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: Manatee Academy K-8	District Name: St. Lucie County
Principal: Lillian Beauchamp	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Barbara Barker	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	Lillian Beauchamp	Masters in Counselor Education, Specialist in Educational Leadership/ English 6-12, Guidance and Counseling K-12, School Principal	1	8	Principal Manatee Academy K8: '12 Assistant Principal Fort Pierce Central High: '11, '10, '09, '08, '07, '06, '05 School Grade: B, C, C, D, C, D, D, C Proficiency (Reading): 52, 42, 44, 37, 32, 23, 27, 27 Proficiency (Math): 51, 73, 67, 61, 53, 45, 51, 51 Proficiency (Writing): 83, 85, 86, 81, 86, 76, 72, 73 Proficiency (Science): 47, 38, 27, 18, 21, 26, --, -- Learning Gains (Reading): 65, 48, 47, 47, 48, 48, 43, 51 Learning Gains (Math): 62, 77, 72, 65, 73, 69, 66, 66 Lowest 25% (Reading): 66, 42, 39, 48, 50, 62, 47, 62 Lowest 25% (Math): 62, 78, 59, 56, 80, 74, --, -- AYP:

					2012 – Not Available 2011 – Not Available 2010 – Not Available 2009 – NO, 72%: only males made AYP in math 2008 – NO, 69%: only whites made AYP in math 2007 – NO, 69%: only whites made AYP in math 2006 – NO, 56%: only whites made AYP in math, reading 2005 – N/A
Assistant Principal	Peggy Chase	Masters in Curriculum and Instruction in Secondary Science Education/ Educational Leadership (all Levels)	5.5	18	Assistant Principal Manatee Academy: '12, '11, '10, '09, '08, '07 School Grade: B, A, B, B, B, C Proficiency (Reading): 52, 69, 66, 66, 66, 71 Proficiency (Math): 51, 70, 66, 61, 63, 62 Proficiency (Writing): 83, 89, 83, 82, 81, 86 Proficiency (Science): 47, 53, 37, 43, 37, 28 Learning Gains (Reading): 65, 66, 65, 65, 67, 63 Learning Gains (Math): 62, 70, 67, 59, 69, 48 Lowest 25% (Reading): 66, 71, 65, 64, 63, 51 Lowest 25% (Math): 62, 73, 68, 59, 68, 49 AYP: 2012 –Not Available 2011 – NO, __%: (Reading-Black, ED, SWD) (Math-Black, SWD) (Writing-SWD) 2010 – NO, 79%: (Reading-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Black, Hispanic, SWD) 2009 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Total, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, EWD) 2008 – NO, 72%: (Reading-Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) (Math-Total, Black, Hispanic, ED, SWD) 2007 – NO, 95%: (Math-Black, ED)
Assistant Principal	Melissa Hutchings	Masters in Educational Leadership (All Levels), English Grades 5-9	0	0	Assistant Principal: N/A

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

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

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

N/A	None	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. Interview Process by administration; Secure quality staff with a similar philosophy.	Principal	ongoing	ongoing
2. New teachers attend district-based orientation	District	ongoing	ongoing
3. New teachers attend school-based induction meeting	Principal/Assistant Principal	ongoing	ongoing
4. Enhanced resources, e.g., in class library, access to technology for instructional and administrative purposes	Assistant Principal	ongoing	ongoing
5. School-based professional development and/or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	Team Leaders	ongoing	ongoing
6. High-quality teacher mentoring, induction, and/or subject-specific coaching	Team Leaders	ongoing	ongoing

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
ALBERTS, SHARON	Elementary Ed. K-6	4th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
BAUMGARTEN, ANGELA	Exceptional Student Ed. K-12	ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
BIHARI, ASHLEY	English 5-9, Math 5-9	5th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
BIHARI , CALEB	PreK/Primary Ed, Reading Endorsement	1st	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
BOUHUYS, ELIZABETH	Elementary Ed. K-6	5th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
BURCH-LABAFF, BRENDA	Elem Ed K-6, ESE K-12	ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
CROSBY, KRISTIN	English 6-12, Reading Endorsement	7th/8th Reading	Out-of-Field/Pursue Reading endorsement/Professional Plan
DERISI, STEPHANIE	MG English 5-9	Drama	Not HQ (SAE, Elem. K-6 & MGIC): SLC will reimburse SAE reg. fees.
DERISI, STEPHANIE	MG English 5-9	Drama	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan

FERRARI, JOSEPH	Elementary Ed. K-6, Exceptional Student Ed. K-12	ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
GOLDENBERG, FELICE	Elem Ed K-6	Kindergarten	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
HANNAH, ROBIN	Exceptional Student Ed. K-12, ESOL Endorsement	7th/8th Reading	Out-of-Field/Pursue Reading endorsement/Professional Plan
HAZLETT, HEATHER	Guidance And Counseling, PK-12	4th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
KAVALIAUSKAS, NICOLE	Primary Ed K – 3, Educational Leadership	Kindergarten	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
KERIAZIS, ELENA	Pre-K/Primary (Age 3-Grade 3)	1st	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
LABAFF, LEE	Elementary Ed. 1-6, Varying Exceptionalities K-12	ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
MORA, KATHRYN	Emot Hand K-12, Hist 6-12, MGIC 5-9, MG	7th-8th/Social Studies	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL & Reading endorsement/Prof. Plan
MORRIS, SARA	Elem Ed K-6	5th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
RIFE, PAIGE	Exceptional Student Ed. K-12 MG English 5-9 Elementary Ed. K-6	ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
ROBERTS, NICOLE	MGIC 5-9, ESE K-12	8th/ESE	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
SCOTTO, VINCENT	Elem Ed K-6 Math 5-9 Ed. Leadership (All Levels)	5th	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
SHEFFER, CURTIS	VE K-6	ESE-VE-Self-Contained	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
SLOCUM, BRIENNE	English 6-12	7th/8th Language Arts	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
WEIXLER, CLIFF	English 5-9	6th/Language Arts	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan
WYATT, AMBER	Elem Ed K-6, ESE K-12	3rd	Out-of-Field/Pursue ESOL endorsement/Professional Plan

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

100	7% (7)	37% (37)	23% (23)	33% (33)	31% (31)	N/A	8% (8)	3% (3)	57% (57)

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
Judith Dortival	Robert Friend	Math teachers	As per district
Maggie King	Bethany Hurles	LA teachers/grade 8	As per district
Maggie King	Brienne Slocum	LA teachers	As per district
Lisa Kelly	Sharon Alberts	Grade 4 teachers	As per district
Agatha Cason	Dennis Rookwood	Math teachers	As per district
Barbara Barker	Kristin Crosby	Reading teachers	As per district
Jannifer Thomas	Stephanie Derisi	Performing arts teachers	As per district
Vincent Scotto	Elizabeth Bouhuys	Grade 5 teachers	As per district
Carol Murray	Jared Lamborn	Civics teachers	As per district
Hazel Wells	Tracy Lermond	ESE teachers	As per district
Paige Rife	Samantha Vandegrift	ESE teachers	As per district
Rebecca Wayne	Judy Nova	Science teachers	As per district
Marilee Seymour	Casey Dayton	ESE teachers	As per district
Heather Hazlett	Donna Teixeira	Highly Effective teacher	As per district
Angela Baumgarten	Samantha Vandegrift	ESE teachers	As per district
Elena Keriazis	Tracey Mathey	Grade 1 teachers	As per district
Robin Hannah	Debbie McNiesh	Reading teachers	As per district

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

Additional Requirements

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

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

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

Suggested Members include:
- Administrators
- RTI:B Team Liaison
- School Counselor
- School Psychologist
- School-Based ESE Specialist
- District RTI Specialist

Elementary
- K-2 Representative
- 3-5 Representative

Secondary
- Teacher Representatives

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

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

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

Various School Teams

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

Group PST
Elementary

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

Middle

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

Individual PST

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

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

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.
4. The leadership team will consider the end of year data.

MTSS Implementation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

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

2. District RTI Specialists, School Psychologists, and the Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Support Coach will be providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures.

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).

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
- Administrators
- Media Specialist
- Reading Department
- ESE Chairperson
- K-5 Representative

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
• Team meets monthly to review school wide assessment data, recommend interventions, assign models/support for classroom teachers, provide training, and organize information for parents.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
• Implementation of the CCSS
• Adherence to the SLC Literacy Routines.

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

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

Teachers of grades 6-8 will teach vocabulary across the content by focusing on key words within the subject areas: evidence will include but is not limited to word walls, vocabulary test items, etc.	
In order to increase student comprehension while reading subject area informational text, teachers of grades 6-8 will continue to use Thinking Maps to encourage students to analyze content reading: evidence will include students' use of thinking maps to demonstrate understanding.	
Reading across the content area professional development will be offered to all teachers of grades 6-8. This professional development was first proposed and approved by the Building Level Planning Team and facilitated by the Media Specialist during the 2012-2013 school year.	

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS
Reading Goals

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. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	1a. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013, 61% (915) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	52% (571) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June 2013, 61% (915) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					
			1a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	1a.2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	1a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of SLC Framework for Quality Instruction	1a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

				(Framework). *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	
		1a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	1a.3. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	1a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	1a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.
		1a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary	1a.4. * Emphasize reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching which help students determine the meaning of words by using context clues. Teacher Leaders will train teachers on using this strategy throughout content areas. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a.4. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	1a.4. *The teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**		1b.1. *Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	1b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	1b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools
Reading Goal #1b: By June 2013, 50% (13) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 38% (10) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 4, 5,	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 50% (13) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level				

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
and 6 on the FAA Reading Test.	4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test.						
			1b.2. *Discerning relevant details from a passage using auditory processing.	1b.2. *Daily read aloud practice to process and coach students based on appropriate access points.	1b.2. *District Support Team *Administration *Teacher.	1b.2. *The teacher will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment. *IEP team will review as needed to develop and/or revise plan.	1b.2. *Teacher generated assessment based on IEP goals *Brigance Assessment
			1b.3. *Students have processing challenges for recalling information and supporting details	1b.3. *Use read alouds, auditory tapes, and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols.	1b.3. *Administration *Teacher.	1b.3. *Students' written or oral responses	1b.3. *Student performance tasks on teacher made assessments *Teacher observation. *Brigance Assessment
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading.			2a.1.
			*Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.
				2a.1.
				*Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.
					2a.
					*District Professional Development Team
					
					  *Administration
					
					  *Teacher
						2a.
						* Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.
						
						* Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.
							2a.1.
							*SLC Framework
							*Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

Reading Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 29% (305) of students in grades 3-8 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 26% (284) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 29% (305) of students in grades 3-8 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading					

		Test.					

			2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	2a.2. *District Professional Development Team Administration Teacher	2a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	2a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team * Administration *Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made—performance task items.
			4a.4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	4a.4. –*Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources derived from informational text. * Journeys core advanced materials will be used to support enrichment instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery of enrichment instruction.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	4a.4. *The teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	4a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments. *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of above target goal– Level 4.
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	2b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Reading Goal #2b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013, 30%							

(8) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	19% (5) of the students in grades 3-8 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.	By June 2013, 30% (8) of students in grades 3-8 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Reading Test.					
			2b.2. *Limited schema with fiction, nonfiction, and informational texts	2b2. *Students will be exposed to fiction, nonfiction, and informational text and be taught to identify the differences using Thinking Maps.	2b.2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	2b.2. *Observation of DQ 3 Element 18	2b.2. *Feedback using Frameworks *FAA
			2b.3 *Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	2b.3 *Research based strategies to enhance vocabulary and effectively utilize context clues should be explicitly taught to students (e.g.: pictures accompanying print; pictures should be faded for long-term comprehension and retention.).	2b.3 *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	2b.3 *Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	2b.3 *Teacher made assessments *FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: By June of 2013, 72% (745) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 65% (705) of the students in grades 3-8 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 72% (745) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning	3a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	3a.1 *.District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	3a.1 *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

	Reading Test.	gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					
			3a.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	3a.2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	3a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	3a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team *Administration * Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative - review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.
			3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary	3a.4. *Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3a.4. * District Professional Development Team *Administration * Teacher	3a.4. *The teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	3a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.**			3b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	3b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Reading Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 65% (11) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 59% (10) of the students in grades 3-8 made learning gains on the FAA Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 65% (11) of the students in grades 3-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Reading Test					
			3b.2. *Limited teacher training on rubric interpretation and effective instructional strategies to achieve levels of proficiency.	3b.2. *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities to gain a higher level of understanding of the rubrics and how to interpret the data to drive instruction.	3b.2. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	3b.2. *Bi-monthly collaborative meetings to review student data to design effective instructional strategies to support student deficits.	3b.2. *Teacher generated assessments and data collection tools *FAA
			3b.3 *Students' lack of understanding the use of context clues to comprehend the text	3b.3 *Vocabulary should be introduced to students with pictures and print. Pictures should be faded for long-term comprehension and retention. *Direct instruction of context clues.	3b.3 *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	3b.3 *Increased percentage of time students use new vocabulary appropriately	3b.3 *Teacher generated assessments *Brigance Assessment *FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. *Common Core Standards present new	4A.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional	4A1 *District Professional Development Team	4A.1 * Administration observation of effective implementation with	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

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

Reading Goal #4a: By June 2013 76% (113) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	66% (121) students in grades 3-8 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	By June 2013 76% (113) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	*Administration * Teacher	feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	
			4a.2.A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration	4a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	4a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	4a.3. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	4a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	4a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.
			4a.4. *The students come to school with limited background knowledge.	4a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys toolkit to support background knowledge deficits. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will support background knowledge through read alouds.	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team * Administration *Teacher	4a.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. .

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

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**		N/A				
Reading Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
.						

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 53% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In June 2012, 52% of students were proficient in Reading.	By June 2013 61% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 9%.	By June 2014 65% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2015 69% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2016 73% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2017 77% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 4%.
Reading Goal #5A: By June 2013, 61% of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 9%.						

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**			5B.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5B.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5B1 *District Professional Development Team *Administration Teacher	5B1 *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5B: By June 2013, 51% Black, 68% White, 78% Asian and 58% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 41% Black and 49% Hispanic students made satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: 60 Black: 41% Hispanic: 49% Asian: 56 American: 0 Indian: 0	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 51% Black, 68% White, 78% Asian and 58% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. White: Black: 57% Hispanic: 50% Asian: American Indian:					
			5B.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	5B.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5B.2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	5B.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5B.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			5B3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5B.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding.	5B.3. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	5B3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5B.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.

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

			*Instructional and peer coaching.			
		5B.4. *Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5B.4. * Students will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts to support assessment deficiencies. *Journeys core will provide opportunities to make text-to-self connections combined with evidence from the text to draw conclusions and make inferences.	5B.4. * District Professional Development Team *Administration *Teacher	5B.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Student think alouds will provide evidence to support their ability to make inferences and draw conclusions.	5B.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. .
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: By June of 2013, 29% of ELL students in grades 3-8 will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 33% of students in grades 3-8 made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 29% of ELL students in grades 3-8 will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	5c.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. *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 Administration	5c1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5c1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
		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: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5c2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration	5c.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5c.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs

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

		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 *Teacher *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 based on the performance scale. .
		5a.4. * Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 1: VOCABULARY	5a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys leveled readers for ELL students and implement Journeys suggested lessons to support vocabulary deficiencies. *St. Lucie County literacy routines word work will support instructional vocabulary focus.	5a.4. * District Professional Development Team *Teacher * Administration	5a.4. *Students' academic language will increase understanding of vocabulary and through authentic writing tasks and oral expression.	5a.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Teacher observation *Easy CBM *FCAT 2.0
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5d.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff 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. *.District Professional Development Team * Administration	5d1 *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5D: By June of 2013, 43% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 25% in grades 3-8 are making satisfactory progress	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 43% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 will				

	in reading on 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0.	make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.				
	.		5d.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support continued professional development.	5d2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration	5d.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5d.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			5d.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5d.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	5d.3. * District Professional Development Team *Teacher *Administration	5d.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5d.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.
			5d.4. Teacher deficiencies in preparedness to work with students with disabilities.	5d.4. *Teachers will be trained to support students with disabilities with the Journeys toolkit across all reporting categories. *St. Lucie County literacy routines will be implemented to support student disabilities continued professional development.	5d.4. * District Professional Development Team *Teacher * Administration	5d.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	5d.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Easy CBM progress monitoring *Journeys unit assessments *FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5E.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5E1. 1.District Professional Development Team *Administration	5E1 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5E1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5E: By June of 2013, 55% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 48% in grades 3-8 are making satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 55% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0					
	.		5E.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff	5E.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5E2. *District Professional Development Team *Administration	5E.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflective of the St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5E.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			5E.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to	5E.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on	5E.3. * District Professional Development Team *Teacher	5E.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	5E.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning 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	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

				meetings)		
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Technology to Enhance Instruction	K-8	Teacher Leader	School-wide	On-going September - May	Classroom Observations and data review with feedback	Administration
Read 180	6-8	District PD	Intensive Reading teachers	September	Classroom Observations and data review with feedback	Administration
Language!	6-8	District PD	Intensive Reading teachers	September	Classroom Observations and data review with feedback	Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Read 180	Student and teacher resources for the program	1000 E 5100 5100 0361 P2400 1000 E 5100 5100 0361 10100 1000 E 5100 5100 0361 30009	$5,322.07 $1,748.80 $2,895.20
			Subtotal: $9,966.11
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Read 180	Substitute Teachers	1010	$142.00
Language!	Substitute Teachers	1010	$483.33

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

			Subtotal: $625.33
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:$10,591.44

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. CELLA Goal #1: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 53.7% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills. By June 2013, 65% 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, 53.7% of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.*	1.1. *ELL students need to learn both English as core content and social/spoken English in order to communicate effectively.	1.1. * Language Experience Approach *Utilize a Language Experience Approach were students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-sensorial experiences.	1.1. *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	1.1. *Teachers provide on-going formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	1.1. *CELLA
		1.2.	1.2. *Modeling *Teachers demonstrate to the learner how to do a task, with the expectation that the learner can copy the model. Modeling includes thinking aloud and talking about how to work through a task.	1.2. *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	1.2. *Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. *CELLA
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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
			*Cooperative Learning Group *Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	*Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	*Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	*CELLA
2. Students scoring proficient in Reading. CELLA Goal #2: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 26.9% of ELL students were proficient in Reading. By June 2013, 34% 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, 26.9% of ELL students were proficient in Reading.*	2.1. *The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	2.1. *Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge.	2.1. *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. *Formative Assessment	2.1. *CELLA
		2.2.	2.2. *Reading aloud to students helps them develop and improve literacy skills.	2.2. *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. *Timed Student Reading	2.2. *CELLA
		2.3	2.3 *Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 *Formative Assessments	2.3 *CELLA
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing. CELLA Goal #3: *Based on the 2012 CELLA data,*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	2.1. *The next barrier for ELL students is the number of unfamiliar words encountered	2.1. *A dialog journal is a written conversation in which a student and the teacher communicate	2.1. *Administration/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1. *Journals	2.1. *CELLA

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

32.4% of ELL students were proficient in Writing. By June 2013, 36% of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLA.	*Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 32.4% of ELL students were proficient in Writing.*	as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher or peer academic talk.	regularly and carry on a private conversation. Dialog journals provide a communicative context for language and writing development.			
		2.2.	2.2. *Graphic Organizers	2.2. *Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. *Student Work	2.2. *CELLA
		2.3	2.3 *Rubrics provide clear criteria for evaluating a product or performance on a continuum of quality. They are task specific, accompanied by exemplars, and used throughout the instructional process.	2.3 *Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.3 *Student Writing Samples	2.3 *CELLA

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
			Total: 0

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. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 61% 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:* 51% of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 61% of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.					
			1a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1a.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

		1a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	1a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	1a.3. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
		1a4. *According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions	1a4. * Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives. *Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions. * GoMath! Core materials will be used for instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	1a4. * Administrators * Teachers	1a4. * Results of weekly assessments will be reviewed by grade level teams and leadership to ensure progress. * Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed.	1a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.		1b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	1b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	1b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Mathematics Goal #1b: By June 2013, 100% (7) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 86% (6) of the students in grades 3-8 were proficient at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 100% (7) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.				
		1b.2. *Students are challenged to complete proper steps to solve a problem.	1b.2. *Provide students with opportunities to learn concepts using basic math vocabulary, manipulatives visuals, number lines, and assistive technology.	1b.2. *Teacher *ESE specialist *Administration	1b.2. *Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking for problem solving.	1b.2. *Teacher generated assessment *Teacher observation as students solve the problems. *FAA

		1b.3. *Based upon individual student's abilities as indicated in their IEP, the student's cognition, and background knowledge impedes acquisition of skills to apply to high level mathematical equations.	1b.3 *Using research based strategies and materials, the students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long-term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	1b.3. *Teacher *ESE specialist *Administration	1b.3. *The students will participate in daily work stations with accountability measures to support rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	1b.3. *Teacher generated accountability pieces at each station with data collection in place. *Teacher observation *Briagance Assessment *FAA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 61% 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:* 31% (157) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.. / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 61% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher	2a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	2a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		2a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	2a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	2a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Administration	2a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	2a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items

		2a4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	2a4. * GoMath! Grab-N-Go and Enrichment materials will be utilized for differentiated instructional * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the students are learning	2a4 * Teachers * Administration	2a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	2a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	2b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Mathematics Goal #2b: By June 2013, 14% (0) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0% (0) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 14% (1) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.					
			2b.2. *Background knowledge may be limited to support review and require further instruction in DQ 2.	2b2. *Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	2b.2. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.2. *Students will participate in academic games supporting review of concepts. Additionally, students will participate in learning stations focused on individual concepts with accountability measures correlated to the access points to determine level of mastery in each concept. *Administrative walkthrough to observe lesson design	2b.2. *Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. *FAA
			2b.3 *Due to the nature of the individual's Disability, students are challenged with	2b.3 *Using researched- based strategies and materials students must have explicit instruction and continuous repetition/practice when learning	2b.3 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.3 *Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to	2b.3 *Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency.

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

		processing and application of math concepts.	math concepts.		demonstrate understanding.	*Brigance Assessment *FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	3a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #3a: By June 2013 74% (372) 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:* 62% (311) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment. / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013 74% (372) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
		3a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3a.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	3a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	3a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Administration	3a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	3a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items

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

		3a4. *Teachers lack of use of manipulatives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.	3a4. * GoMath! Grab-N-Go materials * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results, including in problem situations	3a4. * Teachers * Administration	3a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**		3b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department LC opportunities.	3b.1 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	3b.1 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Mathematics Goal #3b: By June of 2013, 100% (2) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	**2012 Current Level of Performance:*** 100% (2) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FAA Math Test.	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:*** By June of 2013, 100% (2) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.				
		3b.2. *Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged to effectively communicate their thought processes through written and/or oral language.	3b.2. *The students will be provided with research-based strategies and visual choices to support mathematical thinking to solve problems.	3b.2. *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team *Teacher	3b.2. *Students will provide a variety of visuals to support their thinking through problem solving of equations.	3b.2. *Teacher generated tests *Teacher observation *Brigance Assessment *FAA
		3b.3 Due to the nature of the individual's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts.	3b.3 *Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts.	3b.3 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	3b.3 *Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided time to practice to demonstrate understanding.	3b.3 *Teacher generated assessments from each learning station calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency. *FAA *Brigance Assessment

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	4a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	4a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #4a By June 2013 72% (141) 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:* 62% (121) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013 72% (141) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	4a.3. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	4a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			4a4. *Students lack the foundation of number	4a4. * GoMath! MTSS Support * Think Central Strategic	4a4 * Teachers * Administration	4a4. * Individual and collaborative review of	4a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM

		sense.	Intervention * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.		student reflective logs	Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.

N/A

Mathematics Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 61% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 53% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math.	In June 2012, 51% of students were proficient in Math.	By June 2013 61% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2014 65% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2015 69% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2016 73% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2017 77% of students will be proficient in Mincreasing from the previous year by 4%.

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
Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, 68% of white students, 85% of Asian students, 59% of Hispanic students, and 47% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 59% of white students, 74% of Asian Students, 50% of Hispanic students, and 36% of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 68% of white students, 85% of Asian Students, 59% of Hispanic students, and 68% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	5a.1 *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	5a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5a.3. * District professional development team * Administration	5a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			5a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was reporting :	5a.4. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the	5a.4. * Teachers	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

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

			Numbers and Operations in base 10	Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices			* 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 * 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
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u> By June 2013, 34% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 33% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> By June 2013, 34% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			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 * 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 * 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	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

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
							Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5d.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5d.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5d.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5d.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5d.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> By June 2013, 35% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 20% of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 35% of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			5d.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2 * District professional development team * 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	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.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5e.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5e.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5e.1. * District professional development team * Administration	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflective of Common Core understanding.	5e.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 55% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 55% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment					
			5e.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * 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 * 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.

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1a.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	1a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #1a: By June 2013, 61% (390) of students in grades 6-8 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *51% (320) of the students in grades 6-8 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *By June 2013, 61% (390) of students in grades 6-8 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.*					
			1a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	1a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher	1a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	1a.2. * St. Lucie County Fframework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			1a3. *According to the results of the 2012	1a3. * Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent	1a3. * Administrators * Teachers	1a3. * Results of weekly assessments will be reviewed by grade level teams and	1a3. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks

		FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 6 students was Reporting Category 1 – Fractions, Ratios, Proportional Relationships, and Statistics	representations of given numbers using manipulatives. Increase opportunities for students to use ratios in the real world setting. Move beyond the surface level of statistics and have students determine the appropriate use of central tendencies. *Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions. * Math Connects Core materials will be used for instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	* Math Coach	leadership to ensure progress. * Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed.	* Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**		1b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1 *Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities.	1b.1. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	1b.1. *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA

Mathematics Goal #1b: By June 2013, 63% (12) of students in grades 6-8 will score at a Level 4,5,6 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32% (6) of the students in grades 6-8 are proficient at level 4, 5, 6 on the FAA Reading Test	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 63% (12) of students in grades 6-8 will score at level 4.5.6 on the FAA math test.

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
			problems.	multi-step problem solving strategies. *Use math manipulatives and tools to solve problems.			
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2a.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County Fframework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 33% (198) of students in grades 6-8 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 23% (142) of the students in grades 6-8 are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 33% (198) of students in grades 6-8 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 * District professional development team * Administration * Teacher	2a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	2a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			2a3. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	2a3. * Math Connects Enrichment materials will be utilized for differentiated instructional * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the	2a3 * Teachers * Administration	2a3 * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	2a3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

				students are learning			
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1. *Students are deficient in basic algebra and geometry needed to solve high level math problems.	2b.1. *Teacher will develop instructional strategies for functional real world application in a school, work or home setting	2b.1. *Teacher *Administration	2b.1. *Teacher lessons designed using the access points using algebra and geometry applications	2b.1. *FAA *Brigance Assessment *Data Collection *Observation
Mathematics Goal #2b: By June 2013, 15% (3) of students in grades 6-8 will score at a Level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 0% (0) of the students in grades 6-8 are proficient at level 7 on the FAA Math Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 15% (3) of students in grades 6-8 proficiency level 7 score on the FAA math test.					
			2b.2. *Students are deficient in multi-step problem solving skills to solve high level math problems.	2b2. *The students will engage in lessons requiring repetition for long term learning math concepts such as fact fluency, tools for measurement, multi-step problem solving strategies. *Use math manipulatives and tools to solve problems	2b.2. *Teacher *Administrator	2b.2. *Teacher lessons that reflect access points using multi step problem solving strategies	2b.2. *FAA *Brigance Assessment, *Data Collection *Observation.
			2b.3 *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points. .	2b.3 *Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities.	2b.3 *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.3 *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.3 *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels,	3a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #3a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	62% (386) of the students in grades 6-8 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2012 74% (444) of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.		teams, etc.)			
By June 2013 74% (444) of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.							
			3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			3a.3. *Teachers lack of use of manipulatives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.	3a.3. * Math Connects Explore section materials * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results, including in problem situations	3a.3. * Teachers * Administration	3a..3. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3a.3. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**			**3b.** *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	3b.1. *Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	3b.1. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	3b.1. *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	3b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools FAA
Mathematics_Goal #3b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

By June of 2013, 100% (2) of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FAA Math Test.	100% (2) of the students in grades 6-8 made learning gains on the FAA Math Test.	By June of 2013, 100% (2) of the students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains on the 2011-2012 FAA Math Test.					
			3b.2. *Due to the nature and severity of individual student's disability, students are challenged with processing and application of math concepts	3b.2. *Students must have continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts	3b.2. *District PD Team *Teachers *Administration	3b.2. *Students will participate in a daily practice with digestible bites delivered of each concept and provided practice to demonstrate understanding.	3b.2. *Teacher generated assessments calibrated to levels of access points showing demonstration of proficiency *FAA *Brigance Assessment
			3b.3. *Due to the nature and severity of individual student's disability, students are challenged to effectively communicate their thought processes through written/oral language	3b.3. *Students will be provided with visual choices to support mathematical thinking to solve problems.	3b.3. *Teacher *Administration	3b.3. *Students will provide a variety of visuals to support their thinking through problem solving equations.	3b.3. *Teacher generated assessments *Teacher observation *FAA
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	4a.1. * District professional development team * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4a.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #4a: By June 2013 72% (111) students in grades 6-8 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 62% (96) students in grades 6-8 in the lowest quartile made learning	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013 72% (111) students in grades 6-8 in the lowest					

2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.				
			4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			4a.3 *Students lack the foundation of number sense.	4a.3. * Intensive Math Classes * Destination Success or Math Triumphs intervention programs will be used to support students understanding of foundational skills. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a.3. * Teachers * Administration	4a.3. * Individual and collaborative review of - student reflective logs	4a.3. * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**		N/A				
Mathematics Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target							
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 53% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Math.	In June 2012, 51% of students were proficient in Math.	By June 2013 61% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.	By June 2014 65% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2015 69% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2016 73% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.	By June 2017 77% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 4%.
Mathematics Goal #5A: By June 2013, 61% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 10%.							

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**			5B.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was reporting category 2- Expressions, equations and functions for our 8th grade students.	5B.1. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices to support student conversation to help combat students' misconceptions.	5B.1. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5B.1. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5B.1. * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
Mathematics Goal #5B: By June 2013, 68 % of white students, 59% of Hispanic students, 85% Asian students, and 47% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 59% of white students, 50% of Hispanic students, 74% Asian students, and 36% of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 68 % of white students, 59% of Hispanic students, 85% Asian students, and 47% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					

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

		5B.2. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5B.2. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5B.2. * District professional development team * Administration	5B.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		5B.3 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5B.3 *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5B.3 * District professional development team * Administration	5B.3 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5B.3 * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: By June 2013, 34% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 33% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment. / 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 34% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	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 * Administration	5C.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5C.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		5C.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework	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 * Administration	5C.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework	5C.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

		exist among instructional staff.				* Administrative/teacher conferencing
		5C.3 *Students come with limited academic language.	5C.3 *Instructional staff will engage students in daily vocabulary activities.	5C.3 * Teachers	5C.3 *Academic vocabulary used by students in written and oral responses.	5C.3 * St. Lucie County 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 * Administration	5D.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5D.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 35% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 20% of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 35% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			5D.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	5D.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5D.2 * District professional development team * 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 *Students struggling with multi-step problem solving.	5D.3. *Provide students with ways to break down the problems into digestible bites using Thinking Maps and other graphic organizers.	5D.3. *Teachers	5D.3. * Observation of student independently applying step-by-step problem solving	5D.3. * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of

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
							targeted goal-level 3.
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 * Administration	5E.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5E.1. * St. Lucie County Fframework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 55% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 44% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 55% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			5E.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	5E.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5E.2 * District professional development team * 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 *Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.	5E.3 *Supporting students' background knowledge and situations that require the mathematics through real world videos and EDU2000.	5E.3 *Teachers	5E.3 *Observation of appropriate use of vocabulary in student written and oral Language.	5E.3 * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.**			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.**			4.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.
Mathematics Goal #4:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	*Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.			1.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	1.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	1.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #1: *By June 2013, 100% (19) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *95% (18) of the students enrolled in Algebra I were proficient at level 3 or above on the Algebra I EOC.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *By June 2013, 100% (19) of students enrolled in Algebra I will score at level 3 or higher on the Algebra I End of Course Exam.*					
			1.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework	1.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer	1.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	1.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting	1.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

			exist among instructional staff.	support.		application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	
			1.3. *According to the results of the 2012 Algebra EOC assessments, the area of greatest difficulty for students was Reporting Category 3- Rationals, Radicals, Quadratics, and Discrete Math.	1.3. *Provide additional practice in solving and graphing quadratic equations that involve real world applications. *Develop guidelines for students to use writing and journaling to identify learned concepts and to eliminate misconceptions.	1.3. *Administrators *Department head Teachers	1.3. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	1.3. * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I 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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.			2.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration *Teacher	2.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #2: By June 2013, 42% (8) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 32% (6) of the students enrolled in Algebra I are proficient at Level 4 or 5 on the 2011-12 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 42% (8) of students enrolled in Algebra I will achieve Levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.					
			2.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2.2 *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2.2 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	2.2 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	2.2 * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			2.3 *The area of deficiency is	2.3 * Pearson enrichment materials	2.3 *Teachers	2.3 * Individual and collaborative	2.3 * St. Lucie County

		teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	will be utilized for differentiated instruction. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Select rigorous, real-world problems, aligned to the content the students are learning	*Department Heads *Administration	review of student reflective logs	Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs),Reading and Math Performance Target		**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.**		3B.1. White: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Black: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting	3B.1. *Provide all students with more practice in solving real world problems to explore and apply the use of system of equations. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. *Honor student learning styles through an instructional model that embraces diversity and the	3B.1. *Teachers *Department Heads *Administration	3B.1. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	3B.1. * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

Algebra Goal #3B:

By June 2013, ___% of white students, ____% of Hispanic students, and ____% of black students will be proficient on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*
There were ____ students not proficient in Algebra I. ____ of students were Hispanic,_____ of students were	By June 2013, ___% of white students, ____% of Hispanic students, and ____% of black

	Caucasion,___ of students were Black.	students will be proficient on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Hispanic: The area of greatest difficulty for students based on the Reporting Category data for Algebra I EOC is Reporting Category 1- Functions, Linear Equations and Inequalities. Asian: American Indian:	brain's natural learning cycle.		
			3B.2. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3B.2. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3B.2. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3B.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3B.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			3B.3 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	3B.3 Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3B.3 * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3B.3 * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3B.3 * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3C.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3C.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3C.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3C.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3C.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #3C: By June 2013, ___% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* ____% of ELL students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-12 Algebra I EOC assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, ____% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC assessment.					
			3C.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	3C.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3C.2. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3C.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3C.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			3C.3 *Students come with limited academic language.	3C.3 *Instructional staff will engage students in daily vocabulary activities.	3C.3 * Teachers	3C.3 *Academic vocabulary used by students in written and oral responses.	3C.3 * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I EOC 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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3D.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each	3D.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical	3D.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	3D.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design	3D.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					

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

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

By June 2013, ____% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC Assessment.	Performance:*	Performance:*	standard.	Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	*Teacher	reflecting Common Core understanding.	
	____% of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-12 Algebra I EOC Assessment.	By June 2013, ____% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-13 Algebra I EOC Assessment.					
			3D.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County Framework exist among instructional staff.	3D.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	3D.2. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3D.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	3D.2. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			3D.3 Students have difficulty processing multi-step problems.	3D.3 Provide students with step-by-step support for problem-solving.	3D.3 * Teachers *Department Heads	3D.3 * Observation of student independently applying step-by-step problem solving	3D.3 * St. Lucie County Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 Algebra I EOC 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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3E.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3E.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels,	3E.1. * District professional development team * Administration *Teacher	3E.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core	3E.1. * St. Lucie County Framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #3E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

		3E.3
		*Students lack the schema necessary to solve real-world problems.
			3E.3
			*Supporting students' background knowledge and situations that require the mathematics through real world videos and EDU2000.
				3E.3
				*Teachers
				* Instructional Coaches
					3E.3
					*Observation of appropriate use of
					  vocabulary in student written and oral
					  Language.
						3E.3
						* St. Lucie County Benchmarks
						* Results from the 2013 Algebra EOC assessment
						* Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

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

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1. N/A	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Geometry Goal #3A: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*							

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Technology to Enhance Instruction	K-8	Teacher Leader	School-wide	On-going September - May	Classroom Observations and data review with feedback	Administration

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

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

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)).

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

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
Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 68% (242) of students in grades 5 and 8 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 47% (167) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 68% (242) 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.	1a.3. *Science Teachers/Science Chair/Administration	1a.3. Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/labs addressing the necessary benchmarks. Monitor the use of nonfiction writing (e.g., Power Writing/Lab Reports, Conclusion writing, Current Events, etc.) After each assessment (Interim or Quarterly Science Benchmark Assessments), conduct data analysis to identify students' performance within those categories and develop differentiated instructional activities to address individual student needs. Conduct mini-assessments	1a.3. Classroom Observations of student work during labs Writing prompts Benchmark Assessments Science Fair Projects

		Provide opportunities for teachers to apply mathematical computations in science contexts such as manipulating data from tables in order to find averages or differences. Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science. Instruction in grades K-5 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.		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.

Science Goal #1b: By June of 2013, 80% (8) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4,5,6 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	1b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	1b.1. *Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	1b.1. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	1b.1. *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	1b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
	70% (7) students achieved a Level 4, 5or 6 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment	80% (8) students will achieve a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.					
			1b.2. *Opportunities for students to learn the language of science	1b.2. *Teachers will use a variety of data to plan science instruction and use teaching strategies that will enhance the instruction	1b.2. *Teacher *Administration	1b.2. *Review FAA data and review data on teacher made tests	1b.2. *FAA *Teacher made assessments
			1b.3. *Poor foundational skills in Reading and math affect the success of students in the science curriculum.	1b.3. *Analyze Reading data to provide appropriate leveled science text and materials for struggling students.	1b.3. *Teacher *Administration *ESE Specialist	1b.3. *Review and monitoring of classroom assessments, teacher made tests, class work and FAA scores.	1b.3. *Curriculum based assessments, review of lesson plans, classroom observations

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 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 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	2a.1. *PLC Science Teacher Leaders	2a.1 *PLC Meeting Data, Student Data from Formative Assessments	2a.1. *Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT
Science Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 15% (53) of students in grades 5 and 8 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 11% (39) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/2012 FCAT assessment.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 15% (53) students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2012/2013 FCAT assessment.					
			2a.2. *Students need to master informational reading and nonfiction writing.	2a.2. *Infuse Science into the Literacy Block.	2a.2. *Classroom Teachers	2a.2. *Informal/Formal Observations, Student Work, Collaborative Grading Rubrics, and data from Student samples.	2a.2. *Writing Samples, FCAT Writing, Formative/Summative Assessments
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2b.1. *Train teachers to effectively implement Access Points.	2b.1. *Instructional staff will participate in department PLC opportunities	2.1. *District PD Team *ESE Specialists *Administrative Team	2b.1. *Lesson Study observations and debriefing sessions	2b.1. *Lesson Study Documentation and Reflection Tools *FAA
Science Goal #2b: By June of 2013, 20% (2) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 7 on the 2012-2013 FAA Science Assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 20% (2) students achieved a Level 7 in science on the 2011/2012 FAA assessment.	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 20% (2) students will achieve a Level 7 in science on the 2012/2013 FAA assessment.					
			2b.2. *Students have processing challenges for recalling	2b.2. *Use research- based strategies and methodologies to explicitly	2b.2. *Teachers *Administrators	2b.2 *Review of individual students pre/post test data	2b.2. *Data collection sheets *Teacher made assessments

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

71

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

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

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

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

End of Biology EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SLC Framework for Quality Instruction (Framework)	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Common Core	K-8	Teacher Leader/Admin	School wide	On – going Aug-May	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Administration
Technology to Enhance Instruction	K-8	Teacher Leader	School-wide	On-going September - May	Classroom Observations and data review with feedback	Administration

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
			Total: 0

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

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

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% (288) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 83% (266) of the students scored 3.0 or higher as measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 90% (288) 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. *Grade Chair(s)	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.			1b.1. *Students' appropriate determination of writing structure	1b.1. *Incorporate read-alouds into lesson design to support guided writing practice.	1b.1. *Administrative Team *ESE Chair *Teacher	1b.1. *Classroom observation feedback on elements in DQ1, DQ2, DQ3,and DQ4	1b.1. *SLC Framework documentation
Writing Goal #1b: By June of 2013, 83% (10) of students will score at 4 or higher on the Florida Alternate Assessment for Writing.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* In 2012, 66% (8) of students scored at 4.0 or higher on the Florida Alternate Assessment for Writing.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 83% (10) of students will score at 4 or higher on the Florida Alternate					

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

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

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Anchor Standards	K – 5	Grade Level CCSS Rep.	Classroom Teachers	August 2012	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write From the Beginning	K - 2	District Trainer	New teachers in K - 2	September 2012	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write for the Future	6-8	District Trainer	6-8 Language Arts Teachers	July 2012	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Holistic Scoring	3-8	District Trainer	3-8 Reading/LA Teachers	October 15, 2012	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.

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

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write For the Future	Training resource binders	1000 E 51005100 0361P2400	$324.00
			Subtotal: $324.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write For the Future	Substitute Teachers		
Holistic Scoring	Substitute Teachers		
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: $324.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	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	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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1. Student reading ability	1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1. Student reading ability	1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1. Student reading ability
Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam. *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	Civics Goal #1: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier 2.1. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant. 2012 Current 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 2.1. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant. 2012 Current 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 2.1. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant. 2012 Current Level of Performance:*
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	2.1. Student motivation and seeing course content as relevant. 2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.		2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.		2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2: By the end of the year, 50% of students (*n*) will score 70% or higher on the Civics SLC final exam.	

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

	NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012		NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012		NO DATA AVAILABLE FOR 2012	

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Use of Civics Item Specs and CCSS	Grade 7	Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Grades 3-5 Civics Benchmarks	Grades 3-5 and 7	Grade/Dept. Chair	Grade level	August 30	Learning goals/scales	Administration
Civics DBQ Project/CIS	Grade 7	DBQ Trainer	Grade level	September-March	Follow-up training, student work samples	Administration
Project Citizen	Grade 7	PC Trainer	Grade level	August-January	Portfolio	Administration

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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: 0
			Total: 0

End of Civics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

U.S. History Professional Development

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

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

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 96% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated by June	2012 Current Attendance Rate:* 94% (1414) 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) #15 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* 96% (1444) 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) #12 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	1.1. *Truancy maintained attendance rate 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

2013.	#39	#15					
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.			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	K-8	Student Services/ District staff	All counselors and attendance staff	September 26, 2012	A truancy Intervention Program will be developed during the PD. An Assistant Principal will monitor this implementation of the program.	Assistant Principal and Counselor
Health and Wellness	Physical Education and Health	District staff Coordinator of Health and Wellness and school health/nurse	PE/Health teachers, resource teachers	October 26, 2012	Create a wellness council to monitor implementation of program recommended by the District Health/Wellness Coordinator	Administrators, School Nurse/Health Aide, and wellness council

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0
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: 0
			Total: 0

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

Suspension Goal #1: Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10% by June 2013.	2012 Total Number of In –School Suspensions #405 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School #184 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions #111 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School #73	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions #364 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School #165 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions #100 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School #65	* Students tend not to retain or apply school-wide expectations	*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.	*Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	*Monitor behavior incident report and BIR monthly.	*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.
			1.2.	1.2. *Deans and/or Guidance Counselor will make contact with parents or students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension. Parents will be provided with training on building an understanding of the SLC Student Code of Conduct.	1.2. *Deans/Counselor	1.2. *Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents of students who have been placed on in/out of school suspension.	1.2. *Parent Contact Log, Parent sign in/out log
			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	K8	PBS Core Team/Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	October 15 PD Mtgs every two weeks	Coaching/Mentoring	RtIB Coach/Committee

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

PD on MTSS/RTI	K8	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	October 15	Coaching/Mentoring	RtIB Coach/Committee

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	1.1. Students drop out of school due to lack of earned credits toward promotion and graduation.	1.1. Provide opportunities for students to attend credit recovery throughout the school day or extended school day.	1.1. Guidance Counselors	1.1. Monitor student credit recovery completion of credits/courses report monthly.	1.1. Student Academic History and Graduation requirement screens on Skyward.
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of dropouts by 5% by June 2013. **2012 Current Dropout Rate:*** # **2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*** # **2012 Current Graduation Rate:*** # **2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*** #					
Our second goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of graduates by XX% by June 2013.	1.2. Students drop out of school due to a sense of feeling that no one cares about them at school - the lack of a positive adult relationship.	1.2. Provide staff with PD on Building Authentic Relationships With Youth At Risk from the National Dropout Prevention Center Network.	1.2. Administrators	1.2. Monitor entry/withdrawal data monthly. Review withdrawal interview data.	1.2. Annual Dropout report
	1.3. Students drop out of school due to social/emotional issues.	1.3. Alternative schooling provides potential dropouts a variety of options that can lead to graduation, with programs paying special attention to the student's individual social needs and academic requirements for a high school diploma.	1.3. School based administrators and Alternative Education Department	1.3. Monitor entry/withdrawal data monthly. Review withdrawal interview data.	1.3. Entry/Withdrawal report from zoned schools and alternative schools.

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity					
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.					
PD Content /Topic	Grade	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates and Schedules	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for

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

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

and/or PLC Focus	Level/Subject	and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Monitoring

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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.

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

* 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)

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

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				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total: $10,591.44
Mathematics Budget
Total: 0
Science Budget
Total: 0
Writing Budget
Total: $324.00
Attendance Budget
Total: 0
Suspension Budget
Total: 0
Dropout Prevention Budget

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

	Total: 0
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total: 0
Additional Goals	
	Total: 0
	Grand Total: $10,915.44

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