Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: FAIRLAWN ELEMENTARY	District Name: St. Lucie
Principal: Marcia Cully	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Fran Pitts	Date of School Board Approval: October 9, 2012

Student Achievement Data:

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

Highly Effective Administrators

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

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Marcia Cully	BA –Elementary Education : Oglethorpe University (Elem. Ed. 1-6) M.ED – Reading Georgia State University (Rdg. Administration & Supervision: Florida Atlantic University (Ed. Leadership K-12) Principal Certification – State of Florida (K-12)	4	24	MSE: 07-08 B/100%AYP 08-09 A/100%AYP FLN: 09-10 A/95 FLN: 10-11 A/97 FLN: 11-12 A

| Assistant Principal | Patricia Gascoigne | B.A. - Elementary Education F.A.U (Elem. Ed. 1-6) M.ED NOVA Educational Leadership (K-12) ESOL Endorsement School Principal State of Florida | 4 | 8 | MSE: 04-05 B/95%AYP 05-06 A/97%AYP 06-07 A/100%AYP 07-08 B/100%AYP 08-09 FLN: 09-10 A/95 FLN: 10-11 A/97% A/100%AYP FLN: 11-12 A |

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

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

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

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff who have Clinical Educator status	Principal and Assistant Principal	ongoing	
2. Provision of appropriate Professional Development	Principal and Assistant Principal	ongoing	
3. Administrative meetings with new staff	Principal and Assistant Principal	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
Cheryl Burleson	Elementary Ed. 1-6 MG English 5-9	Fourth Grade	ESOL endorsement
Susan Donaldson	Early Childhood (Nursery-K) Elementary Ed. 1-6	First Grade	ESOL endorsement
David Edwards	Business Ed.6-12 Elementary Ed. K-6	Fifth Grade	ESOL endorsement
Kathryn Forbes	Elementary Ed. 1-6 Primary Ed. K-3	Fourth Grade	ESOL endorsement
Shirley Helton	Elementary Ed. 1-6 Early Childhood (Nursery-K)	Fifth Grade	ESOL endorsement
Carol Hendricks	Elementary Ed. 1-6 Primary Ed. K-3	Kindergarten	ESOL endorsement
Holly Herndon	Elementary Ed. 1-6	Second Grade	ESOL endorsement

Carolyn Johnson	Elementary Ed. 1-6	First Grade	ESOL endorsement
Mary Kelly	Elementary Ed. 1-6	Fourth Grade	ESOL endorsement
Kyle McCleary	Pre-K/Primary (Age 3-Grade 3)	Kindergarten	ESOL endorsement
Fran Pitts	Varying Exceptionalities K-12 Elementary Ed. K-6	Kindergarten- Third Grade	ESOL endorsement
Roseanne Shepherd	Early Childhood (Nursery-K) Elementary Ed. 1-6	Third Grade	ESOL endorsement
Candace Wickham	Varying Exceptionalities K-12 Elementary Ed. K-6	Gifted	Gifted endorsement

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	2.17% (1)	23.91% (11)	34.78% (16)	39.13% (18)	26.09% (12)		2.17% (1)	6.52% (3)	63.04% (29)

Teacher Mentoring Program

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

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

Fran Pitts	Jeannine Johannes	Jeannine Johannes is a new teacher working in KG-5 Inclusion classrooms with Varying Exceptionalities students. Fran Pitts is the ESE School Based Specialist and team leader who has vast experience working with ESE students.	Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/ activities on log.
Holly Herndon	Brittany Mascara	Brittany Mascara is a new teacher working in a second grade class. Holly Herndon is the second grade team leader and has vast experience working with second grade students.	Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development. • Utilize release time for teacher observations. • One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. • Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. • Observe a highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/ activities on log.

| Lindsey Neshkoff | Kyle McCleary | Kyle McCleary is a new teacher working in a Kindergarten class. Lindsey Neshkoff is the kindergarten team leader and has vast experience working with kindergarten students. | Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher.
• Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development.
• Utilize release time for teacher observations.
• One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison.
• Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives.
• Observe a highly effective teacher.
• Complete and document target skills/activities on log. |

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-*Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

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

Marcia Cully- Principal
Patricia Gascoigne- Assistant Principal
Dr.Lurana Hillard- School Psychologist
Keena Master- Guidance Counselor
Kelly Southall- Literacy
Kelly Johnson- Math
Fran Pitts- ESE Specialist/ School Based
Lindsey Neshkoff-K-2 Representative
Loryn Black- K-2 Representative
Holly Herndon- K-2 Representative
Lisa Helseth 3-5 Representative
David Edwards-3-5 Representative

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

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

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

Various School Teams
Fairlawn 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. 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

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

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

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

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

2. Managed data will include:
   Academic
   - Oral Reading Fluency Measures
   - EasyCBM Benchmark Assessments
   - Journeys Benchmark Assessments
   - State/Local Math and Science assessments
   - FCAT
   - Student grades
   - School site specific assessments

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. Training for all administrators along with their Core Team to support the identification of students in need of intervention using data.

2. District RTI Specialists, School Psychologists, and Literacy Coaches will be providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures; and

---

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:
1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).   Faith Kicklighter, Cathy Kosco-Laite, Marilyn Wilkes, Roseanne Shepherd, Mary Kelly, Dessie Rogers, Jane Whitaker, and Sarah Eastridge.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).   The Literacy Leadership Team meets on a monthly basis. The team reviews school wide reading and writing data and provides ongoing support for student achievement and strategies needed to enhance our curriculum.

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

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will support instructional staff in the implementation of:
- The St Lucie County K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan
- Write from the Beginning & Beyond Response to Literature
- Common Core Standards K-2
- New Grade Scale for K-2

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (b) F.S
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

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 to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	1a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the required minimum Civics content for grades 3 – 5.	1a.1. District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #1a: By June 2013, 37% (112) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	32% (97) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June 2013, 37% (112) 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 of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	1a.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework). *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	1a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		1a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate reflective thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	1a.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	1a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale. .	
		1a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reading Application	1a.4. * Emphasize reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching and Kagan Strategies. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a.4. *Teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.	

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

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

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 to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	2a. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	2a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	2a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 44% (132) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (122) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 44% (132) 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 of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	2a.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	2a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	2a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.	
		4a.4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	4a.4. *Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources derived from informational text. * Journeys core advanced materials will be used to support enrichment instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery of enrichment instruction.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4a.4. *The 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.	4a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of above target goal– Level 4.	

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	N/A					
Reading Goal #2b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	3a.1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	3a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #3a: By June of 2013, 75% (145) 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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

72% (138) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 75% (145) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					
		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: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	3a.2. *District Professional Development Team

Administration

Teacher | 3a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.

*Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework.

*Administrative/Teacher conferencing. | 3a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | 3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice. | 3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided 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

Administration

Teacher | 3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.

*Individual and Collaborative review of student work. | 3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items. | |
| | | 3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary | 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

Administration

Teacher | 3a.4. *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. | |

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

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

4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	4A.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	4A1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4A.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #4a: By June 2013 72% (35) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	67% (34) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	By June 2013 72% (35) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					

		4a.2A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration	4a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	4a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		4a.3. *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 Teacher	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.	
		4a.4. *The students come to school with limited background knowledge.	4a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys toolkit to support background knowledge deficits. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will support background knowledge through read alouds.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	4a.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. .	

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

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	N/A						
Reading Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 74% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In June 2012, 72% of students were proficient in Reading.	By June 2013 78% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2014 81% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 7%.	By June 2015 83% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 9%.	By June 2016 85% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 11%.	By June 2017 87% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 13%.
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013, 75% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5B.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5B1 1.District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, 63% Black and 83% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	58% Black and 61% Hispanic students made satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: 0 Black: 58% Hispanic: 61% Asian: 0 American: 0 Indian: 0	By June 2013, Black 63% and Hispanic 83% students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: Black: 57% Hispanic: 50% Asian: American Indian:				
		5B.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5B.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5B.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5B.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
		5B3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5B.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	5B.3. * District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	5B3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5B.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.

		5B.4. *Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5B.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 Administration Teacher	5B.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Student think alouds will provide evidence to support their ability to make inferences and draw conclusions.	5B.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. .	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	.	.					
Reading Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5d.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5d.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5d1. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration	5d1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5D: By June of 2013, 59% Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	50% in grades 3-5 are making satisfactory progress in reading on 2-11-2012 FCAT 2.0.	By June of 2013, 59% Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.					

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

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

		5d.4. Teacher deficiencies in preparedness to work with students with disabilities.	5d.4. *Teachers will be trained to support students with disabilities with the Journeys toolkit across all reporting categories. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support student disabilities continued professional development.	5d.4. * District Professional Development Team Teacher Administration	5d.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	5d.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Easy CBM progress monitoring *Journeys unit assessments *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		

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5E.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5E1. 1.District Professional Development Team Administration	5E1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5E1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5E: By June of 2012, 70% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	64% in grades 3-5are making satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	By June of 2012, 7 70% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0					

| | | 5E.2
*A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff | 5E.2.
*Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading. | 5E2.
*District Professional Development Team

Administration | 5E.2.
*Administration observation of
  effective implementation
  with feedback.

*Teacher lesson design reflective
  of the St. Lucie County
  Framework.

  *Administrative/Teacher
  conferencing. | 5E.2.
  *SLC Framework
  *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs | |
| | | 5E.3.
*The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice | 5E.3.
*Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding.
*Instructional and
  peer coaching | 5E.3.
* District Professional Development Team
Teacher
Administration | 5E.3.
*Administration observation of
  effective implementation with
  feedback.

*Individual and Collaborative review of student work. | 5E.3.
*Student Responses from teacher made
  performance task items based on the
  performance scale. | |

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning						

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

Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Thinking Maps & Beyond	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	October 2012	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Kagan	K-5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	January 2013	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Thinking Maps and Beyond	Increase Comprehension of literature and respond through writing	P24	$1,780
			$
Subtotal: $1,780.			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study for CCC	Substitutes for 40 teachers for 2 days	Title II (if available)	$5,600.00
Kagan Strategies	Engagement strategies	Title II (if available)	$5,000.00
Subtotal: $10,600.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $12, 380.			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. ELL students need to learn both English as core content and social/spoken English in order to communicate effectively.	1. Language Experience Approach Utilize a Language Experience Approach were students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	1.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	1.1. Teachers provide on-going formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	1.1. CELLA	

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

CELLA Goal #1: _Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 62.5% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 73% (30) of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA._	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 62.5% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.					
		1.2.	1.2. Modeling Teachers demonstrate to the learner how to do a task, with the expectation that the learner can copy the model. Modeling includes thinking aloud and talking about how to work through a task.	1.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	1.2. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. CELLA
		1.3.	1.3. Cooperative Learning Group Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	1.3. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	1.3. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.3. CELLA
Students read in English at grade level text 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	

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

2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge.	2.1. Administration/Literacy Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. Formative Assessment	2.1. CELLA	
CELLA Goal #2: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 8.3% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 12% (*) of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 8.3% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Reading.					
		2.2.	2.2. Reading aloud to students helps them develop and improve literacy skills.	2.2. Administration/Literacy 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 Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Formative Assessments	2.3 CELLA

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

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. The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. A dialog journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialog journals provide a communicative context for language and writing development.	2.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. Journals	2.1. CELLA	
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u> *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.8% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 24% (*) of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLA.*	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 20.8% (*) of ELL students were proficient in Writing.					
		2.2.	2.2. Graphic Organizers	2.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Student Work	2.2. CELLA
		2.3	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 Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Student Writing Samples	2.3 CELLA

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 38% (117) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	33% (98) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	By June 2013, 38% (117) 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 * Math lead teacher * Administration *Teacher	1a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		1a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	1a.3. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

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

		1a4. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 and Grade 5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions	1a4. * Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives. Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions. * GoMath! Core materials will be used for instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a4. * Administrators * Teachers * Math lead teacher	1a4. * Results of weekly assessments will be reviewed by grade level teams and leadership to ensure progress. * Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed.	1a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	N/A						
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		.					

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 * Math lead teacher * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 47% (126) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	41% (122) 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, 47% (126) 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 * Math lead teacher * 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 students are learning	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.	

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	N/A						
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. * District professional development team * Math lead teacher * 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		

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

Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 65% (125) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (107) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2012 65% (125) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		3a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3a.2 * District professional development team * Math lead teacher * 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 * Math lead teacher	3a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	3a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
		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 * Administration	3a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	N/A						
		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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		
4a. 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 * Math lead teacher * 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 #4a By June 2013 50% (15) 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:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	39% (11) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013 50% (15) 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 * Math lead teacher * 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.	

4b. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	N/A						
.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 77% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math.	By June 2012 73% of students were proficient in Math	By June 2013 78% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 5%.	By June 2014 81% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 7%.	By June 2015 83% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2016 85% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 12%.	By June 2017 87% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 14%.

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

Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 78% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.							
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		
	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 * Math coaches * 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		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, 75% (100) of white students, 90% of Hispanic students, and 63% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	68% (94) of white students, 73% of Hispanic students, and 55% of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 75% (100) of white students, 90% of Hispanic students, and 63% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.				
		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 * Math coaches * 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 * Instructional coaches * 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	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	5a.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5a.4. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a4. * 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.							
Mathematics Goal #5C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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 * Instructional coaches * 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		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 60% (28) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	55% (20) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 60% (28) of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.				
		5d.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * 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 * Instructional coaches * 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 * Instructional coaches	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 to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5e.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5e.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5e.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 73% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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

	68% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 73% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment				
		5e.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5e.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		5e.3. The daily expectation of student written 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)).

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.	N/A					
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2a: \	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	
		2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	N/A	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2b.2.	2b2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3a: _Enter narrative for the goal in this box._	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	_Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box._					
		3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	
		3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a..3.	3a.3.	

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

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

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

4a. 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 #4a: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	
		4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	

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

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4b: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	

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

Mathematics Goal #5C: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		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.	

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #5E: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						

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

Algebra Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Algebra Goal #3B: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	

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

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme					

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development						

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

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

2013 School Improvement Plan – DRAFT
Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

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. Implement Science Discovery Days every early Dismissal.	1a.1. Grade Group Chair	1a.1. Team Meeting Data Elements	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation Framework	
Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 49% (49) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	44% (41) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	49% (49) of students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment.				
		1a.2. Time and funding for professional development	1a.2. Implement and train teachers on the 5e lesson model as the standard for science instruction.	1a.2. Science Committee/ District	1a.2. Professional development surveys	1a.2. Teacher Evaluation Framework

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

			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.		students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.	N/A					
Science Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		.				

		1b.2. Opportunities for students to learn the language of science	1b.2. Teachers will use a variety of data to plan science instruction and use teaching strategies that will enhance the instruction	1b.2. Teacher Administration	1b.2. Review FAA data and review data on teacher made tests	1b.2. FAA Teacher made assessments	
		1b.3. Poor foundational skills in Reading and math affect the success of students in the science curriculum.	1b.3. Analyze Reading data to provide appropriate leveled science text and materials for struggling students.	1b.3. Teacher Administration ESE Specialist	1b.3. Review and monitoring of classroom assessments, teacher made tests, class work and FAA scores.	1b.3. Curriculum based assessments, review of lesson plans, classroom observations	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science. | 2a.1. Elementary Science Teachers do not have a depth of Science background knowledge. | 2a.1. ● Develop Professional Learning Communities (PLC) of elementary science teachers in order to research, collaborate, design, and implement instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry-based learning in Physical, Earth Space, and Life Sciences. The PLC should include | 2a.1. PLC Science Teacher Leaders | 2a.1 PLC Meeting Data, Student Data from Formative Assessments | 2a.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT | | |

		vertical and horizontal alignment within the school in order to ensure continuity of concepts taught and to stress the importance of the New Generation SS Standards. ● Use of Science Fusion and all included resources					
Science Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 20% (# 20) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

	15% (# 14) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/2012 FCAT assessment.	20% (# 20) 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.	N/A		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	
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				

		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					

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

2. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to**						

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Biology Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

End of Biology EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

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

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

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Discovery Days	School Based Materials		$0.00

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

	Subtotal:			
	Subtotal:			
	Total:			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

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

Writing Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013, 90% (90) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.							
	In 2012, 36% (36) of the students scored 4.0 or higher as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	By June 2013, 65% (90) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.					
		1a.2. Students' appropriate use of conventions of writing and use of details that include high levels of vocabulary	1a.2. Classroom instructors will utilize Appendix C from CCSS ELA to model exemplars in writing.	1a.2 Administrative Team	1a.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.2. SLC Framework documentation	
		1a.3. Appropriate implementation according to the research supporting Write From the Beginning	1a.3. K – 2 Teachers will participate in Lesson Study targeting Write From the Beginning lessons.	1a.3. Reading Coach	1a.3. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1a.3. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools	

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	N/A						
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Writing Professional Development

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

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

Anchor Standards	K – 5	Grade Level CCSS Rep.	Classroom Teachers	August 2013	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write From the Beginning	K - 5	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	Ongoing August -May	Classroom Observation and Lesson Plans	Administrative Team

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 (Thinking Maps)	Binder of Resources	P24	$1,640.
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write From the Beginning (Thinking Maps)	Substitutes for new teachers		$0.00
Subtotal: $1,640.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: : $1,640.00			

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

* 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	

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

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

	Total:		

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Attendance	1.1. Excessive tardies 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.	1.1. Assistant Principal Data Specialist Guidance Counselor teachers	1.1. Bi-weekly updates to Administration from the MTSS/RTI and to entire faculty at faculty meetings.	1.1. Truancy logs and attendance rosters.	

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

Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 98% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated by June 2013. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 25% by June 2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				
	96%	By June 2013,our expected attendance rate will increase to 98%				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				

	"153 "students accumulated 10 or more absences excused and unexcused	By June 2013,our expected number of students with excessive absences will reduce by 25% (77)"				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
	"146" students accumulated 10 or more excessive tardies or signed out early"	By June 2013,our expected number of students with excessive tardies will reduce by 50% (73)""				
		1.2. Illnesses – excused absences have increased by 10% from previous year.	1.2. Provide parents with information for the KidCare program, Florida's state insurance program for children.	1.2. Administrators Data Specialist Guidance Counselor teachers	1.2. Administrators will ascertain health education and health prevention strategies to be implemented throughout the school.	1.2. Attendance rosters
		1.3. School daily start and end time could conflict with student personal appointments	1.3. Provide access to early morning child care / drop off. Recognize students for perfect attendance during award ceremonies. Review school wide attendance policy with teachers and notifying parents of absences. When students have accrued 10 days unexcused absences or tardies, the school administration will contact the parent	1.3. Administrators Data Specialist Guidance Counselor teachers	1.3.	1.3.

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Truancy Prevention	K12	Student Services/ District staff	All counselors and attendance staff	September 26, 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
Health and Wellness	Physical Education and Health	District staff Coordinator of Health and Wellness and school health/ nurse	PE/Health teachers, resource teachers	October 26, 2012	Create a wellness council to monitor implementation of program recommended by the District Health/Wellness Coordinator	Administrators, School Nurse/ Health Aide, and wellness council

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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
Truancy Prevention	Provide incentives for students with improved attendance.		
Best Practices and Model Truancy Programs **Reimer, M. S., & Dimock, K. N.**	This publication focuses on those programs, approaches, and strategies that have already demonstrated success. Six critical components of successful truancy intervention programs are identified. This is the first publication in the *Truancy Prevention in Action* series. (2005)		**Item Number:** TP0502 **Price:** $9.50 each (Members: $7.60)
Subtotal:$19.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Health and Wellness PD	Substitutes for teachers		
Subtotal:			
Total:$19.00			

End of Attendance Goals

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. There are limited opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior.	1.1. Create incentives through school-based Positive Behavior Supports and/or MTSS/RTI to recognize and reward positive compliance on St. Lucie County Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Administrative team and PBS Core team	1.1. Monitor behavior incident report and BIR monthly.	1.1. PBS incentives log of attendance for students who are recognized for complying with SLC Student Code of Conduct along with monthly BIR/ Skyward data reports.		

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

Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 50% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions				
	(4) students received in-school suspension	By June 2013, our expected number of in-school suspensions will be reduced by 50% (2)				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School				
	(3) students received in-school suspension	By June 2013, our expected number of in-school suspensions will be reduced by 50% (2)				
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	(14) days	By June 2013, our expected number of out of school suspensions will be reduced by 50% (7)				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	(3) students	By June 2013, our expected number of students suspended out of school will be reduced by (1)				

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
			Deans and/or Guidance Counselor will make contact with parents or students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the SLC Student Code of Conduct.	Deans/Counselor	Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension.	Parent Contact Log, Parent sign in/out log	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD on PBS	K12	PBS Core Team/ Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	On-going August- May		School Psychologist
PD on MTSS/RTI	K12	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	On-going August-May		School Psychologist

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

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout	**Problem-**					

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

Prevention Goal(s)	solving Process to Dropout Prevention						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	N/A	1	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	#	#					
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	#	#					
		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						

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

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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
Do You Really Want to Drop Out? You Ought To Know the Facts! Reimer, M. S.	This small booklet lays out the facts for young people who might be considering dropping out. *Sold only in quantities of 50.* (2004)		**Item Number:** DP0401 **Price:** $35.00 per pkg. of 50 (Members: $28.00)
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement					

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1. Need for better accounting procedures to better determine number of hours	1.1. Develop a system for tracking all hours	1.1. Volunteer Coordinator	1.1. End of the year volunteer hour count	1.1 Log of activities and hours.		
During the 2012-2013 school year, Fairlawn will increase parent volunteer hours by one percent.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	Our 2011-2012 data indicates we had 7,317 volunteer hours of volunteer service	During the 2012-2013 school year, Fairlawn will increase parent volunteer hours by one percent. *(7,400)*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional						

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Accurate count of volunteer hours	Computer program for parents to use for signing in and out for parent involvement and volunteer activities.	Capitol/Internal funds	$4,500.00
Subtotal: $4,500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: $4,500.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to				

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

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

STEM Professional Development

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with					

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each						

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

Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $12,380.00
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total: $1,640.00
Writing Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total: $4,500.00
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total: $18.539.00

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select "checked" under "Default Value" header; 3. Select "OK", this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	▢Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

▢ Yes   ▢ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council will meet the second Thursday of each month or more frequently as necessary to meet school, district or state mandates. The September meeting took nominations for new members, reviewed the SAC responsibilities and reviewed the goals and priorities for the School Improvement Plan. The monthly meetings will be held to review data, update the team on the school's progress towards implementation of the School Improvement Plan and make recommendations for the continued success of Fairlawn Elementary.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount