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: Dan McCarty School	District Name: St. Lucie
Principal: Mimi Hoffman	Superintendent: Mr. Lannon
SAC Chair: Diane Laster	Date of School Board Approval: Oct. 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)

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

Principal	Mimi Hoffman	Masters in Elementary Education/ School Principal (all Levels) Elementary Education (grades 1-6)	1	11	Principal, (Assistant Principal), Assistant Principal Dan McCarty School, Manatee Academy, (Northport Middle School), Manatee Elementary:
					'12, '11, '10, '09, '08, '07, '06, ('05). ('04), '03, '02
					School Grade: D, A, B, B, B, C, B, (C), (C), B, B
					Proficiency (Reading): 66%, 66%, 66%, 71%, 73%, (48%), (45%), 64%, 66%
					Proficiency (Math): 66%, 61%, 63%, 62%, 64%, (48%), (40%), 58%, 64%
					Proficiency (Writing): 83%, 82%, 81%, 86%, 86%, (65%), (78%), 76%, 73%
					Proficiency (Science): 37%, 43%, 37%, 28%, NA, (NA), (NA), NA, NA
					Learning Gains (Reading): 65%, 65%, 67%, 63%, 57%, (56%), (60%), 65%, 59%
					Learning Gains (Math): 67%, 59%, 69%, 48%, 61%, (68%), (57%), 64%, 72%
					Lowest 25% (Reading): 65%, 64%, 63%, 51%, 49%, (63%), (68%), 63%, 59%
					Lowest 25% (Math): 68%, 59%, 68%, 49%, NA, (NA), (NA), NA, NA
					AYP:
					2011 - NO
					2010 – NO, 79%: (Reading-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					(Math-Black, Hispanic, SWD)
					2009 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					(Math-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					2008 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					(Math-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					2007 – NO, 95%: (Math-Black, ED)
					2006 – Provisional, 87%: (Reading-SWD)
					(Math-Black, ED, SWD)
					(2005) – NO, 50%: (Reading-Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
					(Math-Total, Black, ED, SWD)
					(2004) – NO, 60%: (Reading-Black, ELL, SWD)
					(Math-Total, Black, ED, ELL, SWD)
					2003 – NO, NA%: (Reading-SWD)
					(Math-Black, SWD)
					2002 – NA

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

Assistant Principal	Rebecca Goodman	B. S. Elementary Education, M. Ed. Educational Leadership, Principal Certification – State of Florida ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement	4	6	2009-2012 Assistant Principal of Dan McCarty School Grade D, C, Reading Mastery 48%, Math Mastery 44%, Writing Mastery 81%, Science Mastery 27%. Reading Gains 60%, Math Gains 66%, Lowest 25% Reading 67%, Lowest 25% Math 74%. AYP - 79% White and Hispanic subgroups met AYP status. 2008-2009 Assistant Principal at Savanna Ridge Grade A – Reading mastery 76%, Math mastery 69%, Writing mastery 94%, Science mastery 41%. AYP – 82%. Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in reading. White subgroup was the only subgroup that met proficiency in math. 2007-2008 Grade A - Reading mastery 71%, Math mastery 61%, Writing mastery 89%, Science mastery 41%. AYP – 82%. Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in reading. Black, Hispanic & ED did not meet proficiency in math. 2006-2007 Grade C – Reading mastery 67%, Math mastery 57%, Writing mastery 82%, Science mastery 36%. AYP – 95% - Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in reading. All subgroups met proficiency in math. 2005-2006 Grade B – Reading mastery 67%, Math mastery 53%, Writing mastery 85%. AYP – 87%. Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in reading. Black & ED subgroup did not meet proficiency in math. 2004-2005 Grade C – Reading mastery 67%, Math mastery 54%, Writing mastery 85%. AYP – 73%. Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in reading. Black and ED subgroups did not meet proficiency in math.

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

Assistant Principal	Simmie Burns	Elementary Education 1-6, School Principal - All Levels, Math 5-9 Associate Arts, Bachelor's of Science;Elementary Education, Master's of Science; Educational Leadership	0	8	Assistant Principal of Forest Grove Middle School in 2008-2009-2012 Grade: C, B, Total points: 518. Reading Mastery: 59%, Math mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 36%, Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: 85%. Learning gains in Reading: 66%, Learning gains in Math: 68%, Lowest 25% LG in Reading: 75%, Lowest 25% LG in Math: 68%. Blacks, Hispanics and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Blacks, Hispanics, White, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Math. All subgroups made AYP in writing. ELL and SWD were not considered a ub group. 2009-2010- School grade B- Reading - 62% of student met high standards. Math-61% of student met high standards. 89% met high standards in writing, and 41% made high standards in science. 62% made learning gains in reading and 68% made learning gains in math. 58% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading and 65% made learning gains in math. Forest Grove Middle School met 90% of the AYP criteria overall. Students with Disabilities and ESOL students were not a sub group. 2010-2011

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

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

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

Reading	Matthew Saenz	B.A. Elementary Education	1	1	Dan McCarty School, Manatee Academy '12, '11,'10, '09, '08, '07, '06, School Grade: D, A, B, B, B, C, B Proficiency (Reading): 66%, 66%, 66%, 71%, 73% Learning Gains (Reading): 65%, 65%, 67%, 63%, 57%, (56%), (60%), 65%, 59% Lowest 25% (Reading): 65%, 64%, 63%, 51%, 49%, AYP: 2011 - NO 2010 – NO, 79%: (Reading-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Black, Hispanic, SWD) 2009 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) 2008 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD)
Math	Cecilia Martin	B.S. Computer Information Systems, M.S. Mathematics 6-12, Mathematics rtification, Currently working on Doctorate in Educational Leadership	8	5	2009-2012 Math Coach of Dan McCarty School Grade D, C,C, Reading Mastery 48%, Math Mastery 44%, Writing Mastery 81%, Science Mastery 27%. Reading Gains 60%, Math Gains 66%, Lowest 25% Reading 67%, Lowest 25% Math 74%. AYP - 79% White and Hispanic subgroups met AYP status. proficiency in reading. White subgroup met proficiency in math.
Science	Beth Bonvie	B.S. Science	6	2	2009-2012 Science Coach of Dan McCarty School Grade D, C,C, Reading Mastery 48%, Math Mastery 44%, Writing Mastery 81%, Science Mastery 27%. Reading Gains 60%, Math Gains 66%, Lowest 25% Reading 67%, Lowest 25% Math 74%. AYP - 79% White and Hispanic subgroups met AYP status.

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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. Interview Process by administration; Secure quality staff with a similar philosophy.	Principal	Ongoing	
2. New teachers attend district-based orientation	District	Beginning of school year	
3. New teachers attend school-based induction meeting	Principal/Assistant Principal	Beginning of school year	
4. Enhanced resources, e.g., in class library, access to technology for instructional and administrative purposes	Administration; Instructional Coaches	August 2012	
5. School-based professional development and/or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	Administration, Instructional Coaches, Consultants	Ongoing	
6. High-quality teacher mentoring, induction, and/or subject-specific coaching	Administration, Mentors, Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
7. Planning time that is coordinated with that of other teachers of the same subject, grade, and/or students.	Administration	August 2012	
8. Frequent observations and feedback.	Administration, Instructional Coaches	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

Staff Demographics

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

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
58	12.07% (7)	31.03% (18)	34.48% (20)	22.41% (13)	32.76% (19)		15.52% (9)	3.45% (2)	29.31% (17)

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
Rebecca Dumont	K'asha Franklin	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Rebecca Dumont	John Partlow	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Steven Torres	Beverly Simmons	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Nakysha Dennis	Cecilia Martin	Math Coach	Meetings and support
Jane Ingram	Sonya Bradley	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Jane Ingram	Jeremiah Best	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Jane Ingram	Dawn Carlin	Elementary experience	Meetings and support
Teresa Sullivan	Gina Clark	Reading teacher	Meetings and support
Matt Sines	Kari Koulouvaris	Reading Coach	Meetings and support
Heather Eakins	Francis Lansiquot	Social Studies teacher	Meetings and support
Heather Eakins	John Hett	Social Studies teacher	Meetings and support
Patrick Sines	Nelda Baptiste	L. Arts teacher	Meetings and support
Patrick Sines	Latricia Stubbs	L. Arts teacher	Meetings and support
Patrick Sines	Michael House	L. Arts teacher	Meetings and support
Patrick Sines	Sarah Nitti	L. Arts teacher	Meetings and support

Matt Saenz	Daniel Roberts	Reading Coach	Meetings and support
Matt Saenz	Rebecca Branam	Reading Coach	Meetings and support
Matt Saenz	Delice Cavanagh	Reading Coach	Meetings and support
Beth Bonvie	Christopher Tolliver	Science Coach	Meetings and support
Beth Bonvie	Carrie Bobo	Science Coach	Meetings and support
Wonderful Monds	Carla Pryor	PE teacher	Meetings and support
Wonderful Monds	Aaron Gluff	PE teacher	Meetings and support
Paul Perry	Evan Jones	ESE teacher	Meetings and support
Paul Perry	Danielle Morningstar	ESE teacher	Meetings and support

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 Allocations provide additional funding for the Literacy, Science and Math coaches who serve as a resource to classroom teachers in implementing strategies that support students in meeting grade level expectations in reading, math, science and writing.
Title I, Part C- Migrant SLCSB Migrant Recruiter and the Secondary Advocate provide support to migrant students and their families. The students and their parents are supported through summer programs and parent involvement activities.
Title I, Part D Funds support educational programs at the Detention Center, PACE, Project Rock and DATA House (alternative sites for students working with varying issues). Student services are coordinated with the St. Lucie County School District's dropout prevention programs.
Title II In coordination with Title I and Title III, Title II provides professional development that addresses the needs of teachers so that they can meet the needs of their students. Professional development is continuous and product-driven. Follow-up visits and fidelity checks ensure that the strategies are being implemented.
Title III The district ESOL program specialist provides support to teachers. Professional development is provided to teachers so that they acquire the skills and strategies that work best for English Language Learners. ELL students are provided additional support in learning academic vocabulary and curriculum with a highly qualified ESOL teacher utilizing our English learning lab.

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

Title X- Homeless Dan McCarty works with the Coordinator, Social Worker and student service specialists to provide needed resources such as clothing, school supplies and social service referrals to students identified as homeless.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Nutrition Programs Dan McCarty participates in the Free and Reduced Lunch program and the Universal Free Breakfast program.
Housing Programs n/a
Head Start n/a
Adult Education n/a
Career and Technical Education n/a

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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

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.

Suggested Members include:
- Administrator(s) – Mimi Hoffman
- RTI:B Team Liaison – Jane Ingram
- School Counselor – Kim Johnson
- Literacy Coach – Matt Saenz
- Math Coach – Cecelia Martin
- School Psychologist – Gweneth Pelcyger
- School-Based ESE Specialist – Cheryl Karlson

Elementary
- 3-5 Representative – Rebecca Dumont

Secondary
- Teacher Representative – Gina Clark, Cicily Morgan, Teresa Sullivan

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

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

Group PST
Elementary

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

Middle

Meetings at this level include members of the Core PST meeting with grade level and/or various school teams to review data, finalize identification of intervention groups, and/or review response of students receiving interventions. Teachers alone do not identify and make intervention placement decisions. Decisions such as these are 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
   - FAST data
   - 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.

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

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, Guidance Counselor 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). This team is comprised of staff members who represent the varied grades and disciplines on campus and members of School Renewal Dept. The committee is chaired by our literacy coach. Committee members include: principal, assistant principal, social studies instructor (grade 7), language arts instructor (grade 8), ESE support specialist (grades 6 – 8), media specialist (grades 3 – 8 and), science instructor (grade 8), third grade instructor, fifth grade instructor, mathematics coach (grades 3 – 8), and science coach (grades 3 – 8).

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). This team meets one time per month to reflect upon school-wide needs based on the review of trend data as well current summaries of school and district progress monitoring data. Using this information in conjunction with practices supported by credible research, the committee organizes and supports school-wide implementation of strategies to address areas of need.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? This year, the committee will support the use of Thinking Maps in all grades and subject areas along with strategies to aid teaching content vocabulary for the sake of enhanced comprehension. The committee will also support the use of higher order questions to drive depth to students' understanding.

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.

*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.

With a strong awareness of the varying levels of proficiency/non-proficiency, Dan McCarty's development of the Reading Focus Calendar, guides instruction and feedback, as well as provides a strong focus for mastery of key skills. This will promote accelerated achievement in all subgroups including our highest need subgroups (Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities). All teachers are viewed as reading teachers. The middle school reading teachers and the literacy coach guides content area teachers in the use of reading strategies so that our students are guided in the application of reading across all disciplines. Our math coach models the use of reading strategies to analyze and solve real world math problems. Our science coach models and provides support for the continuation of applying the strategies in science. Social studies teachers use the reading data to drive the development of their Professional Growth Plans. Core-teachers model and guide students in the use of reading strategies. All content area teachers participate in data chats to review the mini-assessment and Benchmark data to analyze the achievement of our students in the area of reading. Representatives from all core and content areas of learning are participants in family literacy events.

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?

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS
Reading Goals

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

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1a.1. Teachers' varying degrees of awareness and understanding of Common Core State Standards.	1a.1. Engage all teachers in ongoing Professional Development activities that develop awareness of Common Core State Standards, the ability to unwrap the standards, develop learning goals and specific scales, plan instructional activities for the standards, and develop common formative assessments for the standards along with a collaborative scoring process.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches	1a.1. Data from classroom observations using the SLC Framework. Analysis of teacher-developed instructional activities and formative assessments.	1a.1 Results of common formative assessments, Benchmark tests, and FCAT 2.0.		

Reading Goal #1a: On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 will increase to 45% (320).	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	30% (218) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.	On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 will increase to 45% (320).				

		1a.2. Teachers' continuously developing skill in implementing quality instruction as defined by the SLC Framework.	1a.2. Engage all teachers in ongoing professional development activities that develop and enhance skill in quality instruction.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches, School Renewal, DA Members	1a.2. Data from classroom observations using the SLC Framework	1a.2. Results of common formative assessments, Benchmark tests, and FCAT.	

		1a3. Students lack of ability to attend to longer and more difficult passages/ questions; Lack of stamina; Lack of rich learning experiences to increase vocabulary and schema; Limited experiences with various genres	1a3 Implementation of SLC Literacy Plan. Direct Explicit Instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Structures, Kids at Hope, Student feedback, Data tracking, Reading Counts, 100 Book Challenge, Interest Inventories, Brainpop, United Streaming, Language!, Read 180, Goal Setting/Data Tracking, Block Scheduling,	1a3 Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administrators, School Renewal, DA Members	1a3 Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administrators	1a3 FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Teacher common assessment, Interest Inventories, SAM, ORF, Easy CBM, Journey's assessments	

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1b.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PD opportunities.	1b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1 Observations and debriefing sessions Professional Development Surveys	1b.1. Implementation of access points		
Reading Goal #1b: By June 2013, 47% (9)students will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

37% (*students) are proficient at level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.	By June 2013, 47% (9) students will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.					
	1b.2. *Discerning relevant details from a passage using auditory processing.	1b.2. *Daily read aloud practice to process and coach students based on appropriate access points.	1b.2. District Support Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	1b.2. The teacher will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment. IEP team will review as needed to develop and/or revise plan.	1b.2. Teacher generated assessment based on IEP goals Brigance Assessment	
	1b.3. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details	1b.3. Use read aloud materials such as auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols	1b.3. Reading Coach Administration Teacher	1b.3. Students' written or oral responses	1b.3. Student performance tasks on teacher made assessments Teacher observation Brigance Assessment	

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.	2a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff 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.	2a1. 1.District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2a1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	2a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs, FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Teacher common assessment, Interest Inventories, SAM, ORF, Easy CBM, Journeys assessments		

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

Reading Goal #2a: On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 will increase to 21% (149).	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	2012 Current Level of Performance:*On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Assessment, 11% (78) of students scored at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading .	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the percentage of students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 will increase to 21% (149).				

		2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exists 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher School Renewal DA Members	2a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback *Administrative/ Teacher conferencing	2a.2. *SLC 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher School Renewal DA Members	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.	

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department PD opportunities.	2b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1 observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. FAA		
Reading Goal #2b: By June 2013, 47% (9 students) will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	37% (*students) are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	By June 2013, 47% (* students) will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.					

		2b.2. Limited schema with fiction, nonfiction, and informational texts	2b2. Students will be exposed to fiction, nonfiction and informational text and will be taught to identify the differences using Thinking Maps.	2b.2. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.2. Observation of DQ 3 Element 18	2b.2. Feedback using Frameworks FAA	
		2b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	2b.3 Research based strategies to enhance vocabulary and effectively utilize context clues should be explicitly taught to students (e.g.: pictures accompanying print; using pictures as a strategy should be minimized for long-term comprehension and retention.).	2b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	2b.3 Teacher made assessments FAA	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| **3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.** | 3a.1. *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

Reading Coach

Administration

Teacher | 3a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback | 3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs | | |

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

Reading Goal #3a: By June of 2013, 68% (484) of the students will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	58% (413) of the made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June of 2013,68% (484) of the students 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

Reading Coach

Administration

Teacher
School Renewal DA Members | 3a.2.
*Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback

County Framework.

*Administrative/ Teacher conferencing | 3a.2.
*SLC Framework
*Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs | |

		3a3. Students lack of ability to attend to longer and more difficult passages/ questions; Lack of stamina; Lack of rich learning experiences to increase vocabulary and schema; Limited experiences with various genres	3a3 Implementation of SLC Literacy Plan, Direct Explicit, Instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Structures, Kids at Hope, Student feedback, Data tracking, Reading Counts, 100 Book Challenge, Interest Inventories, Brainpop, United Streaming, Goal Setting/Data Tracking, Language!, Read 180, Imagine Learning, Block Scheduling,	3a3 Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administrators School Renewal DA Members	3a3 Observations; Reflective conversations	3a3 FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Teacher common assessment, Interest Inventories, SAM, ORF, Easy CBM, Journeys assessments	

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.**	3b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department PD opportunities.	3b.1 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.1 observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. FAA		
Reading Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 33% (4 students) will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	23% (* students) made learning gains on the FAA Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 33% (4 students) will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test					

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

		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	
		Limited teacher training on rubric interpretation and effective instructional strategies to achieve levels of proficiency.	Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities to gain a higher level of understanding of the rubrics and how to interpret the data to drive instruction.	District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	Monthly collaborative meetings to review student data to design effective instructional strategies to support student deficits.	Teacher generated assessments and data collection tools FAA	
		3b.3 Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	3b.3 Vocabulary should be introduced to students with pictures and print, (e.g.: pictures accompanying print; using pictures as a strategy should be minimized for long-term comprehension and retention).	3b.3 District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3b.3 Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	3b.3 Teacher generated assessments Brigance Assessment FAA	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher	4A.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

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

Reading Goal #4a: By June 2013 70% (124) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	65% (115) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013 70% (124) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.				

		4a2. 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: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration	4a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting the St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/ Teacher conferencing	4a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

| | | 4a.3.
*The students come to school with limited background knowledge. | 4a.3.
Implementation of SLC Literacy Plan, Direct Explicit, Instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Structures, Kids at Hope, Student feedback, Data tracking, Reading Counts, 100 Book Challenge, Interest Inventories, Brainpop, United Streaming, Goal Setting/Data Tracking, Language!, Read 180, Imagine Learning, Block Scheduling, | 4a.3.
* District Professional Development Team

    Reading Coach
    Administration
    Teacher

School Renewal DA Members | 4a.3.
*Administration observation of   effective implementation with   feedback
*Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions | 4a.3.
* Common weekly teacher generated assessments
*AIMS Web Assessments
*Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3.
*Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment
Easy CBM, Journeys assessments, SRI

. | |

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

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 years, DM will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 15% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.	In June 2012, 30% (218) of students were proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 15%.	By June 2013 45% (320) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 15%.	By June 2014 55% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10 %.	By June 2015 65% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2016 70% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 5%.	By June 2017 75% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 5%.
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013 45% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 15%.							

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. Students lack of ability to attend to longer and more difficult passages/questions; Lack of stamina; Lack of rich learning experiences to increase vocabulary and schema; limited experiences with various genres	5B.1. Implementation of SLC Literacy Plan, Direct Explicit, Instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Structures, Kids at Hope, Student feedback, Data tracking, Reading Counts, 100 Book Challenge, Interest Inventories, Brainpop, United Streaming,	5B.1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher School Renewal DA Members	5B.1. Collaborative data analysis; Classroom observations	5B.1. *Common weekly teacher generated assessments *AIMS Web Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment. SRI; Benchmarks; ORF		

		Goal Setting/ Data Tracking, Language!, Read 180, Imagine Learning, Block Scheduling,					
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013 45% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 15%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	White:52% Black:24% Hispanic: 34%	White:55% Black:27% Hispanic: 44%					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Unable to read in native language; parents non-English speaking	5C.1. Literacy Routines Collaborative Data Analysis Kagan Structures Ruby Payne Thinking Maps Kids at Hope SES after school tutorials Goal setting, data tracking Brainpop United Streaming Read 180 Language! ESOL Nights, Imagine	5C.1. Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administration, ESOL Paras	5C.1. Collaborative Data analysis; Classroom observations	5C.1. FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Common Assessments, ORF, SRI	

		Learning, Rosetta Stone, Block Scheduling,					
Reading Goal #5C: By June 2013 26% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	12%	26%					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. Lack of backg round knowledge and skills	5D.1. Literacy Routines, Collab orative Data Analysis, Kagan Structur es, Ruby Payne, Thinkin g Maps, Kids at Hope, SES after school tutorials, Goal setting/ data tracking, Brainpo p, United Streami ng, Read 180, Languag e!, Block	5D.1. Classroom teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administration, ESE teachers and paras School Renewal DA Members	5D1 Collaborative Data analysis; Classroom observations	5D.1. FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Common Assessments, ORF, SRI, Journeys assessments	

		Scheduli ng,					
Reading Goal #5D: By June 2013 26% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	18%	26%					
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. Lack of background knowledge, skills, and motivation	5E.1. Literacy Routines, Collaborative Data Analysis, Kagan Structures, Ruby Payne, Thinking Maps, Kids at Hope, SES after school tutorials, Goal setting/ data tracking, Brainpop, United Streaming, Read 180, Language!, Block	5E.1. Administration, Instructional Coaches, Teachers, School Renewal DA Members	5E.1. Collaborative data analysis; Classroom walkthroughs	5E.1. FCAT, Mini-BATS, Benchmarks, Common Assessments, ORF, SR1, SAM, Participation in reading incentives, Journeys assessments	

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

		Scheduling,					
Reading Goal #5E: By June 2013 39% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	29%	39%					

Reading Professional Development

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

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

SLC Framework For Quality Instruction (Framework)	3rd – 8th	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	3rd – 8th	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Differentiated Instruction	3rd – 8th	Instructional Coaches	School wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
Literacy Routines	3rd – 8th	Rd. Coach	School wide	Ongoing	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration, Literacy Coach
Collaborative Lesson Design	3rd – 8th	Coaches	School wide	Ongoing	Observation, Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
Data Analysis	3rd – 8th	Administration, Coaches	School wide	Ongoing	Observation	Administration, Leadership Team
Thinking Maps	3rd – 8th	Administration	School wide	Ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
Kids at Hope	3rd – 8th	Administration	School wide	Ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
Kagan Structures	3rd – 8th	Coaches	School wide	Ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
HMH – Journeys	3rd – 5th	District/Coach	3rd – 5th Teachers	Summer/Ongoing	Data Analysis	Administration, Literacy Coach
100 Book Challenge	3rd – 8th	American Reading Co/ Coach	School wide	August/Ongoing	Observations, School Pace	Administration, Literacy Coach
Reading Counts	3rd – 8th	Coach	School wide	Ongoing	Observations, SAM Reports	Administration, Literacy Coach
Technology	3rd – 8th	Staff members	School wide	Ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Administration, Leadership Team
Block Scheduling	6th – 8th	Staff Members PD Dept.	6th – 8th	Ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Administration, Literacy Coach

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
100 Book Challenge	Modules	Title 1	$7,600.00
Language! Materials	Language! Program	Title 1	$9340.00
Daily Five Manuals	Literacy Routines	Title 1	$280.00
Read 180 Materials	Read 180 Program	Title 1	$15000
Subtotal: $32,220.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
2 Sisters Website Subscription	Supplement to Daily 5	Title 1	$69.00
Subtotal: $69.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
100 Book Challenge – American Rd. Co	Training and monitoring	Title 1	7200.00
DA Conference - Orlando July 2012	Trainings with DOE personnel	Title 1	$1,170.00
Int./State Reading Conferences	Attendance at conferences	Title 1	$11,913.32
Subtotal :$20,283.32			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Literacy Coach	Coach	Title 1	$67, 705.00
Instructional support	Teacher	Title 1	$5,000.00
Subtotal: $72,705.00			
Total:$125,277.32			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase					

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

	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 where 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	
<u>CELLA Goal #1:</u> **Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 43.7% (31) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 53% of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA.**	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 43.7% 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	
2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1. The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. Activating and/ or Building Prior Knowledge.	2.1. Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. Formative Assessment	2.1. CELLA	

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

CELLA Goal #2: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 28.2% (20) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 38% 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, 28.2% 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 Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Timed Student Reading	2.2. CELLA
		2.3	2.3 Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 Administration/ Literacy Coach/ Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 Formative Assessments	2.3 CELLA
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

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 dialogue journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialogue 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	
CELLA Goal #3: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 22.5% (16) of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 32% of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLA.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 22.5% 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 Coach/ 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

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Mathematics Goals

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

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	

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

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 * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 44% (313) of students will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	34% (242) of the students were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013, 44% (313) of students 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 coaches * Administration *Teacher School Renewal DA Members	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

| | | 1a3.
Lack of basic knowledge/ skills | 1a3.
* Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives. Increase opportunities for students to use ratios in the real world setting. Move beyond the surface level of statistics and have students determine the appropriate use of central tendencies. *Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions. | 1a3.
* Administrators
* Teachers
* Math Coach
School Renewal
DA Members | 1a3.
* 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. | 1a3.
* Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks
* Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment
* Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3. | |

			* Math Connects Core materials will be used for instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. *Wileys Warmups *Kagan Structures *Thinking Maps *Destination Math *Goal setting and data monitoring by students *Block Scheduling				

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1 Instructional staff will participate in department PD opportunities. .	1b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1. Observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA		
Mathematics Goal #1b: By June 2013, 40% (12 students) will score at a Level 4,5,6 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	. 55% (* students) are proficient at level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test	By June 2013, 65% (* students) will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.					

		1b.2. Students limited in basic math skills based on their cognitive impairment	1b.2. Using research-based strategies, instructional staff will provide direct instruction in basic math concepts embedding opportunities for re-teaching, to acquire mastery of targeted skills and repetition to maintain skills.	1b.2. Teacher Administration	1b.2. Teacher lessons that reflect access points using basic math skills.	1b.2 FAA Brigance Assessment, Data Collection Observation.	
		1b.3. Students are deficient in multi-step problem solving skills to solve high level math problems.	1b.3 The students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long term learning math concepts such as fact fluency, tools for measurement, multi-step problem solving strategies. Use math manipulatives and tools to solve problems.	1b.3. Teacher Administrator	1b.3. Teacher lessons that reflect access points using multi step problem solving strategies	1b.3. FAA Brigance Assessment, Data Collection Observation.	

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 coaches * 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, 22% (156) of students 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:*				
	14% (99) of the students are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	By June 2013, 22% (156) of students 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 coaches * Administration * Teacher *School Renewal	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	

		2a3. *Lack of higher level thinking lessons	2a3. * Math Connects 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 *Wiley's Warmups *Kagan Structures *Writing across the curriculum *Thinking Maps *Destination Math *Goal setting and data monitoring by students *Block Scheduling	2a3 * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration *School Renewal *DA Members	2a3 * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	2a3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2b.1. Students are deficient in basic algebra and geometry needed to solve high level math problems.	2b.1. Teacher will develop instructional strategies for functional real world application in a school, work or home setting	2b.1. Teacher Administration	2b.1. Teacher lessons designed using the access points using algebra and geometry applications	2b.1. FAA Brigance Assessment Data Collection Observation		
Mathematics Goal #2b: By June 2013, 35% (7 students) will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	25% (* students) are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	By June 2013, 35% (* students) proficiency level 7 score on the FAA math test.				
		2b.2. Students are deficient in multi-step problem solving skills to solve high level math problems.	2b2. The students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long term learning math concepts such as fact fluency, tools for measurement, multi-step problem solving strategies. Use math manipulatives and tools to solve problems	2b.2. Teacher Administrator	2b.2. Teacher lessons that reflect access points using multi step problem solving strategies	2b.2. FAA Brigance Assessment, Data Collection Observation.
		2b.3 Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.3 Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities.	2b.3 District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.3 Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.3 Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	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 coaches * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback	3a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

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

Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 70% (449) of the students will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	60% (427) of the students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2012 70% (499) of the students will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.				

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

		3a.2. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.2. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.2. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	3a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback	3a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		3a.3. *Lack of basic skills	3a.3. * Math Connects Explore section 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	3a.3. * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration *School Renewal *DA Members	3a.3. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a.3. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	1b. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PD opportunities	3b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	3b.1. Observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. FAA		
Mathematics Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 49% (6 students) in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	39% (* students) in made learning gains on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 49% (* students) will make learning gains on the 2011-2012 FAA Math Test.				
		3b.2. Due to the nature and severity of individual student's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts	3b.2. Students must have continuous repetition/ practice when learning math concepts	3b.2. District PD Team Teachers Administration	3b.2. Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided practice to demonstrate understanding.	3b.2. Teacher generated assessments calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency FAA Brigance Assessment	

		3b.3. Due to the nature and severity of individual student's disability, students are challenged to effectively communicate their thought processes through written/oral language	3b.3. Students will be provided with visual choices to support mathematical thinking to solve problems.	3b.3. Teacher Administration	3b.3. Students will provide a variety of visuals to support their thinking through problem solving equations.	3b.3. Teacher generated assessments Teacher observation FAA	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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. *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 coaches * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback	4a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #4a: By June 2013 75% (128) students 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:*					

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

	67% (119) students in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013 72% (128) students 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: webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *School Renewal	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

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

		4a.3 *Students lack basic skills and math vocabulary	4a.3. * Intensive Math Classes * Destination Success or Math Triumphs intervention programs will be used to support students understanding of foundational skills. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. *Wiley's Warmups *Kagan Structures *Writing across the curriculum *Thinking Maps *Block Scheduling	4a.3. * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration *School Renewal *DA Members	4a.3. * Observations	4a.3. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**	4b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	4b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities.	4b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	4b.1. Observations and debriefing sessions	4b.1. FAA		
Mathematics Goal #4b: By June 2013 ? students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Math.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	? students in in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FAA Math	By June 2013 ? students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FAA Math.				
		4b.2. Due to the students multiple impairments they are unable to retain and recall information or effectively communicate and solve problems.	4b.2. Instructional staff will use multi-modalities to teach basic math Skills	4b.2. Teacher Administration	4b.2. Collect data on a data collection sheet as stated in IEP goals	4b.2. Data collection sheet Brigance Assessment FAA	
		4b.3 Limited abilities to apply basic facts and concepts when solving basic math problems.	4b.3 Students must be afforded multiple opportunities for re-teaching in order to gain mastery of skills and must have continuous repetition/ practice when learning math concepts.	4b.3. Teacher ESE Specialist Administration	4b.3. Students will be provided problems and given opportunities to demonstrate their understanding with oral or written explanations of math concepts by using lo tech or high tech assistive technology or visual math manipulatives	4b.3. Data Collection Teacher Observation Brigance Assessment FAA	

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

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** 23% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Math Assessment.	In June 2012, 34% (242) of students were proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 11%.	By June 2013 44% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2014 54% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2015 64% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2016 70% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2013 75% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 5%.
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013 44% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.							

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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Lack of basic skills/ foundation	5B.1. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices to support student conversation to help combat students' misconceptions.	5B.1. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5B.1. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5B.1. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment		

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

Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013 44% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	White: 59% Black: 24% Hispanic: 46%	White: 69% Black:34% Hispanic: 56%				
		5B.2. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5B.2. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5B.2. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5B.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback	5B.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

| | | 5B.3 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff. | 5B.3 *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support. | 5B.3 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration | 5B.3 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/ teacher conferencing | 5B.3 * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs | |
| | | 5B 4 Lack of basic skills, including reading, and math vocabulary | 5B4 *Wileys Warmups *Destination Math *Writing across curriculum *Math Word Walls *Goal setting and data tracking by students *Kagan Structures *Thinking Maps *Block Schedule | 5B4 Administration Math Coach School Renewal DA Members | 5B4 Observations and reflective conversations | 5B4 Common assessments, Benchmarks FCAT 2.0 | |

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5C.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5C.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5C.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5C.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

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

Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013 37% () of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	27%	37%				

		5C.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	5C.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5C.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *School Renewal *DA Members	5C.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/ teacher conferencing	5C.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5C.3 Students come with limited academic language.	5C.3 Instructional staff will engage students in daily vocabulary activities. *Imagine Learning Block Scheduling	5C.3 * Teachers * Instructional coaches *ESOL Paras School Renewal	5C.3 Academic vocabulary used by students in written and oral responses.	5C.3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County 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

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 * Math coaches * Administration	5D.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5D.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

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

Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 36% 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:*				
	26%	36%				
		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 School Renewal	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

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		
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 reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5E.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

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

Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 43%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:*					
	33%.	43%					

| | | 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
*School Renewal | 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 Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.	5E.3 Supporting students' background knowledge and situations that require the mathematics through real world videos and EDU2000. *Wiley's Warmups *Destination Math *Writing across curriculum *Kagan Structures *Thinking Maps Block Schedules	5E.3 *Teachers * Instructional Coaches School Renewal DA Members	5E.3 *Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral Language.	5E.3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment	

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Eviden2015ce-based Program(s)/ Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Wiley's Warm Ups 6 - 8	Math supplement	Title 1	$2015.00
Subtotal: $2015.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Math Coach	Coach	Title 1	$60,614.00
Subtotal: $60,614.00			
Total: $62,629.00			

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.	1.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	1.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
<u>Algebra Goal #1:</u> By June 2013, 77% (14) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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	
70% (12) of the students enrolled in Algebra I were proficient at level 3 or above on the Algebra I EOC.	By June 2013, 77% (14) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.					
		1.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	1.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher *School Renewal	1.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework *Administrative/ teacher conferencing	1.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.	2.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	2.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Algebra Goal #2: By June 2013, 27 % (4) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance :*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	17% (3) of the students enrolled in Algebra I are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-12 Algebra I EOC assessment.	By June 2013, 27% (4) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.				
		2.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	2.2 Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher *School Renewal	2.2 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework *Administrative/ teacher conferencing	2.2 * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Algebra Goal #3A: *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		

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**	3B.1. 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. and Inequalities.	3B.1. Provide all students with more practice in solving real world problems to explore and apply the use of system of equations. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3B.1. *Teachers *Instructional Coaches *Department Heads *Administration School Renewal	3B.1. * Classroom observations	3B.1. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I assessment		
Algebra Goal #3B: By June 2013, 77% (14) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	70% (12) of the students enrolled in Algebra I were proficient at level 3 or above on the Algebra I EOC.	By June 2013, 77% (14) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.				
		3B.2. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3B.2. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3B.2. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	3B.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3B.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

		3B.3 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3B.3 Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3B.3 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher	3B.3 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/ teacher conferencing	3B.3 * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	3C.1. .	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra Goal #3C: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		B.					
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: NA	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		

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	3E.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3E.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3E.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher *School Renewal	3E.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3E.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Algebra Goal #3E: By June 2013, 27% (4) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

	17% (3) of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC Assessment.	By June 2013, 27% (4) of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra EOC assessment.				
		3E.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3E.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3E.2. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher *School Renewal	3E.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/ teacher conferencing	3E.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

| | | 3E.3 Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems. | 3E.3 Supporting students' background knowledge and situations that require the mathematics through real world videos and EDU2000. | 3E.3 *Teachers * Instructional Coaches *School Renewal | 3E.3 *Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral Language. | 3E.3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment | |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

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
Math Connect/ Pearson	6-8 Math	Math Coach	6-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Go Math/ Think Central	3-5/ Math	Math Coach	3-5 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Differentiated Instruction	3-8 Math	Math Coach	3-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal

Kagan	3-8 Math	Kagan Coach	3-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Thinking Maps	3-8 Math	TM Coach	3-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Technology (Destination Math, FCAT Explorer)	3-8 Math	Math Coach	3-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Kids at Hope	3-8 Math	KAH Coach	3-8 Math Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal
Block Scheduling	6th – 8th	Staff members	6th – 8th Math Teachers	Ongoing	Observations, data chats	Administration, Math Coach, School Renewal

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 background knowledge and reading skills/ vocabulary	1a.1. *Leveled reading books in Science *Brainpop *Writing across curriculum *Kagan Structures *Discovery Education	1a.1. Administration Science Coach DA Members	1a.1. Collaborative planning; data analysis discussions Classroom Observations	1a.1. Mini-BATS, FCAT, Benchmarks		
Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 37% (89) students will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	27% (65) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	37% (89) students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment.					

| | | 1a.2.
Opportuniti es for students to express their learning in regards to science content | 1a.2.
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, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion.

Provide opportunities for teachers to apply mathematical computations in science.

Provide opportunities | 1a.2.
Science Teachers/ Science Coach/ Administration DA Members | 1a.2.
Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/ labs addressing the necessary benchmarks.

Monitor the use of nonfiction writing (e.g., Lab Reports, Conclusion writing, Current Events, etc.)

Data analysis of student needs.

Monitor students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work.

Science Bowl | 1a.2.
Classroom Observations of student work during labs

Writing prompts

Benchmark Assessments

Science Fair Projects | |

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

		for teachers to integrate literacy in the science class					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	1b.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	1b.1.Observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. FAA		
Science Goal #1b: By June of 2013, 65% (* students) will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment. •	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	60% (* students) achieved a Level 4, 5or 6 in science on the 2011/ 2012 FAA assessment	65 %(* students) will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/ 2013 FAA assessment.				
		1b.2. Opportu nities 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		

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2a.1. Variance of instructional staff's background knowledge in science.	2a.1. Develop Learning Communities (PLC) of science teachers Use of Science Fusion and all included resources	2a.1. LC Science Teacher Leaders Administration DA Members Coach	2a.1 LC Meeting Data, Student Data from Formative Assessments	2a.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT, Mini-BATS		
Science Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 8% (19 students) will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	2% (7) achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on The 2011/ 2012 FCAT assessment.	8% (19) 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 Routine. *Science Bowl	2a.2. Classroom Teachers Coach DA Members	2a.2. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	2a.2. Writing Samples, FCAT Writing, Formative/ Summative Assessments	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2b.1. Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1. Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	2.1. District PD Team ESE Specialists Administrative Team	2b.1. Observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. FAA		

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

Science Goal #2b: By June of 2013, 40% (* students) will score at a Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*				
	20% (* student) achieved a Level 7 in science on The 2011/ 2012 FAA assessment.	40% (* students) will achieve a Level 7 in science on the 2012/ 2013 FAA assessment.				

		2b.2. Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details that will limit their abilities to able 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	

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NGSSS Benchmarks	3rd – 8th	Administration, Coach	Grade level	Ongoing	Learning goals/scales	Administration

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

Science Fair Project Process	3rd – 8th	Coach	Grade level	October-May	Follow-up training, student work samples	Administration
HM/ Think Central	3-8 Science	Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Observations, Lesson Plans	Instructional coaches/ administration
Collaborative lesson design and data analysis	3-8 Science	Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Observations, Lesson Plans	Instructional coaches/ administration
Kagan	3-8 Science	Kagan Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Observations, Lesson Plans	Instructional coaches/ administration
Thinking Maps	3-8 Science	TM Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Observations, Lesson Plans	Instructional coaches/ administration
Kids at Hope	3-8 Science	Science Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Observations	Instructional coaches/ administration
Brainpop	3-8 Science	Science Coach	3-8 Science Teachers	August with on-going follow up/ support	Collaborative data chats from assessments and benchmarks	Instructional coaches/ administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude District funded						
Materials						
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount			
Supplies for experiments/ demonstrations	Science materials	Title 1	$10,000			
Subtotal: $10,000.00						

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Coach	Coach	Title 1	$54, 224.00
Subtotal: $54,224.00			
Total: $64,224.00			

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.	1a.1. Conduct site based professional development to deepen understanding of the Writing Curriculum and expectations. *Collaboratively scoring of writing in all subjects	1a.1. CCSS Site-based Grade Level/ Department Representative Team Member Coach School Renewal DA Members	1a.1. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.1. SLC Framework documentation FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment		

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

Writing Goal #1a: By June 2013, 80% (194) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 63% (153) of students scored 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	By June 2013, 80% (194) will score 3.0 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment.					
		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 School Renewal DA Member Coach	1a.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.2. SLC Framework documentation FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment	
		1a.3. Identification of resources to support the use of writing exemplars in the design of lesson plans	1a.3. Instructors will participate in Lesson Study targeting the use of CCSS Appendix C to design lessons using exemplars.	1a.3. Literacy Coach	1a.3. observations and debriefing sessions	1a.3. 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.	1b.1. Students' appropriate determination of writing structure	1b.1. Incorporate read- aloud strategies into lesson design to support guided writing practice.	1b.1. Administrative Team Literacy Coach ESE Chair Teacher	1b.1. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1b.1. SLC Framework documentation		
Writing Goal #1b: 66% (* students) will score proficient as measured by the writing portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	33% (* student) scored at 4.0 or higher on the writing portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment.	66% (* students) will score at 4.0 or higher on the writing portion of the Florida Alternate Assessment.					

		1b.2. Students' ability to sequence appropriately	1b.2. Using writing exemplars from Appendix C of the CCSS, design a variety of lessons requiring students to deconstruct and reorganize passages sequentially.	1b.2 Administrative Team Literacy Coach ESE Chair Teacher.	1b.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1b.2. SLC Framework documentation	
		1b.3. Students' ability to identify main idea and details within a paragraph.	1b.3. Using sentence strips, students will practice sorting main idea and details into paragraphs.	1b.3. Administrative Team Literacy Coach ESE Chair Teacher	1b.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1b.2. SLC Framework documentation	

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	3rd – 8th	Literacy Coach	Classroom Teachers	Ongoing	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team School Renewal
Write from the Beginning/for the Future	3rd – 8th (L. Arts)	Literacy Coach	Classroom teachers	Ongoing	Observation and Feedback	Administration School Renewal
Write Score	6th – 8th L. Arts	Literacy Coach	Classroom teachers	Ongoing	Data analysis; observation	Administration School Renewal

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 Score support			*Paid for from 2011-12 budget*
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

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

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		

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1. Student reading ability	1.1. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. Provide activities that allow students to interpret primary and secondary sources of information. Provide opportunities for students to examine opposing points of view on a variety of issues. Provide opportunities for students to utilize print	1.1. Administration Literacy Coach School Renewal	1.1. School and district assessments will be administered to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	1.1. Pre and interim assessments SLC Civics final exam SLC Framework. FCAT reading.		

		and non-print resources to research specific issues related to government/ civics; help students provide alternate solutions to the problems researched. Provide opportunities for students to participate in project-based learning activities, including Project Citizen.					
Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 24 % of students (44) will be proficient on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	Based on Civics Final Semester exam, 14% (26 students) were proficient.	By the end of the 2013 year, 24 % of students (44) will be proficient on Civics SLC final exam.				

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

		1.2. Teachers' effective use of instructional strategies	1.2 All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. Emphasis on appropriate elements from DQ1, DQ2 and DQ3. Institute regular, on-going common planning sessions for Civics teachers to ensure that the Civics curriculum is taught with fidelity and is paced so as to address all State and District Benchmarks and curricular requirements. Provide classroom activities which help students	1.2. Administration Coaches School Renewal	1.2. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework Administrative/ teacher conferencing	1.2. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework. Individual class Project Citizen portfolio including 5-step process and student writing samples.	

			develop an understanding of the content-specific vocabulary taught in government/civics.				

		1.3. Student background knowledge	1.3. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. DQ2 Elements 6, 8, 12, and 15 for teachers to establish background knowledge. In the long-term, have teachers in grades 3-5, utilize District-recommended lesson plans with assessments aligned to identified Civics benchmarks to maximize opportunities for students to master content.	1.3. Administration Coaches School Renewal	1.3. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework Administrative/ teacher conferencing	1.3. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework.	

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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant.	2.1. All strategies will include appropriate and intentional CCSS reading and writing literacy standards for History/Social Studies. DQ5 Elements 25, 29, and 32. Provide opportunities for students to write to inform and to persuade. Provide students with opportunities to discuss the values, complexities, and dilemmas involved in social, political, and economic issues; assist students in developing	2.1. Administration	2.1. School and district assessments will be administered to monitor student progress and adjust the instructional focus.	2.1. SLC Civics final exam data. SLC Framework. Individual class Project Citizen portfolio including 5-step process and student writing samples.		

		well-reasoned positions on issues. Provide opportunities for students to strengthen their abilities to read and interpret graph, charts, maps, timelines, political cartoons, and other graphic representations.					
Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, % of students () will score Level 4 or 5 on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	By the end of the year, % of students () will score Level 4 or 5 on the Civics SLC final exam.					

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
Use of Civics Item Specs and CCSS	Grade 7	Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Grades 3-5 Civics Benchmarks	Grades 3-5 and 7	Grade/Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Civics DBQ Project/ CIS	Grade 7	DBQ Trainer	Grade level	September-March	Follow-up training, student work samples	Administration
Project Citizen	Grade 7	PC Trainer	Grade level	August-January	Portfolio	Administration

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance					

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

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. Lack of transportation Lack of motivation	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MSTT/ RTI team for intervention services. Provide parents with information for the KidCare program, Florida's state insurance program for children. Perfect Attendance incentives Enforce no early pick ups after 3:15	1.1. Attendance Committee	1.1. Bi-weekly updates to Administration from the MTSS/RTI to entire faculty at faculty meetings. Administrators will ascertain health education and health prevention strategies to be implemented throughout the school.	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 96% Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by at least 10% by June 2013.	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	93.1%	96%					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	305	270					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	27	20					

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
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)

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Suspension	1.1. New Staff	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. CHAMPS	1.1. Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	1.1. Monitor referral rate and participation in incentives	1.1. PBS incentives log of attendance for students who are recognized for complying with SLC Student Code of Conduct along with monthly Skyward data reports.		
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u> Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions and number of students suspended by 10% by June 2013.	<u>2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</u>					
	#621	#550					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</u>					

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

	#240	#200				
	2012 Number of Out- of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	#677	#600				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	#249	#200				
		1.2. Lack of parental support	1.2. Deans and/or Guidance Counselor will make contact with parents or students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the SLC Student Code of Conduct.	1.2. Deans/Counselor	1.2. Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension.	1.2. Parent Contact Log, Parent sign in/out log	

Suspension 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
PD on PBS	3rd – 8th	PBS Core Team/ Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	August, ongoing	Classroom observations	Administration, PBS Core Team
PD on MTSS/RTI	3rd – 8th	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	August, ongoing	Classroom observations	Administration
CHAMPS	3rd – 8th	Civil and Safe Schools	All staff	August, ongoing	Classroom observations	Administration
Kids at Hope	3rd- 8th	Administration	All staff	August, ongoin	Classroom observations	Administration

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
CHAMPS materials	Manuals	Title 1	$4432.54
Teach Like a Champion	PD books	Title 1	$3575.14
Subtotal:$8007.68			
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
CHAMPS	PD for staff with follow-up	Title 1	$8300.00
Subtotal: $8300.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Drop Out Prevention Counselor	Counseling	Title 1	$71,432.00
Subtotal: $71,432.00			
Total: $87,739.68			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*						
.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	#	#				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	#	#				

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

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

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			
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
Counselor *repeat from suspension section*			*Repeat from suspension section* ($71,432.00)
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

<u>**Parent Involvement Goal(s)**</u>
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 <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1</u>: *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.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:</u>*	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:</u>*					
	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

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Resource Room	Materials to support home learning	Title 1	$10,000.00
Subtotal: 10,000.00			

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent/Family Education Nights	Materials/supplies for parents/families	Title 1	$10,000.00
Subtotal:$10,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:$20,000.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**					
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

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

1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level :* 	2013 Expected Level :* 					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total: $125,277.32
Mathematics Budget	
	Total: $62,629.00
Science Budget	
	Total: $64,224.00
Writing Budget	
	Total: 0
Attendance Budget	
	Total: 0
Suspension Budget	
	Total: $87,739.68
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: $20,000.00
Additional Goals	
	Total: 0
	Grand Total: $359,870.00

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.
Monitor SIP and data; prepare for 2012 – 13 school year.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount

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