotal:
Total:

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Truancy increased by 8% from the previous year.	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MSTT/RTI team for intervention services. Develop Attendance Committee to provide incentive to identified students in order to increase attendance	1.1. Assistant Principal Attendance Committee	1.1. Bi-weekly updates to Administration from the MTSS/RTI and to entire faculty at faculty meetings. Monthly reward to class with highest percentage in attendance Implement and attendance Mentor Program	1.1. Truancy logs and attendance rosters.
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 96% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated by June 2013.	94%	96%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	#(268/680) 39%	#(203/700) 29%					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 10%	#(75/680) 11%	#(35/700) 5%					
			1.2. Illnesses – excused absences have increased by 10% from previous	1.2. Provide parents with information for the KidCare program, Florida’s	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Administrators will ascertain health education and health	1.2. Attendance rosters

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

and 6% respectively by June 2013.		year.	state insurance program for children.		prevention strategies to be implemented throughout the school.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	K-5	Student Services/ District staff	All counselors and attendance staff	September, 2012	A truancy Intervention Program will be developed during the PD. An Assistant Principal will monitor this implementation of the program.	Assistant Principal and Counselor
Attendance Mentor Program	K-5	Attendance Team Members	All staff members	September, 2012	Monitor student attendance card data Attendance Records	Data Specialist Attendance Committee Administrators

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance Mentor Program	Provide incentives for students with improved attendance, attendance cards, door hangers for classrooms	Title I	\$500.00
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

				Subtotal:
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Attendance Incentive Program	Handouts, Presentation Materials	Title I	\$50.00	
				Subtotal:
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
				Subtotal:
				Total:\$500.00

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 20% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions	There were inconsistent opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior during the 2011-2012 school year. There will be an increase of school-wide incentives to encourage positive behavior with a minimum of one activity per month..	Create school wide incentives through school-based Positive Behavior Supports and/or MTSS/RTI to recognize and reward positive compliance on St. Lucie County Code of Student Conduct.	Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	Monthly Behavioral Data Reports	Monthly behavioral data including referral data, suspension data and code data.
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	0	0					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	257	206					

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

	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	113	90					
			1.2.	1.2. Administrators and/or Guidance Counselor will make contact with parents or students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the SLC Student Code of Conduct.	1.2. Administrators/Counselor	1.2. Monitor student behavioral data monthly	1.2. Referral Data Code Data Point Sheets
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS Introduction and Refresher PD	Pre-K - 5	PBS Core Team/Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	August 2012 - Ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs Falcon Buck Monitoring Sheet	PBS Core Team Administrators PBS Coach
PD on MTSS/RTI	Pre-K - 5	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	August 13, 2012 on going	Grade level meetings to address academic and behavioral data Further training of Core Team	RtI Core Team Administrators
Attendance Program Introduction	Pre-K - 5	Administrator Attendance Team Members	All faculty	September 2012 – On-going	Skyward Attendance Data Attendance Team Monitoring of Data Data Specialist Attendance Reports	Administrators Attendance Team RtI Core Team

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Positive Behavior Support	PBS handbook, Materials, Falcon Bucks, Banners	Title I	\$1000.00

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

CHAMPS	CHAMPS Books, Icons Printed and laminated	Title I	\$1000.00
			Subtotal:\$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
FAST	Computer based collection of Behavioral Code Calls to the office to monitor frequency/level of calls as a piece of RtI data		
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PBS Refresher	PBS Plan Booklet/SOAR Posters, Banners	Title I	\$500.00
Leaps	District funded resource that provides lessons on character education as well as support for the PBS and CHAMPS school-wide incentives		
			Subtotal:\$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collection of Code Data	Code Data-Front Office		
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$2,500.00

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

DRAFT

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Transportation is a barrier for some of our parents	1.1. Plan parent events at times when parents may carpool or that they are likely to be able to get a ride	1.1. Administrators	1.1. Monitor Event Rosters	1.1. Parent Sign-In Rosters
Parent Involvement Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	Working families unable to attend/volunteer at school activities	Provide student planners/agendas for parent/school communication for teacher/parent to sign.	Guidance Counselor	Observation of parent participation	Parent Surveys Results
By June 2013 there will be a 10% increase in family involvement at school-wide activities.	60% 411(685)	70% 490(700)	Families are transient/difficult to reach	Utilize social worker to locate families	Social Worker	Student Planners/Agendas	School Improvement Plan
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>			Lack of child care		Literacy Coach	Parent feedback given through oral and written communication	Monitor Student Planners Monitor Student Performance (FACT, Benchmark Quarterly Assessments, Easy CBM, mini-assessments, Journeys testing, Go Math testing)
			Parents lack financial support to provide clothes and supplies for all students to succeed			Surveys	
			1.2. Many parents are not aware of activities they can do at home to enhance learning.	1.2. Host parent curriculum nights	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Monitor Event Rosters	1.2. Parent Sign-In Rosters
			Lack of child care	Enhance understanding of goals and plans in a simple explanation during such meetings as the Annual Title I Parent Right to Know Meeting	Guidance Counselor	Observation of parent participation	Parent Surveys Results
			Data alone does not inform parents of a school's objectives, goals, and plans for improvement	Provide child care	Social Worker	Student Planners/Agendas	School Improvement Plan
				Provide parent trainings, Title I Parent Meeting, ESOL Parent Meeting, to inform parents of current data, SIP and strategies to support their child	Literacy Coach	Parent feedback given through oral and written communication	Monitor Student Planners Monitor Student Performance (FACT, Benchmark Quarterly Assessments, Easy CBM, mini-assessments, Journeys testing, Go Math testing)
						Surveys	

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

		1.3. Costs associated with events School's budget alone cannot provide all of the resources needed for all students to succeed	Utilize surveys for parental input Sponsor events free of charge Form business/agency partnerships and seek grant opportunities			
		1.4. Parents are not fluent in English	1.3. Attempt to translate information in various languages Provide translators at parent events	1.3. Administrators Guidance Counselor Social Worker Literacy Coach	1.3. Monitor Event Rosters Observation of parent participation Student Planners/Agendas Parent feedback given through oral and written communication Surveys	1.3. Parent Sign-In Rosters Parent Surveys Results School Improvement Plan Monitor Student Planners Monitor Student Performance (FACT, Benchmark Quarterly Assessments, Easy CBM, mini-assessments, Journeys testing, Go Math testing

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The Leader in Me: Student Led Conferences	PreK-5	Administrators Teacher Leaders	Administrators and 8 Teacher Leaders	Oct. 2012 – on going	Completion of LC, graphs of student data	Administrators

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent participation in Literacy Nights, Math Nights, Kids at Hope	Printing, Supplies for Parents/Families	Title 1	\$4,000.00

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

Subtotal:\$4,000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Kids at Hope Overview	Trainer, Materials, Books	Title I	\$1000.00
Subtotal:\$1,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$5,000.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: By June 2013, all instructional staff members will increase rigor in the areas of Math and Science.	1.1. Teachers have a weak foundation of the 3 inquiry-based instructional methods of structured, guided, and open.	1.1. Provide Professional Development on Inquiry based instructional methods	1.1. *Administration *School Renewal Team	1.1. Classroom walk-throughs, completed projects and presentations	1.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District benchmark assessments Completed projects Completed presentations
	1.2. Teachers have a weak foundation of the 3 inquiry-based instructional methods of structured, guided, and open.	1.2. Professional Development on Depth of knowledge /Cognitive complexity	1.2. Administration School Renewal Team	1.2. Classroom walk-throughs, completed projects and presentations	1.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District benchmark assessments Completed projects Completed presentations
	1.3. Teachers have a weak foundation of the 3 inquiry-based instructional methods of structured, guided, and open.	1.3. Professional Development on Depth of knowledge /Cognitive complexity	1.3. Administration School Renewal Team	1.3. Classroom walk-throughs, completed projects and presentations	1.3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District benchmark assessments Completed projects Completed presentations

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry-Based Instruction	K-5	School Renewal Team	K-5 Teachers	October 2012 – on going	Classroom Walk-through Gallery Walk presentation May 2013	Administration School Renewal Team

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Think Central on-line materials/strategies	Internet access to Think Central Resource		
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Inquiry-Based Instruction	8 Display Boards, Photo Paper for Digital Prints	Title I	\$100.00
Cognitive complexity/Higher Order Questioning	Paper, Print Shop, Flip Charts	Title I	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$300.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1	1.1	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1: By June 2013, 80% of the staff will receive an overview of the Kids At Hope philosophy and initial training.	2012 Current Level :* There was no involvement in Kids at Hope during the 2011-2012 school year.	2013 Expected Level :* Staff members will be introduced to the Kids At Hope philosophy and training will be provided to at least 80% of staff	Kids At Hope is viewed as another program vs. a philosophy	Provide an overview initial Kids at Hope training to staff members	Administration.	Staff Survey	Staff Survey
			1.2. Cost of materials associated with the Kids at Hope training and advertisement/signs/posters, etc.	1.2. Seek funding from business partners/grants to help underwrite the initial implementation of Kids at Hope	1.2. Administration PBS/Rtl-B Team	1.2. Staff Survey Parent/Community oral and written feedback Event Exit Tickets	1.2. Staff Survey Parent Climate Survey
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kids at Hope	K-5	Administrator Kids at Hope Trainer	School-Wide	January 2013-on going	Classroom Walk-through Weekly Bulletin Monthly Newsletter	Administrators

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

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

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Kids at Hope Book Study	Kids at Hope Book	Title I	\$1000.00
Kids at Hope Training	Training Materials		\$1,000.00
			Subtotal:\$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$2,000.00

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$173,414.83
CELLA Budget	Total: 0
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$4,100.00
Science Budget	Total: \$1,000.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$9,500.00
Civics Budget	Total: 0
U.S. History Budget	Total: 0
Attendance Budget	Total: \$500.00
Suspension Budget	Total: \$2,500.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$5,000.00
STEM Budget	Total: \$300.00
CTE Budget	Total: 0
Additional Goals	Total: \$2,000.00
	Grand Total: \$198,314.83

Differentiated Accountability

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

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

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

Yes No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

The School Advisory Council will assist with monitoring the academic and behavioral focus of the school. The School Improvement Plan will be used as a working document to guide instruction based on student data. The SAC team will offer parent and community perspective in the decision making process for Lakewood Park Elementary.

Each month the School Advisory Council will meet to address the various sections of the School Improvement Plan. Academic data will be shared with the SAC members in the areas of reading, math, writing and science. In addition, goals that pertain to STEM will be infused into the discussion of these areas and how we are addressing and progressing toward these goals. The School Advisory Council will also receive updates on student attendance and behavioral data. Upcoming learning opportunities for families as well as professional development for staff will be presented to the Council and reflections on those activities will be reported on following each of the events. Lakewood Park Elementary will have representatives for the District Advisory Council as well as the Parent Advisory Council. These representatives will report to the School Advisory Council in order to keep all members current on district information. Parents and community members will be encouraged to add their perspective as information is presented and decisions are made. An electronic copy of the School Improvement Plan is provided to each of the SAC members so that it can be reviewed. Members of the School Advisory Council will then be able to offer suggestions or question any portion of the plan that is unclear. School Committees were formed to address each area of the School Improvement Plan. Those committees will review the final draft and offer input to the plan as well. This School Improvement Plan is to be submitted to the School Board by September 24, 2012 and a final copy sent to the

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

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

state by October 12, 2012.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
There are no SAC funds available at this time.	

DRAFT