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: Savanna Ridge Elementary	District Name: St. Lucie County
Principal: LaTanya Greene	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Robert Fletcher	Date of School Board Approval:

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

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

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

Principal	LaTanya Greene	School Principal (All Levels) ESE (K-12) Sociology (6-12)	1	8	**2011-2012** Assistant Principal Oak Hammock K-8 Grade-B Reading Mastery-51% Math Mastery-48% Writing Mastery-71% Science Mastery-39% Reading Learning Gains-% Math Learning Gains-% Lowest 25%-Reading-% Lowest 25%-Math-% **2010-2011** Assistant Principal Oak Hammock K-8 Grade-A Reading Mastery-67% Math Mastery-70% Writing Mastery-89%

					Science Mastery-46% AYP-77% Black, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in math. Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in reading. **2009-2010** Assistant Principal Oak Hammock K-8 Grade-B Reading Mastery-69% Math Mastery-64% Writing Mastery-87% Science Mastery-43% AYP-74% Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in math. Total, White, Hispanic, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in reading. **2008-2009**

					Assistant Principal Oak Hammock K-8 Grade-B Reading Mastery-69% Math Mastery-61% Writing Mastery-91% Science Mastery-39% AYP-74% Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in math. Black, Hispanic, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in reading. **2007-2008** Assistant Principal Oak Hammock K-8 Grade-B Reading Mastery-65% Math Mastery-64% Writing Mastery-78% Science Mastery-38% AYP-77%

					Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, & SWD-did not make AYP in math. Black, ED, & SWD did not make AYP in reading. **2006-2007** Assistant Principal-Lakewood Park Grade-C Reading Mastery-69% Math Mastery-52% Writing Mastery-76% Science Mastery-24% AYP-74% Black, Hispanic, ED, & ELL did not make AYP in reading. White, Black, Hispanic, ED, & ELL did not make AYP in math.

Assistant Principal	Mrs. Karin Huggins	Ed. S. Ed. Leadership / All Levels M.Ed. in Ed. Technology B. A. Elementary Education/ Grades1-6 Certified in ESOL Grades K-12 Certified in Primary Education / Grades K-3 Reading Endorsement	2	2	**2011-2012:** Assistant Principal of Savanna Ridge Elementary Grade: B Reading Mastery: 59% Math Mastery: 58% Writing Mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 54% Reading Learning Gains-57% Math Learning Gains-65% Lowest 25%-Reading-58% Lowest 25%-Math-57% **2010-2011:** Assistant Principal of Savanna Ridge Elementary Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 73% Science Mastery: 53% AYP: 97% All subgroups met high performance in Writing.

					Safe Harbor requirements met for all subgroups in all areas with the exception of Black students in Reading Lowest 25% increased by twelve percent from 46 to 58 percent in Reading The lowest 25% increased by thirteen percent from 69 to 81 percent in Math. **2009-2010:** Assistant Principal of Savanna Ridge Elementary Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 65% Science Mastery: 40% AYP: 74% All subgroups met high performance in writing. None of the subgroups made proficiency in the category of reading or math. **2008-2009:** Assistant Principal of Savanna Ridge Elementary Grade: A Reading Mastery: 74%

					Math mastery: 68% Science Mastery: 41% AYP: 82% Blacks and Hispanics did not make AYP in math. Blacks did not make AYP in Reading.

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)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Once the district recruits teachers, we review each applicant's qualifications to determine who will be interviewed. References are checked by school based administrators.	Principal and Assistant Principal	September 2012	
2. On-going Mentor/Mentee Program for teachers new to teaching or new to the district.	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Professional Development Team	June 2013	
3. On-going school based Professional Development for instructional staff.	District, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Professional Development Team	June 2013	
4. Formal observation for all teachers new to district including pre-observation planning and post observation reflective conversations.	Principal	August 2012- June 2013	

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
Heather Birch	Exceptional Student Education/K-12 Severe or Profound Disabilities Endorsement	VPK-ESE	Currently enrolled in classes at FAU, working closely with mentor, attending monthly meetings at district and school level.
Elizabeth Ann Shukri	Elementary Education Grades 1-6	Fourth Grade	Currently enrolled in ESOL classes to obtain Endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
48	2.08% (1)	37.50% (18)	37.50% (18)	22.92% (11)	25.% (12)	97.87% (46)	2.08% (1)	10.42% (5)	70.83% (34)

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

Dulce Lynch	Monique Whittick	Mrs. Lynch is grade chair of First Grade, an experienced teacher/ mentor in the same grade level and in the same hallway as Ms. Whittick.	● Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed profes sional developm ent. ● Utilize release time for teacher observati ons. ● One-on-one

			support and coaching provided by mentor and district liaison. ● Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives. ● Observe a highly effective teacher. ● Complete and document target skills/ activities on log. ● Site Based Professional Development on the Art

			and Science of Teaching, SLC Framework, Quality Instruction, FOCUS, Scope and Sequence, Literacy and Math Routines, MTSS, School Culture, Skyward, Etc.

Teresa Lorraine	Heather Birch	Mrs. Lorraine is an experienced teacher of students with disabilities and is knowledgeable of the policies, procedures, and best practices to service students. She is also skilled in working with students across the spectrum and providing the necessary support at all grade levels.	• Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meeting with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher. • Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed profes

			sional develo pment. ● Utilize release time for teacher observ ations. ● One-on-one suppo rt and coac hing provid ed by mentor and district liaison. ● Com plete Pinp oint content to deepen knowle dge on district initiati ves. ● Obse rve a

			highly effective teacher. • Complete and document target skills/ activities on log. • Site Based Professional Development on the Art and Science of Teaching, SLC Framework, Quality Instruction, FOCUS, Scope and

			Sequence, Literacy and Math Routines, MTSS, School Culture, Skyward, Etc.

Additional Requirements

***Coordination and Integration*-Title I Schools Only**

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

Title I, Part A Title 1 funds are used to support student based learning in Reading, Math, Science and Writing. Funds are used to purchase educational materials which support the differentiation of instruction, professional development, after school tutoring programs and parent involvement education and involvement.
Title I, Part C- Migrant The Migrant program supports both individual students and their families. Support is extended to meet academic, economic, and social needs of the family unit as it impacts the student's ability to learn.
Title I, Part D Extends support to programs that assist the family unit and students in crises. These may include giving assistance to homeless families, providing educational assistance to students in the Juvenile Justice system, special needs students through IDEA and aid to migrant families.

Title II Provides the means for teachers to participate in professional development and improve the quality of class instruction in reading, writing, math and science. These services are utilized in conjunction with Title 1, Title 111, and IDEA.
Title III Provides supplemental services for academic support in math, reading, science, and writing.
Title X- Homeless Supports the needs of homeless children with academic supplies and the necessities of everyday living in conjunction with services provided through Title 1.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) NA
Violence Prevention Programs NA
Nutrition Programs Provides information and contacts to community agencies such as food banks, Mustard Seed and The Harvest.
Housing Programs Title 1, Part A and C, coordinates with local agencies to receive support for rent, utilities, and other needs to support health living.
Head Start Support is given through Title 1, Part A and the Early Learning Coalition.
Adult Education Indian River State College provides opportunities for adults to qualify for a GED or high school diploma. This program is in coordination with local school district with Title 1, Part A and C funding.
Career and Technical Education NA
Job Training NA

Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

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:

- LaTanya-Greene-Principal
- Karin Huggins-Assistant Principal
- Alicia Moore-Guidance Counselor
- Dr. Melissa Rosenquist-School Psychologist
- Ruth Gardner-ESE Teacher
- Ken Martin-School-Based ESE Specialist
- Gina Renna-District MTSS/RtI Specialist
- Teresa Lorraine-Speech/Language Pathologist
- Evette Louhisdon-Social Worker

Elementary Teachers

- Dulce Lynch-K-2 Representative

- Rebecca Petrie-3-5 Representative

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

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

Activities of the Core PST include:

- Determining school-wide learning needs
- Developing PD for 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 and addressing barriers
- Identifying resources to implement action plans
- Monitoring fidelity and effectiveness of core, tiered support & ESE instruction
-

MTSS Core PST Chair Alicia Moore	● 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 Karin Huggins & Dr. Melissa Rosenquist	● 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 Ken Martin	● Provides periodic updates to team member regarding the amount of time left to complete a given task
Recorder Rebecca Petrie	● 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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the MTSS Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

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

MTSS Implementation

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

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

2. Managed data will include:

    Academic

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

- Attendance

Behavior

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

3. Tiered intervention data will be housed in Performance Matters and progress monitoring data in Easy-CBM. Additionally, discipline data is housed in BIR and Skyward.

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

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

4. District MTSS Specialists, School based MTSS coaches, School Psychologists, and Instructional Coaches will be providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures:

   - Positive Behavior Support (PBS)
   - CHAMPs
   - Literacy Routines/Framework
   - Math Routines/Framework
   - Behavior Framework
   - Easy CBM
   - Performance Matters

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

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).

Jenna Clark-Literacy Liaison

LaTanya Greene-Principal

Karin Huggins-Assistant Principal

Terry Lorraine-Speech Pathologist

Ken Martin-ESE Department Chair

Kirk Watson-Media Specialist

Lisa Newell-VPK

Heather Birch-ESE-VPK

Jen Kaste-Kindergarten

Patty Jones-First Grade

Melinda Kunst-Fifth Grade

Kerry Harris-Second Grade

Renee Bartley-Third Grade

Kristi Barnes-Second Grade

Robin Smith-Fourth Grade

Janet Brenner-Third Grade

Dacia Clement-ESE

Jeannine Glover-Second Grade

Dulce Lynch-First Grade

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to discuss literacy initiatives in the school/district and the most effective ways to assist teachers in the area of literacy.

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

- Implement the Literacy Routine with fidelity.
- Provide parent workshops to promote literacy learning. (e.g. FBBR- Families Building Better Readers)
- Develop a school-wide incentive plan to promote an appreciation for books and a love of reading. Students will earn rewards for specific accomplishments.
- Work with teachers to integrate vocabulary instruction throughout the entire curriculum.
- Develop a plan to integrate writing for different purposes throughout the entire curriculum.
- Assist teachers with incorporating more performance based tasks in both instruction as well as assessment.
- Begin the process of creating common rubrics for grading performance tasks.
- Use specific learning goals and scales with students.
- Provide timely and effective feedback to students.

Public School Choice

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

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

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

Pre-school and nursery schools in the area are invited to view the Pre-K school program with parents. Parents are given curriculum guides and strategies for preparing students for the school program. During the second semester of the school year, the preschool teacher becomes a member of the kindergarten planning team. Through differentiation of learning, the teacher provides kindergarten learning skills for those students who demonstrate proficiency. Students are allowed to visit the kindergarten class during reading instruction to facilitate the transition. ESOL students are given the home language survey to facilitate placement and services.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	1a.1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	1a.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the required minimum Civics content for grades 3 – 5.	1a.1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	1a.1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #1a: By June 2013, 65% (209) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59% (189) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June 2012, 65% (209) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					

		1a.2. 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities exists among instructional staff to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework.	1a.2. 1.Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	1a.2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	1a.2. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting of SLC Framework for Quality Instruction 3.Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	1a.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		1a.3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development to design reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2.Instructional and peer coaching.	1a.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	1a.3. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	1a.3. 1.Student responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale. .	

		1a.4. 1.The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary	1a.4. 1. Emphasize reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching which help students determine the meaning of words by using context clues. Literacy Coach will train teachers on using this strategy throughout content areas. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. 2. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	1a.4. 1. The literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 2.The MTSS team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1a.4. 1.Common weekly teacher generated assessments. 2.Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 3.Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. 4. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.							
Reading Goal #1b: There are no students in this category.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.	2a.1. 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. 1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	2a.1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	2a.1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	2a.1. 1. SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #2a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June of 2013, 35% (114) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.							
	27% (86) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 35% (114) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					
		2a.2. 1. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	2a.2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	2a.2. 1.Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	2a.2. 1. SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		3a.3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2. Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	3a.3. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. 1. Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.	

		4a.4. 1. The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	4a.4. 1. Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources derived from informational text. 2. Journeys core advanced materials will be used to support enrichment instruction. 3. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery of enrichment instruction.	4a.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	4a.4. 1. The Literacy Coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 2. The MTSS team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	4a.4. 1.Common weekly teacher generated assessments. 2.Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 3. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. 4. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. 5. Journeys unit assessments. 6. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of above target goal– Level 4.	

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.	2b.1.	2b.1	2b.1	2b.1	2b.1.		
Reading Goal #2b: There are currently no students taking FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3a.1. 1. Common Core Standards present new challenges for instructional staff to gain a deep understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	3a.1. 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 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	3a.1 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core knowledge and understanding.	3a.1. 1. SLC Framework for Quality Instruction 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #3a: By June of 2013, 62% (203) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (183) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June of 2013, 62% (203) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					

		3a.2 1. A broad range of knowledge and abilities exist among instructional staff to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework consistently.	3a.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and opportunities for self-reading.	3a.2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	3a.2. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. 3. Administrative/Teacher conferences.	3a.2. 1.SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		3a.3. 1.The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. 1.Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	3a.3. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. 1.Student responses from teacher-made performance task items.	

		3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary	3a.4. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3a.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3a.4. *The reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	3a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	3b.1. .	3b.1	3b.1	3b.1	3b.1.		

Reading Goal #3b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4A.1. **Common Core Standards present new challenges for instructional staff to gain a deep 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.	4A.1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	4A.1 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4A.1. 1. SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #4a: By June 2013 65% (213) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58% (186) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	By June 2012 65% (213) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
		4a.2 1. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	4a.2. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferences.	4a.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		4a.3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	4a.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	4a.3. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	4a.3. 1.Student responses from teacher made performance task items.	

		4a.4. 1. The students come to school with limited background knowledge.	4a.4. 1. Teachers will utilize Journeys toolkit to support background knowledge deficits. 2. St. Lucie County literacy routines will support background knowledge through read-alouds.	4a.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	4a.4. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. 1.Journeys unit assessments 2.Common weekly teacher generated Assessment. 2.Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 3. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. 4. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment.	

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.		
Reading Goal #4b: There are currently no students taking the FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 60% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In June 2012, 63% of students were proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 3.3%.	By June 2013 67% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6.7%.	By June 2014 70% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2015 73% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 13.3%.	By June 2016 77% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 16.6%.	By June 2017 80% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 20%.

Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013, 67% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6.7%.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. 1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5B.1. 1.Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5B1 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5B.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.1. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2012, 50% (70) Black and 57% (74) Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.							

	52% Black and 45% Hispanic students made satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: 0 Black: 52% Hispanic: 45% Asian: 0 American: 0 Indian: 0	By June 2013, 50% (70) Black and 57% (74) Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: Black: 57% Hispanic: 50% Asian: American Indian:					
		5B.2 1. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5B.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5B.2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5B.2. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferences.	5B.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		5B3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5B.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2.Instructional and peer coaching.	5B.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5B3. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5B.3. 1.Student responses from teacher made performance task items.	
		5B.4. 1.Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5B.4. 1. Students will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts to support assessment deficiencies. 2. Journeys core will provide opportunities to make text-to-self connections combined with evidence from the text to draw conclusions and make inferences.	5B.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5B.4. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Student think-alouds will provide evidence to support their ability to make inferences and draw conclusions.	5B.4. 1.Journeys unit assessments 2.Common weekly teacher generated assessments 3.Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 4. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3 5. Results from the 2013 FCAT 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 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. 1.Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5c.1. 1.Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5c1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration	5c1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5c1. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		

Reading Goal #5C: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5c.2 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5c.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5c2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration	5c.2. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5c.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		5c.3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2.Instructional and peer coaching.	5c.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	5c.3. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5c.3. 1.Student responses from teacher-made performance task items based on the performance scale.	

		5a.4. 1. Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 1: VOCABULARY	5a.4. 1.Teachers will utilize Journeys leveled readers for ELL students and implement Journeys suggested lessons to support vocabulary deficiencies. 2. St. Lucie County literacy routines word work will support instructional vocabulary focus.	5a.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5a.4. 1. Students' academic language will increase understanding of vocabulary and through authentic writing tasks and oral expression.	5a.4. 1. Weekly common grade level assessment tests. 2.Teacher observation 3.Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 4.FCAT 2.0	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5d.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5d.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5d1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5d1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d1. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5D: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	.	5d.2 1. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading. 2. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support continued professional development.	5d2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5d.2. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5d.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	

		5d.3. 1.The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5d.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2.Instructional and peer coaching.	5d.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5d.3. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5d.3. 1.Student responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.	

		5d.4. 1. Teacher deficiencies in preparedness to work with students with disabilities.	5d.4. 1. Teachers will be trained to support students with disabilities with the Journeys toolkit across all reporting categories. 2. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support student disabilities continued professional development.	5d.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5d.4. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	5d.4. 1.Weekly common grade level assessment tests. 2.Easy CBM progress monitoring 3.Journeys unit assessments 4.FCAT 2.0	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. 1. Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5E.1. 1.Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5E1. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration	5E1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5E1. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
Reading Goal #5E: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	.	5E.2 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff	5E.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5E2. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration	5E.2. 1. Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. 3.Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5E.2. 1.SLC Framework 2.Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
		5E.3. 1.The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5E.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2.Instructional and peer coaching	5E.3. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teacher	5E.3. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Individual and collaborative review of student work.	5E.3. 1.Student responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.	

		5d.4. 1.The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT2.0 reading test was REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5d.4. 1. Teachers will utilize Journeys in conjunction with Thinking Maps to increase understanding of text structure. 2. The students will participate in literacy routines each day to deepen knowledge and provide practice with identifying components of literary analysis.	5d.4. 1.District Professional Development Team 2.Literacy Coach 3.Administration 4.Teachers	5d.4. 1. Student created Thinking Maps will serve as a discussion processing tool. 2. Summaries will be written based on evidence from text.	5d.4. 1.Weekly common grade level assessment tests 2.Easy CBM progress monitoring 3.Journeys unit assessments 4.FCAT 2.0	

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
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	Pre-K - 5	Teacher Leader/ Administration	School-wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-5	Teacher Leader/ Administration	School-wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Annual Reading Conference	K-5	Teacher Leader/ Administration	Designated Teachers and Administration	October 2012	Grade Level PD	Administration
Collaboration Days for Instructional Planning	K-5	District Professional Developers, Curriculum Specialists, Administrative Team	All Teachers	October 2012, November 2012, February 2013, May 2013	Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans	District Professional Developers, Curriculum Specialists, Administrative Team
Thinking Maps	K-5	District Professional Developers, Administrative Team	All Teachers	On- Going Aug-May	Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans	District Professional Developers, Administrative Team

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development: Annual Reading Conference, Collaborative Planning			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Annual Reading Conference	Common Core/Best Practices/RtI	Title 1	2,500.
Collaborative Planning	Common Core Materials/Assessment Data/ RtI	Title 1	2,500.
Subtotal: $5,000.			
Other: After School Tutorial			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
After School Tutorial	Stipends	Title 1	18,000.
Supplemental Reading Materials	Grade Specific Supplemental Reading Materials	Title 1	1,200.
General Reading Supplies	Classroom Reading Supplies	Title 1	1,500.
Subtotal: $20,700.			
Total: $25,700.			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1. 1.ELL students need to learn English as core content and social/spoken English in order to communicate effectively.	1. Language Experience Approach 1.Utilize a Language Experience Approach where students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	1.1. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	1.1. 1.Teachers provide on-going formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	1.1. 1.CELLA	
CELLA Goal #1: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 35.8% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 40.8% of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA.***	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 35.8% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.***					

		1.2.	1.2. Modeling 1.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. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	1.2. 1.Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. 1.CELLA
		1.3.	1.3. Cooperative Learning Group 1.Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	1.3. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	1.3. 1.Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.3. 1.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. 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. 1.Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge. 2. Utilizing Journeys ELL materials.	2.1. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. 1.Formative Assessment	2.1. 1.CELLA	

CELLA Goal #2: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 43.2% of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 48.8% 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, 43.2% of ELL students were proficient in Reading.***					
		2.2.	2.2. 1.Reading aloud to students helps them develop and improve literacy skills.	2.2. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. 1.Timed Student Reading	2.2. 1.CELLA

		2.3	2.3 1.Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 1.Formative Assessments	2.3 1.CELLA
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. 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. 1. A dialog journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialog journals provide a communicative context for language and writing development.	2.1. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. 1.Journals	2.1. 1.CELLA	

CELLA Goal #3: ***Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 25.9% of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 30.9% 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, 25.9% of ELL students were proficient in Writing.***					
		2.2.	2.2. 1.Graphic Organizers	2.2. 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. 1.Student Work	2.2. 1.CELLA
		2.3	2.3 1.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 1.Administration 2.Literacy Coach 3.Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 1.Student Writing Samples	2.3 1.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
Graphic Organizers/Books	Word to Word Heritage Dictionaries	Title 1	1,500.
Subtotal: $1,500.			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal: $1,500.			
Total: $1,500.			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1a.1. 1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1a.1. 1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1a.1. 1.District professional development team 2.Instructional coaches 3.Administration 4.Teacher	1a.1. 1.Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	1a.1. 1 St. Lucie County framework 2.Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 65% (213) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58% (186) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	By June 2013, 65% (213) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.					
		1a.2. 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1a.2 1.District professional development team 2.Administration 3.Teacher	1a.2. 1.Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2.Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework 3.Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. 1.St. Lucie County framework 2.Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		1a.3. Students have limited opportunities to demonstrate thinking and reflection through written response.	1a.3. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding.	1a.3. 1. District professional development team 2.Administration 3.Teacher	1a.3. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.3. 1. Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.							
There are currently no students taking the FAA.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2a.1. 1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. 1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (Full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2a.1. 1.District professional development team 2.Administration 3.Teacher	2a.1. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. 1.St. Lucie County framework 2.Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 30% (98) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	21% (68) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	By June 2013, 30% (98) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		2a.2. 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. 1. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 1. District professional development team 2.Administration 3.Teacher	2a.2. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework 3.Administrative/teacher conferencing	2a.2. 1. St. Lucie County framework 2.Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		2a.3. 1. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	2a.3. 1 Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding 2. Instructional and peer coaching	2a.3. 1. District professional development team 2. Teachers 3. Instructional coaches 4.Administration	2a.3. 1.Administrative observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Individual and collaborative review of student work	2a.3. 1.Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.							
There are currently no students being Alternately Assessed.							

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. 1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. 1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. 1.District professional development team 2.Math coaches 3.Administration	3a.1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	3a.1. 1. St. Lucie County framework 2. Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 65% (213) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	57% (183) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2012 65% (213) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

		3a.2. 1.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. 1.Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3a.2 1.District professional development team 2.Administration 3.Teacher	3a.2. 1.Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2.Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework 3.Administrative/teacher conferencing	3a.2. 1. St. Lucie County framework 2. Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		3a.3. 1.The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *1.Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. 2. Instructional and peer coaching	3a.3. 1. District professional development team 2. Teachers 3.Instructional coaches 4.Administration	3a.3. 1.Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2.Individual and collaborative review of student work	3a.3. 1. Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		3a4. 1.Teachers lack of use of manipulatives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.	3a4. 1. GoMath! Grab-N-Go materials 2.St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. 3. Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results, including in problem situations	3a4. 1.Teachers 2.Instructional coaches 3. Administration	3a4. 1. Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a4. 1. Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks 2.Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment 3.Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.							
There are no students currently being alternately assessed.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4a.1. 1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. 1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (Full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	4a.1. 1.District professional development team 2 Administration	4a.1. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback 2. Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	4a.1. 1.St. Lucie County framework 2.Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #4a By June 2013 65% (25) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	57% (20) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2013 65% (25) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	4a.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	4a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	4a.3. * Student responses from teacher- made performance task items	
		4a4. *Students lack the foundation of number sense.	4a4. * GoMath! RtI Support * Think Central Strategic Intervention * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a4 * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration	4a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	4a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.							

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	**2011-2012**					**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** 60% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math.					By June 2016 77% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 16.6%.	By June 2017 80% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 20%.
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 67% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 6.7%.							

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		
	5a.1 *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5a.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #5B: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		5a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5a.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		5a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was reporting : Numbers and Operations in base 10	5a.4. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices	5a.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5a.4. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	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 reflective of Common Core understanding.	5c.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #5C: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE. .	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		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	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. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5c.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5c.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5c.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
		5c.4. Students come with limited academic language.	5c.4. Instructional staff will engage students in daily vocabulary activities.	5c.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5c.4. Academic vocabulary used by students in written and oral responses.	5c.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5d.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5d.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5d.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5d.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5d.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		
Mathematics Goal #5D: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		5d.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5d.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5d.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
		5d.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5d.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5d.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5d.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5d.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	

		5d.4. Due to the nature and severity of the individual's disability, students have difficulty processing multi-step problems.	5d.4. Using research based strategies, provide explicit instruction in solving multi-step problems and provide students with step-by-step support for problem-solving.	5d.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5d.4. * Observation of student independently applying step-by-step problem solving	5d.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5e.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5e.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5e.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5e.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs		

Mathematics Goal #5E: WAITING ON DATA FROM DOE.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5e.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5e.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	

		5e.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5e.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5e.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5e.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5e.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items	
		5e.4. Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.	5e.4. Use literature in mathematics to provide the meaning necessary for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and make connections with real-world situations	5e.4. *Teachers * Instructional Coaches	5e.4. *Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral language.	5e.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Go Math and Technology PD	K-5	District PD Liaison, Math Curriculum Specialist	All Teachers	On-going Aug-May	Classroom Observation, student work	Administrative team, District Support Staff
FC for Teachers of Mathematics	K-5	Instructional Strategies	Identified Teachers	October, 2012	Tickets to try, grade level Professional Development	Administrative Team, District Support Staff
Math Routines to include Differentiated Instruction and Centers	K-5	District PD Liaison, Math Curriculum Specialist	All Teachers	Ongoing, Aug- May	Classroom Observation, student work	Administrative team, district Support Staff

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Florida Conference for Teachers of Mathematics	Copy and Paste	Title 1	3,500.
Subtotal:			

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Go Math and Technology PD	District PD Liasion, and District Math Specialist	Title 1	
Math Routine to include Differentiated Instruction and Centers	District PD Liasion, and District Math Specialist	Title 1	
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Mathematics Goals

2013 School Improvement Plan – DRAFT

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving						

	Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1a.1. Lack of multiple resources to meet the science NGSSS standards	1a.1. Provide common planning time for team collaboration on various instructional strategies.	1a.1. Grade Group Chair	1a.1. Team Meeting Data Elements	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation Framework		

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

Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 50% (54) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	42%(44) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	50%(54) of students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment.					
		1a.2. Time and funding for professional development	1a.2. Implement and train teachers on the 5e lesson model as the standard for science instruction.	1a.2. Science Committee/ District	1a.2. Professional development surveys	1a.2. Teacher Evaluation Framework	

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

			data from tables in order to find averages or differences. • Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science. • Instruction in grades K-5 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.		assessments and utilize results to drive instruction. • Monitor students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work.		

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.							
N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

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

		school in order to ensure continuity of concepts taught and to stress the importance of the New Generation SS Standards. • Use of Science Fusion and all included resources					
Science Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 20% (22) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

	12%(13) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/ 2012 FCAT assessment.	20%(22) students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2012/ 2013 FCAT assessment.					
		2a.2. Students need to master informational reading and nonfiction writing.	2a.2. Infuse Science into the Literacy Block.	2a.2. Classroom Teachers	2a.2. Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	2a.2. Writing Samples, FCAT Writing, Formative/Summative Assessments	
		2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.							
N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Science Professional Development

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

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

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1a.1. Knowledge of the Anchor Standards for Writing as outlined in the CCSS for K – 5.	1a.1. Conduct grade level specific professional development to deepen understanding of Writing curriculum and expectations.	1a.1. CCSS Site-based Grade Level Representative Team Member and Assistant Principal	1a.1. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.1. SLC Framework documentation		

Writing Goal #1a: By June 2013, 90% (101) 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, 79% (88) of the students scored 3.0 or higher as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	By June 2013, 90% (101) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.					

		1a.2. Students' appropriate use of conventions of writing and use of details that include high levels of vocabulary	1a.2. Classroom instructors will utilize Appendix C from CCSS ELA to model exemplars in writing.	1a.2 Administrative Team	1a.2. Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1a.2. SLC Framework documentation	
		1a.3. Appropriate implementation according to the research supporting Write From the Beginning	1a.3. K – 2 Teachers will participate in Lesson Study targeting Write From the Beginning lessons.	1a.3. Reading Coach	1a.3. Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1a.3. Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.							
.N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

Writing Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Anchor Standards	K – 5	Grade Level CCSS Rep.	Classroom Teachers	August 2013	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write From the Beginning	Grade 3 and Grade 4 Writing	District Trainer	All 3rd Grade Teachers, Identified teachers in Grade 4.	September 2013	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write From the Beginning (Thinking Maps)	Binder of Resources	Title I	$375.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write From the Beginning (Thinking Maps)	Substitutes for 3 teachers x 3 days	Title I	$675.00
Lesson Study	Substitutes for 5 teachers x 3 days	General Fund	$675.00
Subtotal: $1,725.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance**						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Attendance	1.1. Truancy increased by 8% from the previous year.	1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MSTT/RTI team for intervention services.	1.1. Assistant Principal	1.1. Bi-weekly updates to Administration from the MTSS/ RTI and to entire faculty at faculty meetings.	1.1. Truancy logs and attendance rosters.		

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

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 94% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated by June 2013. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5% by June 2013.							
	%	%					

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
	#	#					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	#	#					
		1.2. Illnesses – excused absences have increased by 10% from previous year.	1.2. Provide parents with information for the KidCare program, Florida's state insurance program for children.	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Administrators will ascertain health education and health prevention strategies to be implemented throughout the school.	1.2. Attendance rosters	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	**Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension**						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. The total number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions increased from XXX incidents during the 2010-11 school year to XXX in the 2011-12 school year, an increase of XXX incidents. There are limited opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior.	1.1. Create incentives through school-based Positive Behavior Supports and/or MTSS/RTI to recognize and reward positive compliance on St. Lucie County Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	1.1. Monitor behavior incident report and BIR monthly.	1.1. PBS incentives log of attendance for students who are recognized for complying with SLC Student Code of Conduct along with monthly BIR/ Skyward data reports.		

Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
	#14	#12.6					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
	#10	#9					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	#84	#75.6					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	#41	#36.9					

		1.2.	1.2. 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. Counselor	1.2. Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on in/ out of school suspension.	1.2. Parent Contact Log, Parent sign in/ out log	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Suspension Professional Development

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD on PBS	K12	PBS Core Team/ Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	January, 2012		
PD on MTSS/RTI	K12	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	October, 2012		
Breakfast for Bus Drivers (PD)	Behavior	AP/ PBSCoach/ PBSTeam Leader	Bus Drivers	September, 2012		

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Parent Involvement <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1. For Title One Schools only, you can insert your Parent Involvement Plan (PIP) here. All others, contact Sarita Ricks: SARITA.RICKS@stluciescholls.org 772.429-7694	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		

This Title I school will upload their PIP.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget

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

Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:* *Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:* *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
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* (Refer to Technical Assistance and align with District Stem Objectives and Goals.)	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through

Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional

Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:

Science Budget
Total:
Writing Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:
Grand Total:

Differentiated Accountability

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
☐Priority	☐Focus	☐Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

▢ Yes ▢ No

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

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

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount