

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: White City Elementary	District Name: St. Lucie County
Principal: Jacqueline C. Lynch	Superintendent: Michael Lannon
SAC Chair: Kathleen Saunders	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	Jacqueline C. Lynch	Bachelors Degree in Education Masters in Educational Leadership Florida Principal Certificate	5	8	2011-2012 Grade B 41% Proficient in Reading 57% Proficient in Math 33% Proficient in Science 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 65% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 64% Making Learning Gains in Math 76% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 49% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math

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

					<p>2010-2011 Grade A AYP 95% 60% Proficient in Reading 82% Proficient in Math 54% Proficient in Science 93% Meeting High Standards in Writing 55% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 67% Making Learning Gains in Math 70% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 67% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade B 57% Proficient in Reading, 71% Proficient in Math, 86% Proficient in Writing, 22% Proficient in Science, 60% LG in Reading, 63% LG Math, 60% Lower Quartile Gains in Reading, 83% Lower Quartile Gains in Math 502 Points Earned. 85% Criteria Met ELL subgroup made AYP in math/reading Black subgroup was only subgroup that did not make AYP in math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade A 108 point gain from prior year AYP - 97% Criteria Met 61% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students at or above grade level in math, 90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 56% of students at or above grade level in Science. All subgroups made AYP except Hispanic students in Reading.</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade C with 39 point gain from prior year. AYP – 64% Criteria met 60% of students reading at or above grade level. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES did not may AYP. 52% of students at or above grade level in math. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY</p>
Assistant Principal	Leslie Dangerfield	<p>Masters in Elementary Ed Reading</p> <p>Florida Principal Certificate</p> <p>PhD. In Educational Leadership</p>	5	6	<p>2011-2012 Grade B 41% Proficient in Reading 57% Proficient in Math 33% Proficient in Science 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 65% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 64% Making Learning Gains in Math 76% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 49% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math</p>

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

				<p>2010-2011 Grade A AYP 95% 60% Proficient in Reading 82% Proficient in Math 54% Proficient in Science 93% Meeting High Standards in Writing 55% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 67% Making Learning Gains in Math 70% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 67% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade B 57% Proficient in Reading, 71% Proficient in Math, 86% Proficient in Writing, 22% Proficient in Science, 60% LG in Reading, 63% LG Math, 60% Lower Quartile Gains in Reading, 83% Lower Quartile Gains in Math 502 Points Earned. 85% Criteria Met ELL subgroup made AYP in math/reading Black subgroup was only subgroup that did not make AYP in math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade A 108 point gain from prior year AYP - 97% Criteria Met 61% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students at or above grade level in math, 90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 56% of students at or above grade level in Science. All subgroups made AYP except Hispanic students in Reading.</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade C with 39 point gain from prior year. AYP – 64% Criteria met 60% of students reading at or above grade level. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES did not may AYP. 52% of students at or above grade level in math. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY</p>
--	--	--	--	---

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

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Linda Hinkle	BA Middle School K-9 Reading Endorsed K-12 Masters in Elementary Education - Early Childhood	4	9	<p>2011-2012 Grade B 41% Proficient in Reading 57% Proficient in Math 33% Proficient in Science 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 65% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 64% Making Learning Gains in Math 76% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 49% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math Grade A AYP 95% 60% Proficient in Reading 82% Proficient in Math 54% Proficient in Science 93% Meeting High Standards in Writing 55% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 67% Making Learning Gains in Math 70% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 67% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade B 57% Proficient in Reading, 71% Proficient in Math, 86% Proficient in Writing, 22% Proficient in Science, 60% LG in Reading, 63% LG Math, 60% Lower Quartile Gains in Reading, 83% Lower Quartile Gains in Math 502 Points Earned. 85% Criteria Met ELL subgroup made AYP in math/reading Black subgroup was only subgroup that did not make AYP in math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade A 108 point gain from prior year AYP - 97% Criteria Met</p>

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

					61% of students reading at or above grade level, 72% of students at or above grade level in math, 90% of students are meeting state standards in writing. 56% of students at or above grade level in Science. All subgroups made AYP except Hispanic students in Reading. 2007-2008 Grade C with 39 point gain from prior year. AYP – 64% Criteria met 60% of students reading at or above grade level. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES did not may AYP. 52% of students at or above grade level in math. BLACK, HISPANIC, ECONOMICALLY
Math	Brie Lamb	Elementary Ed K-6 ESOL Certification	7	First Year as a coach 2012-2013	2011-2012 Grade B 41% Proficient in Reading 57% Proficient in Math 33% Proficient in Science 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 65% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 64% Making Learning Gains in Math 76% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 49% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math
Math	Virginia Mihajlovski	Elementary Ed Pre-K Primary Certification ESE K-12 Masters in Leadership NBCT	1	1	2011-2012 Grade B 41% Proficient in Reading 57% Proficient in Math 33% Proficient in Science 91% Meeting High Standards in Writing 65% Making Learning gains in Rdg. 64% Making Learning Gains in Math 76% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in Reading 49% of Lowest Quartile making learning gains in math

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. Principal will review all applications looking for prior	Principal	August, 2012	

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

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

experience that would support the needs of the school.			
2. Principal will interview all applicants with questions requiring a knowledge base of district/state initiatives, state assessments, intervention across content areas, cultural sensitivity, communication, organizational skills, collaboration, professional ethics and overall presentation of self and ability to articulate thoughts.	Principal	August 2012	
3. Provide new hires with a mentor to support their new learning of district, state initiatives and district protocols in and out of the classroom.	Mentors	Ongoing	
4. Observations/feedback of constructive support to ensure the teacher is aligning well to district/state expectations with positive support for change in those areas of deficiency.	Administration/Mentor	Ongoing	
5. Provide observation opportunities of other other teachers deemed “experts” in specific areas of district initiatives with follow up support to reflect upon observations.	Administration/Mentor/Coaches	Ongoing	
6. Modeling provided by Math/Reading Coaches consisting of pre-conference/observation of coaches modeling/post conference.	Coaches	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective

Staff Demographics

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

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

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

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

36	2.63% (1)	13.16% (5)	50% (19)	34.21% (13)	34.21% (13)	Not to be provided per DOE	7.89% (3)	13.16% (5)	63.16 (24)
----	-----------	------------	----------	-------------	-------------	----------------------------	-----------	------------	------------

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
Maureen McNulty	Mackenzie Buck	Ms. McNulty was a second grade teacher in 2011-2012 and worked with Ms. Buck throughout the summer developing lesson plans, working on collaborative professional reading, supported her room design, and has guided her in professional ethics so due to existing relationship, the continuum was necessary to foster this professional relationship to continue in a mentor/mentee capacity for the 2012-2013 school year.	Both educators will participate in and follow the SLC new teacher expectations re: SHINE and satisfy all SLC requirements for the mentor/mentee program. Informal, afterschool meetings with mentor/mentee will provide support each month.
Brie Lamb	Kimberly Gallagher	Brie Lamb served as the team leader for third grade last year and now serves as a Math Coach for White City Elementary. Ms. Lamb’s new job capacity affords her greater opportunities to spend time to model best practices of research-based instruction and observe Ms. Gallagher’s implementation of the modeled practices to provide constructive support.	Both educators will participate in and follow the SLC new teacher expectations re: SHINE and satisfy all SLC requirements for the mentor/mentee program. Informal, afterschool meetings with mentor/mentee will provide support each month.
Linda Hinkle	Amanda Dewey	Ms. Dewey served as a long term substitute for a 5 th grade teacher in the 2011-2012 school year. Ms. Hinkle supported Ms. Dewey throughout the year in various capacities so there is a continuum of services provided by Ms. Hinkle in order to keep a consistent message supporting SLC initiatives.	Both educators will participate in and follow the SLC new teacher expectations re: SHINE and satisfy all SLC requirements for the mentor/mentee program. Informal, afterschool meetings with mentor/mentee will provide support each month.

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

Allocations provide additional funding for the Literacy, Science and Math coaches who serve as a resource to classroom teachers in implementing strategies that support students in meeting grade level expectations in reading, math, science and writing.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

SLCSB Migrant Recruiter and the Secondary Advocate provide support to migrant students and their families. The students and their parents are supported through summer programs and parent involvement activities.

Title I, Part D

Funds support educational programs at the Detention Center, PACE, Project Rock and DATA House (alternative sites for students working with varying issues). Student services are coordinated with the St. Lucie County School District's dropout prevention programs.

Title II

In coordination with Title I and Title III, Title II provides professional development that addresses the needs of teachers so that they can meet the needs of their students. Professional development is continuous and product-driven. Follow-up visits and fidelity checks ensure that the strategies are being implemented.

Title III

The district ESOL program specialist provides support to teachers. Professional development is provided to teachers so that they acquire the skills and strategies that work best for English Language Learners. ELL students are provided additional support in learning academic vocabulary and curriculum with an ESOL technology program called Imagine Learning that is loaded onto classroom computers for identified students.

Title X- Homeless

White City Elementary works with the Coordinator, Social Worker and student service specialists to provide needed resources such as clothing, school supplies and social service referrals to students identified as homeless.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

District SAI funds are used for summer school of level 1 & 2 readers in grade 3.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs include Second Step and Too Good for Drugs.

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

Nutrition Programs White City Elementary participates in the Free and Reduced Lunch program, the Universal Free Breakfast program, is the recipient of the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program providing the students with either a fresh fruit or fresh vegetable each day. Nutrition Programs Title I part C coordinates with the local programs to provide information on how families can receive services. Such as Mustard Seed, The Harvest
Housing Programs Title I, Part A and C coordinate with local programs that provide support for rent, utilities and other needs of families such as Image of Christ in Fort Pierce.
Head Start Title I, Part A and the Early Learning Coalition
Adult Education Title I, Part A and Part C coordinates with Indian River State College to provide our parents with the opportunity to get their high school diploma.
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Suggested Members include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrator(s) – Jacqueline C. Lynch • District RTI Coach – Mary Makowski • School Counselor – Gina Daigle • Literacy Coach – Linda Hinkle • Math Coach – Virginia Mihajlovski, Brie Lamb • School Psychologist – David Kinkade • School-Based ESE Specialist – Julie Quintin

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

Elementary

- K-2 Representative – Rhiannon Myers
- 3-5 Representative – Sean Madden

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?

Core team meets at least 3-4 times a year to review universal screening data and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1 – Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic/behavioral targets.

Based on the data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support and will provide that information to the Problem Solving Teams (PST). The core team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each Interventionist will have support documented in the intervention plan, and the interventionist and the support person will report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings. The team will collaborate with the Building Level Planning Team, SAC, PBS team, and school literacy team.

Core team members will serve as members of smaller PST.

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?

The Core Team collaborated with the School Advisory Council (SAC) utilizing data from the 2011-2012 school year. The Team helped facilitate a discussion on how to increase academic rigor, particularly in the Literacy and Intervention/Enrichment Block (K-5), and with Tier 1 behavioral instruction.

Utilizing the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets and focus attention on deficient areas will be discussed.

Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:

- FCAT scores and the lowest 25%
- Subgroups
- Strengthens and weaknesses of intensive academic/behavioral programs
- Mentoring, tutoring,

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

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.

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

- FCAT Writes

- SAT – 10

- Curriculum Based Measurement

- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

- St. Lucie County Benchmarks

- Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

- FLKRS

- Office Discipline Referrals

- Retentions

- Absences

The data will be triangulated and analyzed to determine students who need additional instruction with evidence based interventions.

The following databases will be utilized:

- Skyward

- PMRN

- Performance Matters

- RtI Database

Additional data will be available through the following:

- Program Specific Reports

- Easy CBM

- Behavior Incident Reports (BIR)

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Positive Behavior Support (PBS)

- CHAMPs
- Literacy Routines/Framework
- Math Routines/Framework
- Behavior Framework
- Easy CBM
- Performance Matters
- RtI Database
- USF/FLDOE Problem Solving/Response to Instruction and Intervention Tier 1, 2, and 3
- Progress Monitor

Describe plan to support MTSS. The staff will meet twice per month on their regularly scheduled planning times to discuss data presented re: data points of Tier II, Tier III students and discuss overview of Tier I students to determine their current level of performance to determine if any student is demonstrating a deficiency needing remediation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT is comprised of the Administration, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Classroom Teachers

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

The team will meet every other month to define school needs based on school/district data. All parties will be responsible to collecting, disaggregating, analyzing, and proposing "next steps" in order to improve the delivery of instruction, resources, and increase student achievement.

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

The major initiatives will be parent awareness re: changes in assessments, Common Core, Standard Based Grading in K-2 and to provide continued opportunities for teachers to participate in professional learning/collaboration/reflection that will foster synthesizing towards a greater efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of research-based instruction.

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

Public School Choice

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

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

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

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

The Pre-K students in our VPK program are transitioned all year because they are on an elementary school campus. They get adjusted to the routine of
school by being full day students at an elementary site. All VPK students and their families are invited to participate in school wide events and parent
activities.

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

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

--

****High Schools Only***

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

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

--

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

--

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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.	1a. 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	1a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	1a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
By June 2013, 47% (100) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	41% (89) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	By June 2012, 47% (100) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.					
			1a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	1a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	1a.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	1a.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	1a.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.

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

		*The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	*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.	* District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	*Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	*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. Reading coach 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher	1a.4. *The reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	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.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Reading Goal #1b: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.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 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. Reading Goal #2a: By June of 2013, 27% (59) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.			2012 Current Level of Performance:* 22% (47) of the students in grades 3-5 are proficient at level 4 or 5 above on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 27% (59) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	2a. 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	2a. 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. *SLC 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: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	2a.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.
					4a.4. *The area of deficiency is teacher understanding of extended thinking	4a.4. *Organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and	4a.4. * District Professional Development Team	4a.4. *The reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	4a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments

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

		practices.	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.	Reading Coach Administration Teacher	*The MTSS/Rtl team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	*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.				
Reading Goal #2b: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3

1a.4.
* Common We
assessments.
*Easy CBM Be
*Teacher assess
scale achievem
*Results from t

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: By June of 2013, 70% (153) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.			3a.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	3a.1 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3a.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	3a.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs		
			2012 Current Level of Performance: * 65% (142) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * By June of 2013, 70% (153) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	3a.2A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	3a.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	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	3a.3. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	3a.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.

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

			peer coaching.			
		3a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary	3a.4. Journeys core materials will be used to support instruction. St. Lucie County literacy routines will be followed with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	3a.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	3a.4. *The reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. *The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	3a.4. * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. *Journeys unit assessments.
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.						
Reading Goal #3b:		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>		<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>			
		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.		4A.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	4A.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	4A1 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	4A.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4A.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #4a:		2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*			
By June 2013 81% (177) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.		76% (167) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains on	By June 2013 81% (177) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% will make			

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

	FCAT 2.0 Reading.	learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
			4a.2A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	4a.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher	4a.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	4a.3. *Student Responses from teacher 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 Reading Coach Administration Teacher	4a.4. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher observation through of cooperative group discussions.	4a.4. *Journeys unit assessments * Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. *Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments *Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. *Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment.
<p>4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p>			4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.
Reading Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
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.					

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

		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 60% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Assessment.	In June 2012, 41% (89) of students were proficient in Reading decreasing from the previous year by 19%.	By June 2013 47% (102) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2014 53% (116) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2015 57% (126) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2016 62% (137) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.	By June 2017 72% (156) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.
	<u>Reading Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013 47% of students will be proficient in reading increasing from the previous year by 6%.						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5B.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.	5B.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity.	5B1 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher	5B.1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5B.1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
<u>Reading Goal #5B:</u> By June 2013, 59% of white	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance.*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance.*</u>					

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

<p>students, 50% of Hispanic students, and 43% of black students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.</p>	<p>38% Black and 45% Hispanic students made satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.</p>	<p>By June 2013, 59% of white students, 50% of Hispanic students, and 43% of black students will make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 Reading.</p>					
			<p>5B.2 A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.</p>	<p>5B.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.</p>	<p>5B.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher</p>	<p>5B.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.</p>	<p>5B.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs</p>
			<p>5B3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.</p>	<p>5B.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.</p>	<p>5B.3. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher</p>	<p>5B3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.</p>	<p>5B.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items.</p>
			<p>5B.4. *Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application</p>	<p>5B.4. * Students will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts to support assessment deficiencies. *Journeys core will</p>	<p>5B.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration Teacher</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

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

			provide opportunities to make text-to-self connections combined with evidence from the text to draw conclusions and make inferences.				
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, 48% of ELL students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 43% Students in grades 3-5 made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, 48% of ELL students in grades 3-5 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 Reading Coach Administration	5c1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	
			5c.2A 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 Reading Coach Administration	5c.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5c.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
			5c.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and	5c.3. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5c.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5c.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.

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

			peer coaching.			
		5a.4. * Students demonstrated greatest percentage of deficiencies in the REPORTING CATEGORY 1: VOCABULARY	5a.4. *Teachers will utilize Journeys leveled readers for ELL students and implement Journeys suggested lessons to support vocabulary deficiencies. *St. Lucie County literacy routines word work will support instructional vocabulary focus.	5a.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5a.4. *Students' academic language will increase understanding of vocabulary and through authentic writing tasks and oral expression.	5a.4. *Weekly common grade level assessment tests. *Teacher observation *Easy CBM *FCAT 2.0
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		5d.1. *Common Core Standards present new learning for instructional staff 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.	5d.1. 1. District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration	5d1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
By June of 2013, 50% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.	45% in grades 3-5 are making satisfactory progress in reading on 2-11-2012 FCAT 2.0.	By June of 2013, 50% Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0.				
		5d.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5d2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach 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	5d.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided	5d.3. * District Professional Development Team	5d.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with	5d.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the

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

		demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching.	Reading Coach Teacher Administration	feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	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 Reading Coach 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 Reading Coach Administration	5E1 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5E1. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5E: By June of 2013, xx% (xx) Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0	2012 Current Level of Performance:* xx% (xx) in grades 3-5 are making satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June of 2013, xx% (xx) Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-				

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

2.0.	5 will make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0												
		5E.2 *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff	5E.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.	5E.2. *District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Administration	5E.2. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. *Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	5E.2. *SLC Framework *Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs							
		5E.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice	5E.3. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. *Instructional and peer coaching	5E.3. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5E.3. *Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. *Individual and Collaborative review of student work.	5E.3. *Student Responses from teacher made performance task items based on the performance scale.				5d.4. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT2.0 reading test was REPORTING CATEGORY 2: Reading Application	5d.4. 1. Teachers will utilize Journeys in conjunction with Thinking Maps to increase understanding of text structure. 2. The students will participate in literacy routines each day to deepen knowledge and provide practice with identifying components of literary analysis.	5d.4. * District Professional Development Team Reading Coach Teacher Administration	5d.4. *Student created Thinking Maps will serve as a discussion processing tool. *Summaries will be written based on evidence from text.

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

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common core	K-2	Principal	K-2 Teachers, Coaches	October-May	Lesson Plan Integration with Core Program. Classroom Observation with feedback	Administration
Research Based Instructional Strategies	K-5	Principal	K-5 Teachers, Coaches	September-May	Lesson Plan Integration with Core Program. Classroom Observation with feedback	Administration
Kagan Structures	K-5	Classroom Teacher Cohort	K-5 Teachers, Coaches	September-May	Lesson Plan Integration with Core Program. Classroom Observation with feedback	Administration
Learning Scales and Objectives	K-5	Admin/Coaches	K-5 Teachers	November-May	Lesson Plan Integration with Core Program. Classroom Observation 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

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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking.		1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u>	ELL students need to learn English as it relates to core content, in addition to receptive/productive language in English	Language Experience Approach Utilize a Language Experience Approach were students produce language in response to first-hand, multi-	Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader.	Teachers provide on-going formative assessment in both speaking and listening.	CELLA
By June 2013, 48% of ELL students will score proficient in Oral Skills as measured by CELLA.	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 43.5% (33) of ELL students were proficient in Oral Skills.					

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

		in order to communicate effectively.	sensorial experiences.			
		1.2. ELL students need to learn English as it relates to core content, in addition to receptive/productive language English in order to communicate effectively.	1.2. Modeling Teachers demonstrate to the learner how to do a task, with the expectation that the learner can copy the model. Modeling includes thinking aloud and talking about how to work through a task.	1.2. Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	1.2. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format	1.2. CELLA
		1.3. ELL students need to learn English as it relates to core content, in addition to receptive/productive language in English in order to communicate effectively.	1.3. Cooperative Learning Group Students work together in small intellectually and culturally mixed groups.	1.3. Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader.	1.3. Classroom Observations utilizing the SLC Instructional Format.	1.3. CELLA
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in Reading.	2.1.	2.1. Activating and/or Building Prior Knowledge.	2.1. Administration/Literacy Coach/Team or	2.1. Formative Assessment	2.1. CELLA	
<u>CELLA Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u>	ELL students are unfamiliar with both				

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

By June 2013, 32% of ELL students will score proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA.	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 27.7% (33) of ELL students were proficient in Reading.	simple and complex words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.		Grade Level Leader		
		2.2. ELL students are unfamiliar with both simple and complex words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.	2.2. Daily read-aloud to help students develop and improve literacy skills with receptive language.	2.2 Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader.	2.2. Formative Assessment	2.2. CELLA
		2.3 ELL students are unfamiliar with both simple and complex words encountered as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.	2.3 Vocabulary with context clues.	2.3 Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader.	2.3 Formative Assessment	2.3 CELLA
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in Writing.	2.1. ELL students encounter a number of unfamiliar words as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.	2.1. Graphic Organizers	2.1. Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.1 Students will use graphic organizers to outline their thoughts and/or to use as a springboard to a writing sample.	2.1. CELLA	
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :</u>					
<i>By June 2013, 34% of ELL students will score proficient in Writing as measured by CELLA.</i>	<i>Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 29.4% (35) of ELL students were proficient in Writing.</i>					

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

		2.2. ELL students encounter a number of unfamiliar words as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.	2.2. Journal Responses	2.2. Administration/ Literacy Coach/Team or Grade Level Leader	2.2. Students will use journals to write responses to open ended questions or to write reflection statements to a proposed problem/statement supporting 90 90 90 research.	2.2. CELLA
		2.3 ELL students encounter a number of unfamiliar words as an English learner reads a text or listens to teacher /peer converse regarding academics.	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

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 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 * 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: <i>By June 2013, 62% (135) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 math test.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>57% (124) of the students in grades 3-5 were proficient at level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment..</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>By June 2013, 62% (135) of students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test.</i>					

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

		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 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 * Instructional coaches * 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 * Math Coach	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.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Mathematics Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				

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

			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	2a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	2a.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher	2a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	2a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #2a: By June 2013, 31% (66) 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:* 26% (56) 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, 31% (66) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve FCAT levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			2a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	2a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	2a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * 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 * Instructional coaches * 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	2a4. * GoMath! Grab-N-Go and	2a4 * Teachers	2a4. * Individual and collaborative	2a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie

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

		is teacher understanding of extended thinking practices.	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	* Instructional coaches * Administration	review of student reflective logs	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.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
Mathematics Goal #2b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	3a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	3a.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	3a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.
Mathematics Goal #3a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
By June 2013 64% (150) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	64% (140) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	By June 2012 69% (150) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0				

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

		Mathematics assessment.					
			<p>3a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.</p>	<p>3a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.</p>	<p>3a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration *Teacher</p>	<p>3a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing</p>	<p>3a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs</p>
			<p>3a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3a.3. * District professional development team * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration</p>	<p>3a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work</p>	<p>3a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items</p>
			<p>3a4. *Teachers lack of use of manipulatives to demonstrate new concepts concretely.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3a4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration</p>	<p>3a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p>			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #3b:</u></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
<p><i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p>	<p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p>					

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

		3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
		3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.		4a.1. *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	4a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	4a.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	4a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	4a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #4a By June 2013 54% (118) 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:* 49% (107) 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 54% (118) students in grades 3-5 in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.				
		4a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	4a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	4a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	4a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	4a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		4a.3. *The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	4a.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	4a.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	4a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	4a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items

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

		4a4. *Students lack the foundation of number sense.	4a4. * GoMath! RtI Support * Think Central Strategic Intervention * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.	4a4 * Teachers * Instructional coaches * Administration	4a4. * Individual and collaborative review of student reflective logs	4a4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.		4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
		4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 23% of students were proficient on the 2010-2011 FCAT Math Assessment.	In June 2012, 31% (56) of students were proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 8%.	By June 2013 68% (126) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 8%.	By June 2014 71% (131) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 8%.	By June 2015 74% (140) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 8%.	By June 2016 77% (161) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the previous year by 5%.	By June 2017 81% (173) of students will be proficient in Reading increasing from the

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

<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By June 2013 45% of students will be proficient in Math increasing from the previous year by 8%.</p>							previous year by 8%.
<p>Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:</p>			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u> By June 2013, 82% of white students, 70% of Hispanic students, 57% Black, 91% ELL, 90% Economically Disadvantaged and 75% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>76% of white students, 65% of Hispanic students, and 52% of black students were proficient on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.</p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p>By June 2013, 82% of white students, 70% of Hispanic students, and 57% of black students will be proficient in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.</p>	<p>5a.1 *Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.</p>	<p>5a.1. *Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)</p>	<p>5a.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration</p>	<p>5a.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.</p>	<p>5a.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs</p>
			<p>5a.2. *A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.</p>	<p>5a.2. *Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.</p>	<p>5a.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration</p>	<p>5a.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing</p>	<p>5a.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs</p>
			<p>5a.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5a.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration</p>	<p>5a.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work</p>	<p>5a.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items</p>

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

		5a.4. *The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test was reporting : Numbers and Operations in base 10	5a.4. * St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery. * Teachers will follow the Common Core 8 Mathematical Practices	5a.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5a.4. * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5a.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5c.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5c.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5c.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5c.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5c.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C: By June 2013, 69% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> 64% 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, 69% 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 * Math coaches * Administration	5c.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5c.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
		5c.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5c.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5c.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5c.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5c.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items

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

		5c.4. Students come with limited academic language.	5c.4. Instructional staff will engage students in daily vocabulary activities.	5c.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5c.4. Academic vocabulary used by students in written and oral responses.	5c.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		5d.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5d.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5d.1. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5d.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5d.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs	
Mathematics Goal #5D: By June 2013, 53% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 48% of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* By June 2013, 53% of SWD students will be proficient on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.					
			5d.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5d.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5d.2. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5d.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5d.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5d.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5d.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5d.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5d.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5d.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
		5d.4. Students have difficulty processing multi-step	5d.4. Provide students with step-by-step support for problem-solving.	5d.4. * Teachers * Instructional coaches	5d.4. * Observation of student independently applying step-by-	5d.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM	

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

			problems.			step problem solving	Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5e.1. Common Core standards present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard.	5e.1. Instructional staff will be provided professional development on Common Core Standards for Mathematical Practice. (full staff, grade levels, teams, etc.)	5e.1. * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.1. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding.	5e.1. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
Mathematics Goal #5E: By June 2013, 67% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 62% 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, 67% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment					
			5e.2. A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.	5e.2. Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: learning communities, webinars, self-study, and peer support.	5e.2 * District professional development team * Math coaches * Administration	5e.2. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Teacher lesson design reflecting application of St. Lucie County framework * Administrative/teacher conferencing	5e.2. * St. Lucie County framework * Administrative classroom walkthroughs
			5e.3. The daily expectation of student written responses to demonstrate thinking and reflection will be a new practice.	5e.3. * Instructional staff members will be provided professional development on designing reflective questions and analyzing student responses to determine their depth of understanding. * Instructional and peer coaching	5e.3. * District professional development team * Instructional coaches * Administration	5e.3. * Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback * Individual and collaborative review of student work	5e.3. * Student responses from teacher-made performance task items
			5e.4. Students lack the schema	5e.4. Use literature in mathematics to	5e.4. *Teachers	5e.4. *Observation of appropriate use of	5e.4. * Weekly assessments and St. Lucie

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

		necessary to solve real-world problems.	provide the meaning necessary for children to successfully grasp mathematical concepts and make connections with real-world situations	* Instructional Coaches	vocabulary in student written and oral language.	County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks * Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment * Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.
--	--	---	--	-------------------------	--	---

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2a:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2b:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

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

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

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

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

<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.
			4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

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

<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C: <i>By June 2013, 69% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on FCAT 2.0</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>64% of ELL students made satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT 2.0</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>By June 2013, 69% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on FCAT 2.0</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D: <i>By June 2013, 53% of SWD will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on FCAT 2.0.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>June 2012, 48% of SWD will make satisfactory</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>By June 2013, 53% of SWD will make satisfactory</i>					

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

	<i>progress on the mathematics on FCAT 2.0.</i>	<i>progress in mathematics on FCAT 2.0.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

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

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

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

Algebra Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>						
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Algebra Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>								
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Algebra Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>						

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra EOC Goal

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

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

Geometry Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Geometry Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 2016-2017
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Routines	K-5	Math Coach	K-5 Teachers	On-going	Coach will participate in pre-conferencing, modeling and post conferencing when modeling math routines. Grade level meetings will additionally provide support in planning math lesson supporting the math routines.	Math Coaches: Virginia Mihajlovski Brie Lamb
Calendar Math	K-5	Math Coach	K-5 Teachers	On-going	Coach will participate in pre-conferencing, modeling and post conferencing when modeling math routines.	Math Coaches: Virginia Mihajlovski Brie Lamb

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

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 Mathematics Goals

2013 School Improvement Plan – DRAFT

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1a.1. Many students are challenged to when	1a.1. Provide opportunities for teachers to integrate	1a.1. Administration	1a.1. *Journal Responses	1a.1. Teacher Evaluation

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

<p>Science Goal #1a: By June of 2013, 38% (23) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>required to write to explain at a higher level cognitive level.</p>	<p>literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science.</p>		<p>*Observation of cooperative groups.</p>	<p>Framework FCAT</p>	
	<p>33%(20) students achieved a Level 3 in science on the 2011-2012 FCAT assessment.</p>	<p>38%(23) of students will achieve a Level 3 in science on the 2012-2013 FCAT assessment.</p>						
			<p>1a.2. Time and funding for Hands-on materials for each student</p>	<p>1a.2. Implement teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, ad explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion.</p>	<p>1a.2. Science Committee/District</p>	<p>1a.2. Professional development surveys</p>	<p>1a.2. Teacher Evaluation Framework</p>	
<p>1a.3. Opportunities for students to express their learning in regards to science content</p>			<p>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.</p>	<p>1a.3. Teachers/Administration</p>	<p>1a.3. Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/labs addressing the necessary benchmarks. Monitor the use of nonfiction writing. Mini-assessments and utilize results to drive instruction.</p>	<p>1a.3. Classroom Observations of student work during labs Writing written responses Benchmark Assessments</p>		
<p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.</p>			<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	<p>1b.1.</p>	
<p>Science Goal #1b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) sections should be addressed by all schools that have students 	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>						
	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</p>						

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

taking the FAA . • Schools that do not have students taking the FAA should write N/A in these sections. Do not delete any section. • Data for these sections will be provided by the District.			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2a.1. Elementary Science Teachers do not have a depth of Science background knowledge.	2a.1. Collaborate with teachers of science in order to research, collaborate, design, and implement instructional strategies to increase rigor through inquiry-based learning. Use of Science Fusion and all included resources	2a.1. Administration	2a.1 Students will create journal responses to support their understanding and reflections on the expected learning. Students will identify confirmations of expected learning with questions of unanswered inquiries.	2a.1. Benchmark Science Assessments, FCAT
<u>Science Goal #2a:</u> By June of 2013, 12% (7) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT Science Assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 7%(4) students achieved a Level 4 or 5 in science on the 2011/2012 FCAT assessment.	<u>2013Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 12% (7) 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.	2b.1.	2.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.

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

Science Goal #2b: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			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 <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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
STEM Training	Conference – Fl. Assoc. of Sci. Teachers	Title I	\$400.00
Classroom Materials	Hands-on materials for students to participate in Science Experiments	Title I	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,400.00
			Total: \$1,400.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1a. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.
Writing Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Knowledge of the expectations and adjustments made to the scoring of the FCAT assessment.	Teams will participate in professional development session of changes made to the FCAT Writing Assessment and confirm adjustments in their writing lessons to align with the state	Writing Coach and Administration	Student Writing submitted for collaborative scoring.	SLC Framework documentation FCAT 2.0 Writing
By June 2013, 96% (65) of the students will score proficient as measured by FCAT	In June 2012, 91% (62) of students scored a 3.0 or higher on FCAT	By June 2013, 96% (65) of the students will score proficient as					

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

2.0 Writing.	Writing Assessment.	measured by FCAT 2.0 Writing.		standards.			
			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 and review new anchor standard papers to identify new level of expectations.	1a.2 Administrative Team	1a.2. Mini-lessons are written to address the new standards within the lessons with collaborative scoring to ensure that the students were moving towards a level of mastery of the expected learning.	1a.2. SLC Framework documentation
			1a.3. Write from the Beginning is a new writing program for SLC and remains at an unfamiliar level to some teachers.	1a.3. Teachers will participate in support sessions from coaches for conferencing, register to observe modeled sessions in their classroom by coach and participate in post modeling conference.	1a.3. Writing Coach	1a.3. Student Writing Samples	1a.3. Monthly Prompts FCAT 2.0 Writing.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Writing Goal #1b:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
		1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	

Writing Professional Development

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

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

Anchor Standards	K – 5	Literacy Coach	Classroom Teachers	On-going	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team
Write From the Beginning	K - 5	Literacy Coach	Classroom Teachers	On-going	Classroom Observation and Feedback	Administrative Team

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

Civics Professional Development

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

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Civics Goals

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

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement
-------------------------------	--

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

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

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

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

				meetings)		

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			<p>1.1. Lack of transportation</p> <p>Lack of motivation</p>	<p>1.1. Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to MSTT/RTI team for intervention services.</p> <p>Provide parents with information for the KidCare program, Florida’s state insurance program for children.</p> <p>Perfect Attendance incentives</p> <p>Enforce no early pick-ups after 2:45</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance Committee</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers will report students to Admin. and community support team – Boys and Girls club of excessive absences.</p>	<p>1.1. Attendance rosters.</p>
<u>Attendance Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 96%	93.1%	96%					
Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by at least 10% by June 2013.	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	305	270					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>					
	27	20					
			<p>1.2 Many students stay home for no apparent reason evidenced by lack of attendance notes or reasons that are not acceptable excuses.</p>	<p>1.2 Teachers will increase student awareness of the instructional learning goals by board postings and classroom discussions.</p>	<p>1.2 Teachers</p>	<p>1.2 Teachers will monitor student awareness of expected learning goal by tracking student progress and monitoring understanding of the learning goal</p>	<p>1.2 Mini-Benchmark assessment tests Benchmark tests</p>
			<p>1.3 We have some families that return to their home countries and take the children</p>	<p>1.3 Information regarding the policies and consequences from not following policies are</p>	<p>1.3 Administration Data specialist</p>	<p>1.3 Following notification of excessive absences/tardies, the school will monitor the</p>	<p>1.3 Skyward District Mainframe System Boys/Girls Club truancy records</p>

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

			with them.	sent home to increase understanding of the impact the absences have on their students. ESOL paraprofessionals assist in communicating with the families for clarification		attendance of children presenting attendance issues with more family contact or requesting support from Boys/Girls Club that works in a partnership with St. Lucie County to decrease truancy.	
--	--	--	------------	---	--	--	--

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
Attendance Policies	K-5	Administration Data Specialist Boys/Girls Club	All Staff	September	Administration, teachers, Data Specialists, Boys/Girls club will monitor reports and communicate monthly on students raising concerns.	Administration Data Specialist Boys/Girls Club

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. New Staff	1.1. Create incentives through school-based Positive Behavior Supports and/or MTSS/RTI to recognize and reward positive compliance on St. Lucie County Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Administrative team and PBS Core team or MTSS/RTI Core team	1.1. Monitor referral rate and participation in incentives	1.1. PBS incentives log of attendance for students who are recognized for complying with SLC Student Code of Conduct along with monthly Skyward data reports.
<u>Suspension Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Total</u>	<u>2013</u>					
By June 2013 the total number of suspensions and number of students suspended will decrease by 10% by as evidenced by the Student Attendance Report.	<u>Number of In –School Suspensions</u>	<u>Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</u>					
	7	6					
	<u>2012 Total</u>	<u>2013</u>					
	<u>Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School</u>					
	7	6					

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

	<u>2012</u> Number of Out-of- School Suspensions 142	<u>2013</u> Expected Number of Out-of- School Suspensions 128					
	<u>2012 Total</u> Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School 64	<u>2013</u> Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School 58					
			1.2 CHAMPS is new to many teachers so they will need to become more familiar with the process.	1.2 Staff will implement CHAMPS, (Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation) strategies each day in all areas of the school. They provide verbal and visual reminders for all students	1.2 Teachers Administration PBS Coach	1.2 Teachers will post and review their CHAMPS (Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation) expectations throughout the day reminding those students of the expectations as he/she sees the expectation violated.	1.2 District Skyward Mainframe system will be used to run suspension reports

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

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	K-5	PBS Core Team/Administrators	All faculty, staff, students, parents, community	Ongoing	Classroom observations	Administration, PBS Core Team
PD on MTSS/RTI	K-5	MTSS/RTI Core Team members	All faculty	Ongoing	Classroom observations	Administration

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Positive Behavior Support	Student Incentives	General Budget	\$2, 000.00
			Subtotal: \$2, 000.00
Technology			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: \$8300.00
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		1.1. Language barriers	1.1 Interpreters will be accessible to all parent involvement events. Send home information in text/phone servicing Creole/Spanish/English speakers	1.1. Administration Teachers Interpreters – ESOL Secretary Teachers Administration	1.1 Interpreters will be accessible at all events with the use of headsets for all in attendance. Parent Newsletters are sent home to service non-English speaking families. Phone calls will go home school wide in a variety of languages for invitations to school events as well as in text via a flyer.	1.1. Increased number of non-English speakers in attendance note on the sign in sheets. Sign-in Sheets with increased attendance numbers from prior year
By June 2013, 51% (260) parents will participate in activities.	<u>2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*</u> 46% (234) parents participated in activities.	1.2. Identifying correct area of interest for the families that meets their interest level.	1.2 Provide opportunities for families to come to school and be trained on instructional strategies they can implement at home. The strategies will encompass test taking strategies and instructional strategies in increase student	1.2. Administration	1.2. Parents will be provided opportunities to attend school functions in the area of Assessment, Math/Reading/Writing/Science/Social Studies/ Drama/Student Recognition Ceremonies and Individual grade level/classroom	1.2. Sign-in Sheets with increased attendance numbers from last year
	<u>2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*</u> By June 2013, 51% (260) parents will participate in activities.					

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

			achievement..		celebrations.	
		1.3. Knowledge of community resources, language, transportation.	1.3. Parents will be provided with printed matter to support their learning of available community resources. Outside service councils will be invited in to speak to families re: opportunities for support.	1.3. Administration Guidance Counselor District Health Dept Assessment Information from SLC District/DOE School Social Worker/Psychologist	1.3 Parent Resource room will be created and designed to meet their home and school needs. The room will consist of a variety of informational resources..	1.3. Sign-in sheets from parent resource visitation binder.

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

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
Information presentations providing food with the parent learning.	Title I Compliance Meeting, Assessment Meetings, Instructional Strategies families can use at home.	Title I	\$2,000.00
Training sessions on how families can help their child at home.	Printed materials (Children and Parent focused Books, Instructional Materials)	Title I	\$2,000.00
Subtotal:			\$4,000.00
Total:			\$4,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

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

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

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

1. Parent Involvement			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>							
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected level of Parent Involvement:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

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			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

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 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: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity <small>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates 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
1. Additional Goal			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Additional Goal #1:	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in</i>							

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

<i>this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.</i>					
			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:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:

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

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select “checked” under “Default Value” header; 3. Select “OK”, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	XX 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.

XX Yes No

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

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literacy/Math Routine Presentation 2. Children's Services Council Presentation 3. Classroom visitations 4. Technology awareness presentation of what tools are available to their children while at school and from home. 5. District Guest Speakers re: Grading 6. Student Incentive Programs 7. Parent Surveys 8. Compact Review

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount