

I. Current School Status:

A. School Information:

1. School-Level Information:

- a. **School:** Weatherbee Elementary School
- b. **Principal's name:** Michael Hitsman
- c. **School Advisory Council chair's name:**
- d. **Names and position titles of the School-based Leadership Team (SBLT):**

Name	Title
Michael Hitsman	Principal
Jennifer Avellino	Assistant Principal
Terrie Norris	Literacy Coach
Michele Beckford	Math Coach
Margaret Beier	Guidance Counselor

2. District-Level Information:

- a. **District:** St Lucie
- b. **Superintendent's name:** Mrs. Genelle Zoratti Yost
- c. **Date of school board approval of SIP:** 09/15/2013

B. School Advisory Council (SAC):

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. Describe the membership of the SAC including position titles:

Michael Hitsman, Principal
Erinn Anderson, 2nd Grade Teacher (Co-Chair for Area 8: Early Warning Systems)
Christine Gawlak, ESE Teacher (Co-Chair for Area 8: Early Warning Systems)
Michele Beckford, Math Coach (Area 3: Mathematics)
Terrie Norris, Literacy Coach (Area 1 and 2: Reading and Writing)
Mary Bishop, Science Resource Teacher (Area 4: Science)
Rebecca Potter (Area 5: Technology/STEM)

2. Describe the involvement of the SAC in the development of this school improvement plan:

The SAC is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to implementation of the provision of the state system of improvement and accountability. The school improvement plan addresses issues relative to the core academic issues, parent involvement, suspensions, attendance, drop-out prevention, graduation, budget, professional development opportunities, instructional materials, staffing and student support services.

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

Schedules and conducts meetings on a regular basis.
Reviews all applicable student performance data.
Recommends strategies to improve areas of student need.
Gives the final approval of the School Improvement Plan, mid-year review and the end-of-year review.

4. Describe the projected use of school improvement funds and include the amount allocated to each project:

N/A

5. Verify that your school is in compliance with Section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the School Advisory Council by selecting one of the boxes below:

In Compliance

6. If no, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements:

C. Highly Qualified Staff:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. Administrators:

a. # Administrators: 2

b. # Receiving Effective rating or higher: (not entered because basis is < 10)

c. For each of your school's administrators (principal and all assistant principals), complete the following fields:

Administrator	Credentials	Performance Record
Michael Hitsman Principal	Bachelor of Science Agricultural Education Master's Degree in Educational Leadership Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership Years as Administrator: 21 Years at Current School: 8	Year 2012-13 School WBE Grade D AYP N/A Prof Reading 45% Prof Math 52% Prof Writing 54% Lowest 25%(R) 57% Lowest 25%(M) 63% LG (R) 58% LG(M) 59% Year 2011-12 School WBE Grade C AYP N/A Prof Reading 48% Prof Math 52% Prof Writing 82% Lowest 25%(R) 79% Lowest 25%(M) 55% LG (R) 72% LG(M) 61% Year 2010-11 School WBE Grade B AYP 79% Prof Reading 59% Prof Math 75% Prof Writing 93% Lowest 25%(R) 59% Lowest 25%(M) 62% LG (R) 55% LG(M) 55%
Jennifer Avellino Asst Principal	B.S. Speech and Hearing Handicapped Education M.A. Speech and Language Pathology Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership Years as Administrator: 8 Years at Current School: 1	Year 2012-13 School WBE Grade D AYP N/A Prof Reading 45% Prof Math 52% Prof Writing 54% Lowest 25%(R) 57% Lowest 25%(M) 63% LG (R) 58% LG(M) 59% Year 2011-12 School WBE Grade C AYP N/A Prof Reading 48% Prof Math 52% Prof Writing 82% Lowest 25%(R) 79% Lowest 25%(M) 55% LG (R) 72% LG(M) 61% Year 2010-11 School WBE Grade B AYP 79% Prof Reading 59% Prof Math 75% Prof Writing 93% Lowest 25%(R) 59% Lowest 25%(M) 62% LG (R) 55% LG(M) 55%

2. Instructional Coaches:

a. # Instructional Coaches: 2

b. # Receiving Effective rating or higher: (not entered because basis is < 10)

c. For each of your school's instructional coaches, complete the following fields:

Coach	Credentials	Performance Record
Michele Beckford Full-time School-based Areas: Mathematics	Bachelor of Science, Psychology Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education 1-6 Master of Education, Educational Leadership K-12 ESOL Endorsement	Year 2012-13 School WBE Grade D AYP N/A Prof Reading 45% Prof Math 52% Prof Writing 54% Lowest 25%(R) 57% Lowest 25%(M) 63% LG (R) 58% LG(M) 59% Year 2011-12 School WBE Grade C AYP

Years as Coach: 1
Years at Current School: 0

N/A Prof Reading 48% Prof Math 52%
Prof Writing 82% Lowest 25%(R) 79%
Lowest 25%(M)
55% LG (R) 72% LG(M) 61%
Year 2010-11 School WBE Grade B AYP
79% Prof Reading 59% Prof Math 75%
Prof Writing 93% Lowest 25%(R) 59%
Lowest 25%(M) 62% LG (R) 55%
LG(M) 55%

Terrie Norris
Full-time
School-based
Areas: Reading/Literacy

Bachelor of Science, Elementary Ed. K-6/
Developmental and Behavioral Problems
in Children
ESE Certification K-12
ESOL Endorsement K-12
Master's Degree Reading

Years as Coach: 2
Years at Current School: 6

Year 2012-13 School WBE Grade D AYP
N/A Prof Reading 45% Prof Math 52%
Prof Writing 54% Lowest 25%(R) 57%
Lowest 25%(M) 63% LG (R) 58%
LG(M) 59%
Year 2011-12 School WBE Grade C AYP
N/A Prof Reading 48% Prof Math 52%
Prof Writing 82% Lowest 25%(R) 79%
Lowest 25%(M)
55% LG (R) 72% LG(M) 61%
Year 2010-11 School WBE Grade B AYP
79% Prof Reading 59% Prof Math 75%
Prof Writing 93% Lowest 25%(R) 59%
Lowest 25%(M) 62% LG (R) 55%
LG(M) 55%

3. Classroom Teachers:

- a. # of classroom teachers: 46
- b. # receiving effective rating or higher: 0, 0%
- c. # Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT), as defined in 20 U.S.C. § 7801(23): 39, 85%
- d. # certified in-field, pursuant to Section 1012.2315(2), F.S.: 44, 96%
- e. # ESOL endorsed: 32, 70%
- f. # reading endorsed: 4, 9%
- g. # with advanced degrees: 12, 26%
- h. # National Board Certified: 3, 7%
- i. # first-year teachers: 4, 9%
- j. # with 1-5 years of experience: 17, 37%
- k. # with 6-14 years of experience: 8, 17%
- l. # with 15 or more years of experience: 15, 33%

4. Education Paraprofessionals, pursuant to s. 1012.01(2)(e):

- a. # of paraprofessionals: 7
- b. # Highly Qualified, as defined in 20 U.S.C. § 6319(c): 7, 100%

5. Other Instructional Personnel:

- a. # of instructional personnel not captured in Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom Teachers or Education Paraprofessionals: 0
- b. # receiving effective rating or higher: (not entered because basis is < 10)

6. Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies:

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

a. Describe your school's strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school; include the person responsible.:

The following strategies are used to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers:

1. Interview process by administration. Secure quality staff with a similar philosophy.
2. New teachers attend district orientation
3. School wide new teacher school orientation
4. Monthly scheduled meetings for new teachers
5. Mentor/Team appointed to each new teacher
6. Quality instructional training with follow-up
7. Frequent observations, classroom walk-throughs and feedback

7. Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

a. Describe your school's teacher mentoring program/plan including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities:

Plan:

Team Leaders and/or Veteran Teachers to Weatherbee Elementary are paired with new teachers or teachers new to Weatherbee Elementary. The Districts' SHINE program is followed with fidelity.

Planned Mentoring Activities:

- Monthly NEST (New Educator Support Team) meetings with school and district personnel support driven by targets specific for each new teacher.
- Attend 3 District Cohort meetings to obtain needed professional development.
- Utilize release time for teacher observations.
- One-on-one support and coaching provided by mentors, school Math/Literacy Coaches and district liaison.
- Complete Pinpoint Content to deepen knowledge on district initiatives.
- Observe highly effective teachers.
- Complete and document target skills/activities on log.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. Describe your school's data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of your MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs:

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.

2. What is the function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to the school's MTSS and the SIP? :

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, and ensures implementation of the intervention and support.

Literacy Coach: Facilitates the data meetings in reference to reading and provides curriculum support strategies in meeting the needs of struggling readers.

Math Coach: Facilitates the data meetings in reference to math and provides curriculum support strategies in meeting the needs of those performing below expectations in the area of math.

Assistant Principal (Data Coach): Provides data to monitor instruction and develops plans and strategies to assist identified students.

Speech Pathologist: Will contribute assessment data on receptive and expressive language skills.

Guidance Counselor: Facilitates the scheduling of the CORE Team meetings as well as monitoring the documentation for the "Response to Intervention" meetings.

3. Describe the systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP:

1. The school-based MTSS Team will review data both aggregated and disaggregated by subgroups to assist in setting of objectives, the action plan strategies, resources and evaluation tools.
2. Grade level groups will review their data. Data will identify those students (by subgroup) for whom the core curriculum is not effective. An analysis of the data will generate hypotheses utilizing a problem solving method. Interventions will be implemented to address each student's specific needs. Progress monitoring will follow.
3. The MTSS problem solving team will meet to review data supported through progress monitoring. Some of the team members will change based on whether the data reflects concerns about behavior and/or reading or math.
4. Core team meets at least 3-4 times a year to review universal screening data and attendance 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.
5. 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.
6. The team will collaborate with the Building Level Planning Team (BLPT), SAC, MTSS-B, Math Committee, and School Literacy Team. Core team members will serve as members of smaller PST and schedule PST meetings (weekly). Core teams will communicate with parents/community to facilitate the understanding of Response to Instruction/Intervention.

4. Describe the data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement (e.g., behavior, attendance):

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

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

2. Managed data will include:

A. Academic

- Oral Reading Fluency Measures
- EasyCBM Benchmark Assessments
- Journeys Benchmark Assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT

• Student grades

- School site specific assessments

B. Behavioral

- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day/per month
- Team Climate Surveys

• C. Attendance

Referrals to special education programs

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

5. Describe the plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents:

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.

3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

E. Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. Describe research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy Type	Minutes Added to School Year	Purpose
Before or After School Program	19,900	Instruction in core academic subjects, Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
Strategy Description	21st Century Learning Communities uses the strategies of additional time to work on Core Academic Subjects, homework, and project-based learning to increase the learning time and give extended learning opportunities.	
How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?	Data is collected from previous State-wide assessments such as the FCAT to determine placement in the program for students in grades 3-5. District and classroom assessments are monitored regularly to determine the effectiveness of the strategies.	
Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?	Erin Monaghan Mary Bishop Michael Hitsman Jennifer Avellino	
Strategy Type	Minutes Added to School Year	Purpose
Weekend Program	1,080	Instruction in core academic subjects
Strategy Description	Saturday Writing Camp - Students in grades 3-4 are invited to participate in a 3 hour workshop each Saturday for six weeks. The focus is centered on all elements of writing to include Nancy Priztio modeling writing. This is an additional means to give feedback to the students in reference to their writing.	
How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?	School-wide Monthly Writing Prompts	
Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?	Administration and Writing Coordinator	

F. Literacy Leadership Team (LLT):

1. Identify the names and position titles of the members of your school-based LLT:

Name	Title
Michael Hitsman	Principal
Terrie Norris	Literacy Coach
Erin Monaghan	Reading Teacher
Aryne Rackley	Third Grade Teacher
Pam Ferentzy	Media Clerk
Dr. Jennifer Nelson	Fifth Grade Teacher
Cindy Winterkamp	First Grade Teacher
Nancy Meihnsner	Fourth Grade Teacher
Teresa Malone	Reading Teacher
Marjorie Bouis	Kindergarten Teacher
Lori Leiblein	Kindergarten Teacher
Monica Adhin	Second Grade Teacher
LaDonna Hannans	Paraprofessional

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

The team will meet on a monthly basis as a minimum. The facilitator will provide an agenda throughout the year by seeking input from the faculty and staff prior to the scheduled monthly meetings. She will also place on the agenda any district required initiatives.

3. What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?:

The Literacy Leadership team will be focusing on several major initiatives that include the implementation of the new St. Lucie County Literacy routines, implementation of the HMH Journeys reading basal series and the implementation of the K-5 Write From the Beginning school-wide writing program. We will continue to refine our a school based program aligned to the district Literacy Routine that addresses sight words, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, decoding, oral language and writing across the curriculum.

G. Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Improvement:

1. Describe how the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student:

1. Provide Professional Development for Literacy to deepen their understanding of Literacy through District Literacy Specialists and District Instructional Partners.
 2. Continued implementation of the Journeys Reading basal series.
 3. Continue implementation of the K-4 Write from the Beginning School-wide writing program.
 4. We will continue to refine our school based program in order for it to align to the District Literacy Routine.
- Professional learning opportunities for all staff are offered throughout the year in the areas of Literacy and Writing.

H. Preschool Transition:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. Describe strategies 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. However, students who attend the private provider's sites also have the opportunity for transition into the elementary school environment. The provider at each site makes their own arrangements to visit school sites. All providers complete a strategy checklist on each child coming into Kindergarten which the Early Learning Coalition sends to the administration of the receiving school to assist in creating the Kindergarten class roster. A "Welcome to Kindergarten" packet is given to each parent when they enroll their child at the school. The packet has Kindergarten transition materials included and school information as well. Weatherbee contacts the local preschools and invites them to the school for a tour of the facility. During the tour the

students are introduced to the teachers and staff, given a guided tour of the campus and provided brochures to share with their families. An annual "Kindergarten Orientation" night is also hosted for parents and students who have enrolled at the school.

Weatherbee will continue to offer a voluntary VPK program which will focus on ensuring that our new students will be intellectually, emotionally, physically, and socially ready to enter our Kindergarten program. The program will consist of one highly qualified instructor and one paraprofessional with a class ratio of 20:1. The program's design is set up to ensure that all of our students come to school eager to learn when they enter Kindergarten. Both adults in the classroom are highly qualified.

I. College and Career Readiness:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

1. How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?:
2. How does the school promote academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful?:
3. Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report \(http://data.fldoe.org/readiness/\)](http://data.fldoe.org/readiness/), which is maintained by the Department of Education, pursuant to Rule 6A-10.038, F.A.C:

II. Expected Improvements:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

A. Area 1: Reading:

1. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA:

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	49%	45%	No	54%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	42%	30%	No	48%
Hispanic	48%	42%	No	53%
White	62%	64%	Yes	66%
English language learners	36%	18%	No	42%
Students with disabilities	37%	9%	No	43%
Economically disadvantaged	48%	42%	No	53%

2. Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	69	26%	37%

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	50	19%	25%
--	----	-----	-----

3. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	0	0%	0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	4	67%	75%

4. Learning Gains:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	160	58%	73%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	158	57%	72%

5. Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	71	42%	52%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	49	29%	39%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	47	28%	38%

6. Postsecondary readiness:

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

B. Area 2: Writing:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	45	54%	75%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	1	100%	100%

C. Area 3: Mathematics:

1. Elementary and Middle School Mathematics:

a. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - students scoring at or above Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA:

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	59%	52%	No	63%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	58%	40%	No	63%
Hispanic	55%	52%	No	60%
White	68%	58%	No	71%
English language learners	46%	26%	No	51%
Students with disabilities	51%	24%	No	56%
Economically disadvantaged	58%	47%	No	63%

b. Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	70	25%	58%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	64	23%	30%

c. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	3	50%	60%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	1	17%	25%

d. Learning Gains:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	163	59%	74%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	175	63%	73%

2. Middle School Acceleration (This target includes Algebra I, Geometry, and Biology):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Middle school participation in high school EOC and industry			

certifications			
Middle school performance on high school EOC and industry certifications			

3. High School Mathematics:

a. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - students scoring at or above Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA:

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	59%		No	63%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	58%		No	63%
Hispanic	55%		No	60%
White	68%		No	71%
English language learners	46%		No	51%
Students with disabilities	51%		No	56%
Economically disadvantaged	58%		No	63%

b. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

c. Learning Gains:

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)			
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)			

d. Postsecondary readiness:

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

4. Algebra I End-of-Course Assessment (EOC):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

5. Geometry End-of-Course Assessment (EOC):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

D. Area 4: Science:

1. Elementary School Science:

a. Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	38	44%	50%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	14	16%	25%

b. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	0	0%	0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	1	17%	27%

2. Middle School Science:

a. Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

b. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

3. High School Science:

a. Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6			
Students scoring at or above Level 7			

4. Biology I End-of-Course Assessment (EOC):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

E. Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM):

1. All levels:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		4
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	493	90%	95%

2. High schools:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses			
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses			
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses			
CTE-STEM program concentrators			
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams			

F. Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses			
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses			

Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses			
Students taking CTE industry certification exams			
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams			
CTE program concentrators			
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications			

G. Area 7: Social Studies (Area 7 will not be completed in 2013-14):

1. U.S. History End-of-Course Assessment (EOC):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

2. Civics End-of-Course Assessment (EOC):

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3			
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4			

H. Area 8: Early Warning Systems:

1. Elementary School Indicators:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	69	11%	5%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	57	9%	5%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	50	45%	52%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	41	6%	3%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	10	1%	0%

2. Middle School Indicators:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students who fail a mathematics course			

Students who fail an English Language Arts course			
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

3. High School Indicators:

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time			
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days			
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject			
Students with grade point average less than 2.0			
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade			
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals			
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.			

4. Graduation:

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.			
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)			
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.			
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)			

I. Area 9: Parent Involvement:

1. Describe parental involvement targets for your school:

- Involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A in decisions about how Title I, Part A funds reserved for parent involvement are spent.
- Members of the Parent Involvement Committee, School Advisory Council, and Title I Committee, as well as any other committee where parents or community members serve, will have members nominated by their peers. Individuals will be voted in by approval from the current members serving on the committee. In all proceedings, members will be selected by their peers in accordance with District policy. Members will be recruited through the monthly newsletters, school-wide phone messaging system (Connect-Ed), and letters/fliers inviting parents to participate. Documentation of the invitations and minutes of the proceedings will be recorded, submitted and filed by

the appropriate personnel, adhering to the District's and/or State's mandates.

- Jointly develop/revise with parents the school parent involvement policy and distribute it to parents of participating children and make available the parent involvement plan to the local community
- Jointly conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the school's parent involvement policy
- Use the findings of the parent involvement policy evaluation to design strategies for more effective parent involvement, and to revise, if necessary, the school's parent involvement policy
- Inform parents and parent organizations of the purpose and existence of the Parental Information and Resource Centers (PIRC) in Florida, i.e., PIRC of Family Network on Disabilities in Florida (FND) and PIRC at University of South Florida (USF)
- If the plan for Title I, Part A, developed under section 1112, is not satisfactory to the parents of participating children, the school will submit parent comments with the plan when the school submits the plan to the local educational agency
- Provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least mathematics, language arts, and reading
- Provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I Final Regulations (67 Fed. Reg. 71710, December 2, 2002)
- Provide each parent timely notice information regarding the professional qualifications of the students' classroom teachers and paraprofessionals, as described in section 1111(h)(6)(A)

2. Specific Parental Involvement Targets:

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Meet Your Teacher	422	63%	75%
Kids At Hope Tunnel	112	17%	27%
Title I Right to Know	101	15%	25%
Other Caring Adults Luncheon	403	60%	70%
Parent Conference Night	174	25%	35%
Mariner of the Month	99	15%	25%
Families Building Better Readers	319	48%	58%
Kids at Hope Parent Training	74	11%	21%
Student Led Parent Conferences	403	60%	70%
FCAT Family Night	97	15%	25%
Math Night at Publix	51	8%	18%
Parent ESOL Night	125	19%	29%
Volunteer Breakfast	42	6%	16%
PBS Kids at Hope Talent Show	305	45%	55%
Fifth Grade Graduation	180	99%	100%

J. Area 10: Additional Targets:

1. Description of additional targets:

2. Specific Additional Targets:

K. Problem Solving:

Goal:				
Supported Areas:				
Resources				
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence

Goal:	By June 2014, 75% (81) of students in grade 4 will score a 4.0 proficiency level or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test			
Supported Areas:	Writing			
Resources	Literacy Coach, Write from the Beginning Curriculum, Curriculum Coach, Title One Saturday Writing Camp, Writing Consultant to Model and Support Teachers, Grade Level Professional Development to deepen understanding of the Writing Curriculum, using Writing Exemplars from Appendix C of the Common Core State Standards and Incorporate Read Alouds into lesson design to support guided writing practice.			
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Literacy Coach 4. Classroom Teachers	Review of monthly school-wide writing data.	Monthly	School-wide writing samples

Selected Barrier: Lack of student's ability to use conventions of writing, grammar and sentence structure.

Strategy: Professional Development for our district writing curriculum, "Write from the Beginning". This includes incorporating thinking maps throughout the writing process.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. District Writing Specialist 2. Contracted Writing Consultant 3. Literacy Coach	1. Teachers will attend district trainings on "Write from the Beginning". 2. Five teacher trainings throughout the year with our contracted writing consultant to train teachers. 3. Model and coach teachers in the implementation of "Write from the Beginning".	1. District trainings are scheduled in the Fall of 2013 2. Five trainings by our contracted writing consultant will be scheduled on the following dates: 8/28, 10/15, 11/13, 1/14 and 2/4 3. On-going modeling throughout the school year with identified teachers	1. Teacher will receive inservice points at the completion of the training. 2. Review of the student writing portfolios and writing samples 3. Coach Logs documenting classroom visits and teacher conferencing
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Literacy Coach 4. Contracted Writing Consultant	1. Attend professional development trainings 2. Review writing samples and provide feedback to students and teachers	1. Review of writing portfolio will take place monthly in grade level data meetings. 2. Classroom observations.	1. Data compiled from school-wide monthly writing prompts. 2. Teachers will exchange papers to improve calibration of the scoring utilizing the FCAT rubric. 3. Feedback from our

			writing consultant on writing samples.
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Literacy Coach 3. Instructional Partner 4. Contracted writing consultant	School-wide writing samples	Monthly	Student writing portfolios

Unselected Strategies	Teachers will teach a variety of lessons specifically targeting conventions, spelling and sentence structure.
-----------------------	---

Selected Barrier: Lack of student's ability to use conventions of writing, grammar and sentence structure.

Strategy: Students will increase time on task in writing across all curriculum

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. Classroom Teachers 2. Literacy Coach 3. Instructional Partner 4. Administration	Follow St Lucie County Literacy Routines with fidelity	1. On-going 2. Daily	1. Classroom Walkthroughs 2. Student Writing Samples
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Literacy Coach 4. Contracted Writing Consultant	1. Attend professional development trainings 2. Review writing samples and provide feedback to students and teachers	Monthly	Student writing samples
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Literacy Coach 3. Instructional Partner 4. Classroom Teacher	School-wide writing samples	Monthly	School-wide writing samples

Unselected Strategies	Teachers will teach a variety of lessons specifically targeting conventions, spelling and sentence structure.
-----------------------	---

Selected Barrier: Lack of appropriate implementation of the "Write from the Beginning" curriculum due to new teachers.

Strategy: Professional Development for our district writing curriculum, "Write from the Beginning" will be provided to new teachers.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. Contracted writing consultant 2. Literacy Coach 3. Administration 4. Instructional Partner 5. Classroom teachers 6. Media Specialist	Teachers will attend professional Development to strengthen skills in teaching Write from the Beginning.	Ongoing with Contracted Writing Consultant throughout 2013-14 school year.	School-wide student writing samples
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Literacy Coach 4. Contracted writing consultant	1. Attend professional development trainings 2. Review writing samples and provide feedback to students and teachers	1. Review of writing portfolio will take place monthly in grade level data meetings. 2. Classroom observations.	School-wide writing samples

Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Literacy Coach 3. Instructional Partner 4. Contracted writing consultant	School-wide writing samples	Monthly	School Wide Writing Samples

Goal:	By June of 2013, 50% (44/88) of students in grade 5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the 2013-2014 FCAT Science Assessment.			
Supported Areas:	Science, Science - Elementary School			
Resources	Title One Budget, Science Resource Teacher, Curriculum Coach, Instructional Partner, 21st Century Community Learning Center, Technology resource teacher, RTI Walk to Intervention, Professional development			
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Classroom teachers 3. Science resource teacher	1. Grade groups data meetings will determine if students are at mastery.	On-going throughout the 2013-14 school year	1. Grade group data meetings to analyze data.

Selected Barrier: Opportunities for students to express their learning in regards to science content.

Strategy: Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical, Life, Earth Space, and Nature of Science.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. Classroom teachers 2. Administration 3. Science resource teacher	1. Monitor the implementation of inquiry based, hands-on activities/labs addressing the necessary benchmarks. 2. Monitor the use of nonfiction writing (e.g., Power Writing/Lab Reports, Conclusion Writing, Current Events, etc.) 3. After each assessment (Interim or Quarterly Science Benchmark Assessments), conduct data analysis to identify students' performance within those categories and develop differentiated instructional activities to address individual student needs. 4. Conduct mini-assessments and utilize results to drive instruction. 5. Monitor students' participation in applied STEM activities, i.e., Science Fair and other types of science competitions and the quality of their work.	1. On-going throughout the 2013-14 school year	1. Classroom Observations of student work during labs 2. Writing prompts 3. Benchmark Assessments 4. Science Fair Projects
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Classroom teachers 2. Science Chair 3. Administration	1. Classroom Observations of student work during labs. 2. Monitoring of Science Journals 3. Progress Monitoring Assessments 4. Hands-on Activities and Labs 5. Science Fair Projects	Ongoing through the 2013-14 school year	1. Completed labs, hands-on activities, Science Fair Projects and Science Journals.
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Classroom Teachers 3.	1. Mini-bat assessments data 2. SLC District progress monitoring data 3. Fusion Science assessment data	On-going throughout	2. Student lab work 3.

Science resource teacher	the 2013-14 School year	Science journals 4. Science projects
--------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------

Goal:	In 2013-14, 100% of all 3-5th grade classrooms will conduct a montly STEM Design Challenge.			
Supported Areas:	STEM			
Resources	Title One Budget, Math Coach, Instructional Partner, Curriculum Coach, 21st Century Community Learning Center, Technology Resource Teacher, RTI Walk to Intervention, Professional Development			
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Science Resource Teacher 4. Math Coach	Data will be reviewed during grade group data meetings and feedback will be used to develop further STEM design challenges.	Monthly	Grade group data meetings will produce discussions about how challenges if challenges are producing effects.

Selected Barrier: Teachers are not aware of STEM initiative and how to create STEM Design Challenges.				
Strategy: Teachers will work with Science Resource Teacher and Math Coach to develop STEM design challenges.				
Action Step: Who		What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Math Coach 3. Science Resource Teacher 4. Instructional Partner 5. Classroom Teachers	Create monthly STEM design challenges	Monthly	1. Lesson Plans 2. Student created design challenge products
Monitor Fidelity		What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Instructional Partner 3. Math Coach	1. Classroom walk throughs 2. Review lesson plans for STEM desgin challenges.	Monthly	1. Lesson Plans 2. Student created products from the STEM design challenge
Monitor Effective		What	When	Evidence
	1. Classroom Teachers 2. Administration 3. Science Resource Teacher 4. Math Coach 5. Instructional Partner	Completion of design challenge data will be collected	Monthly	Student created STEM design challenge products

Goal:	By June 2014, 52% (158/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.			
Supported Areas:	Reading - AMO's, Reading - FCAT2.0, Reading - FAA, Reading - Learning Gains, Reading - CELLA			
Resources	Title One Budget, Instructional Partner, Literacy Coach, 21st Century Community Learning Centers			
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence
	1. Weatherbee Leadership Team 2. District Instructional	1. Teacher/Administration Conferences 2. Classroom Observation/Walkthroughs	Data will be reviewed every 5-10 days within grade level data	MTSS/RTI Team will meet every 9 weeks to review overall data. Regroup students as evidenced by the

Partner

meetings.

data.

Selected Barrier: A lack of Common Core Standards (k-2) and Standards Based Instruction (3-5) knowledge present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.

Strategy: Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the process of unpacking a standard for standards based instruction.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
District Professional Development Team, Reading Coach, Administration, Teacher	1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding. 3. The Literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 4. The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1. During monthly Professional Development opportunities for the 2013-14 school year. 2. During weekly Data review meetings held during grade group planning.	1. SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs 3. Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. 4. Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 5. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. 6. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. 7. District Benchmarks (Baseline, Mid-Year and Predictive) 8. Mini-Bats
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Members of the Weatherbee Leadership Team 2. Members of the District Professional Development Team 3. District Instructional Partner	Review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	During Administrative classroom Walk Throughs	1. Formal/Informal Observation Data entered into Pinpoint. 2. Lesson Plans showing Common Board Configuration evidence. 3. Feedback given to teachers after classroom walk throughs.
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Literacy Coach 2. Instructional Partner	The data collected will be mini-bats and District Assessments (Baseline, Mid-Year and Predictive)	Data will be collected weekly with Mini-bats, 3 times a year for District Assessments (September, November and February).	Data reviewed during grade group data meetings

Selected Barrier: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary.

Strategy: Emphasize reading strategies which help students determine the meaning of words by using context clues through the use of Document Based Questioning (DBQ)

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. Instructional Partner 2. Literacy Coach 3. Administrative	1. Verify that the St. Lucie County Literacy routine is followed with fidelity 2. Teachers will differentiate instruction. 3. Teachers will	1. During the 2013-14 school year, Professional Development will be held to address reading strategies and St. Lucie County Literacy	The evidence of the implementation will be seen through lesson plans, administrative classroom walk-throughs and evidence

Team 4. Teachers	unwrap NGSSS vocabulary standards. 4. More rigorous tasks will be aligned to the vocabulary standards.	Routines. 2. During collaborative planning held 4 times a week, the standards will be upwrapped and rigorous tasks will be designed.	of collaborative planning sessions.
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. District Professional 2. Instructional Partners 3. Development Team 4. Literacy Coach 5. Administration	1. Grade level formative assessments will be used and reviewed 2. Teacher modeling "Think alouds" 3. Classroom observations based on the St. Lucie County Framework	1. During classroom walk-throughs 2. Weekly data meetings 3. Informal and formal observations/evaluations	1. Documentation of observations in Teacher evaluation system. 2. Compilation of Weekly data from assessments and documentation on tracking sheets
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. District Professional 2. Instructional Partners 3. Development Team 4. Literacy Coach 5. Administration	1. The Literacy Coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 2. The MTSS Interventionists (Tier II and Tier III) will review data bi-weekly and make adjustments to student interventions as needed	Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.	1. Common Weekly teacher generated assessments. 2. Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments 3. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3. 4. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment. 5. Journeys Unit assessments.

Selected Barrier: A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.

Strategy: Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. District Professional Development Team 2. Literacy Coach 3. Administration 4. Teachers	1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Administrative/Teacher conferencing.	1. SLC Framework 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs	Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework.
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Literacy Coach	1. Classroom Observations/Walkthroughs 2. Administration/Teacher Conferencing 3. Use of St. Lucie County Framework	During Professional Development Days, Team Learning Communities	Fidelity Checklist/Administrative observations
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Administration 2. Instructional Partners	Create exit tickets and surveys to receive teacher feedback	1. During Professional Development Day 2. Team Learning	1. Completion of exit tickets and surveys to compile data on effectiveness of the training 2. Classroom walk through to gather evidence of implementation

Goal:	By June 2014, 58% (218/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.			
Supported Areas:	Math, Math - Elementary and Middle School, Math - Elementary and Middle AMO's, Math - Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Math - Elementary and Middle FAA, Math - Elementary and Middle Learning Gains			
Resources	Title One Budget, Math Coach, Instructional Partner, Curriculum Coach, 21st Century Community Learning Center, Technology Resource Teacher, RTI Walk to Intervention, Professional Development			
Monitor Goal	Who	What	When	Evidence
	1. Administration 2. Math Coach 3. District Instructional Partner 4. Teachers	Data chats about all assessments will guide further instruction.	Changes will be made according to assessment data. Weekly, quarterly and on-going assessment will be used to monitor the incremental changes and adjusted accordingly.	1. Classroom Walk-Through Data 2. Lesson Plan review 3. Collaborative Planning feedback

Selected Barrier: According to the results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment and current student abilities as indicated on the IEP's, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Base Ten and Fractions

Strategy: Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives.

Action Step: Who	What	When	Evidence
1. Classroom teachers 2. ESE teachers 3. Math Coach 4. Instructional Partner	1. Professional development by Math Coach 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework	1. During the 2013-14 school year. 2. On-going classroom observations and modeling.	1. Informal/ Formal Classroom Observations. 2. Math mini assessments. 3. SLC District progress monitoring assessments.
Monitor Fidelity	What	When	Evidence
1. Math Coach 2. District Differentiated Accountability Team 3. Administration	1. Classroom Walk-Throughs 2. Review of lesson plans 3. Monitoring Collaborative Planning Sessions 4. Develop Quarterly Assessment Calendar	1. On-going 2. Daily Classroom Walk-Throughs 3. Routine scheduled assessments (see assessment calendar) 4. Weekly Collaborative Planning Sessions	1. Lesson Plans 2. Feedback given on Teacher Evaluation System 3. Mini assessment data 4. District Progress monitoring assessment data
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Math Coach 2. Administration 3. Guidance Counselor 4. Media Specialist	1. Mini assessments 2. Go Math! Assessments 3. Easy CBM Assessments 4. SLC District Progress Monitoring Assessments (3 times year)	See District and School Progress Monitoring Calendar/Instructional Focus Calendar	Data from assessments listed will be provided during scheduled grade level data meetings. Individual, grade level, school level and District wide comparisons will be reviewed.

Unselected Strategies

St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.

Selected Barrier: According to the results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment and current student abilities as indicated on the IEP's, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Base Ten and Fractions

Strategy: Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions.

Action Step: Who		What	When	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Professional • Instructional Partners • Development Team • Literacy Coach • Administration • Teachers 	Students will maintain a Math Journal	During Math Block	Teachers will provide feedback upon review of student work
Monitor Fidelity		What	When	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Professional • Instructional Partners • Development Team • Math Coach • Administration 	Administration, Instructional Partners and Math Coach will give effective feedback	During Administration observations	Check for fidelity of Math Journals
Monitor Effective		What	When	Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Professional • Instructional Partners • Development Team • Math Coach • Administration • Teachers 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly assessments and St. Lucie County Benchmarks, and Easy CBM Benchmarks • Results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment • Teacher assessment identifying learning scales achievement of targeted goal-level 3.

Unselected Strategies

St. Lucie County Mathematics routine will be implemented with fidelity to frame instructional delivery.

Selected Barrier: Teachers lack of knowledge of implementation of Go Math series, Calendar Math and SLC Math Routine which includes daily expectations of student written responses and the use of manipulatives.

Strategy: Implement SLC Math Routine and Calendar Math using supported Go Math materials.

Action Step: Who		What	When	Evidence
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers 2. Math Coach 3. Administration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development by Math Coach. 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner. 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the 2013-14 school year 2. On-going classroom observations and modeling 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Informal/ Formal Classroom Observations. 2. Math mini assessments. 3. SLC District progress monitoring assessments.
Monitor Fidelity		What	When	Evidence
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math Coach 2. District Differentiated Accountability team 3. Administration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom Walk Throughs 2. Review of lesson plans 3. Monitoring Collaborative Planning Sessions 4. Develop Quarterly Assessment Calendar 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On-going. 2. Daily Classroom Walk Throughs. 3. Routine scheduled assessments (see assessment calendar). 4. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lesson Plans. 2. Feedback given on Teacher Evaluation System. 3. Mini assessment data. 4. District Progress monitoring assessment data.

		Weekly Collaborative Planning Sessions.	
Monitor Effective	What	When	Evidence
1. Math Coach 2. Administration 3. Guidance Counselor 4. Media Specialist	1. Mini assessments 2. Go Math! Assessments 3. Easy CBM Assessments 4. SLC District Progress Monitoring Assessments (3 X year)	See District and School Progress Monitoring Calendar/Instructional Focus Calendar	Data from assessments listed will be provided during scheduled grade level data meetings. Individual, grade level, school level and District wide comparisons will be reviewed.
Unselected Strategies	Aligning new curriculum with the district scope and sequence. Use of instructional focus calendars and content focus sheets. Continue implementation of Deliberate Curriculum Model. Teachers will utilize ThinkCentral.com, Destination Math, Go Math-Soar to Success, FCAT Explorer and other on-line math programs Grade groups will have collaborative planning time to design quality lessons		

III. Coordination and Integration:

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

A. Describe how federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include Title I, Part A; Title I, Part C Migrant; Title I, Part D; Title II; Title III; Title VI, Part B; Title X Homeless; Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI); violence prevention programs; nutrition programs; housing programs; Head Start; adult education; CTE; and job training, as applicable to your school:

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure students' needs are met.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention Programs.

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all level 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students which incorporates field trips, community service, drug tests and counseling

Nutrition Programs

Fruit and Vegetable Grant

Weatherbee Elementary was awarded a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant for the 2011-2012 and again for 2012-2013 school year. The grant sets aside funds for fresh fruits and vegetables to be served to students five times a week Monday- Friday. Information is shared by the district describing the nutritional value of the item and a variety of methods for preparation. In addition, lesson plans are also made available to the teachers for classroom instruction.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

Weatherbee houses a Rosetta Stone Lab which hosts ESOL parents twice a week for 2.5 hours per evening throughout the year.

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

IV. Professional Development:

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

A. For each professional development activity identified in Part II as a strategy to eliminate or reduce a barrier to a goal, provide the following information::

Item 1: 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding. 3. The Literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 4. The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 52% (158/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

A lack of Common Core Standards (k-2) and Standards Based Instruction (3-5) knowledge present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.

Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the process of unpacking a standard for standards based instruction.

2. **Topic, focus, and content (action step):** 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding. 3. The Literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 4. The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.
3. **Facilitator or leader:** Mandy Rowland- District Literacy Liason
4. **Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):**
District Professional Development Team, Reading Coach, Administration, Teacher
5. **Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):**
 1. During monthly Professional Development opportunities for the 2013-14 school year.
 2. During weekly Data review meetings held during grade group planning.
6. **Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:**
 1. SLC Framework
 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
 3. Common Weekly teacher generated

assessments.

4. Easy CBM Benchmark Assessments

5. Teacher assessment identifying learning scale achievement of targeted goal – Level 3.

6. Results from the 2013 FCAT assessment.

7. District Benchmarks :Baseline, Mid-Year and Predictive)

8. Mini-Bats Person Responsible: District Professional Development Team, Reading Coach, Administration, Teacher

Item 2: 1. Verify that the St. Lucie County Literacy routine is followed with fidelity 2. Teachers will differentiate instruction. 3. Teachers will unwrap NGSSS vocabulary standards. 4. More rigorous tasks will be aligned to the vocabulary standards.

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 52% (158/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

The area of deficiency as noted on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary.

Emphasize reading strategies which help students determine the meaning of words by using context clues through the use of Document Based Questioning (DBQ)

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): 1. Verify that the St. Lucie County Literacy routine is followed with fidelity 2. Teachers will differentiate instruction. 3. Teachers will unwrap NGSSS vocabulary standards. 4. More rigorous tasks will be aligned to the vocabulary standards.

3. Facilitator or leader: Mandy Rowland- District Literacy Liason

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

1. Instructional Partner

2. Literacy Coach

3. Administrative Team

4. Teachers

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

1. During the 2013-14 school year, Professional Development will be held to address reading strategies and St. Lucie County Literacy Routines.

2. During collaborative planning held 4 times a week, the standards will be unwrapped and rigorous tasks will be designed.

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

The evidence of the implementation will be seen through lesson plans, administrative classroom walk-throughs and evidence of collaborative planning sessions. Person Responsible: 1. Instructional Partner

2. Literacy Coach

3. Administrative Team

4. Teachers

Item 3: 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Administrative/Teacher conferencing.

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 52% (158/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

A broad range of knowledge and abilities to implement research-based practices of the St. Lucie County framework exist among instructional staff.

Instructional staff members will be provided professional development opportunities: webinars, learning communities, peer support and self-reading.

2. **Topic, focus, and content (action step):** 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback.
2. Administrative/Teacher conferencing.
3. **Facilitator or leader:** Trish Cordeiro
4. **Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):**
 1. District Professional Development Team
 2. Literacy Coach
 3. Administration
 4. Teachers
5. **Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):**
 1. SLC Framework
 2. Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs
6. **Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:**

Teacher lesson design reflecting of St. Lucie County Framework. Person Responsible: 1. District Professional Development Team

 2. Literacy Coach
 3. Administration
 4. Teachers

Item 4: 1. Professional development by Math Coach 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 58% (218/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

According to the results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment and current student abilities as indicated on the IEP's, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Base Ten and Fractions

Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives.

2. **Topic, focus, and content (action step):** 1. Professional development by Math Coach 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework
3. **Facilitator or leader:** Math Coach, Instructional Partner
4. **Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):**
 1. Classroom Teachers
 2. ESE Teachers
 3. Math Coach
 4. Instructional Partner
5. **Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):**
 1. During the 2013-14 school year.
 2. On-going classroom observations and modeling.
6. **Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:**
 1. Informal/ Formal Classroom Observations.
 2. Math mini assessments.
 3. SLC District progress monitoring assessments. Person Responsible: 1. Classroom teachers
 2. ESE teachers
 3. Math Coach
 4. Instructional Partner

Item 5: Students will maintain a Math Journal

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 58% (218/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

According to the results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment and current student abilities as indicated on the IEP's, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Base Ten and Fractions

Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions.

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): Students will maintain a Math Journal

3. Facilitator or leader: Michele Beckford

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

- District Professional
- Instructional Partners
- Development Team
- Literacy Coach
- Administration
- Teachers

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

During Math Block

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

Teachers will provide feedback upon review of student work Person Responsible: • District Professional

- Instructional Partners
- Development Team
- Literacy Coach
- Administration
- Teachers

Item 6: 1. Teachers will attend district trainings on "Write from the Beginning". 2. Five teacher trainings throughout the year with our contracted writing consultant to train teachers. 3. Model and coach teachers in the implementation of "Write from the Beginning".

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 75% (81) of students in grade 4 will score a 4.0 proficiency level or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

Lack of student's ability to use conventions of writing, grammar and sentence structure.

Professional Development for our district writing curriculum, "Write from the Beginning". This includes incorporating thinking maps throughout the writing process.

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): 1. Teachers will attend district trainings on "Write from the Beginning". 2. Five teacher trainings throughout the year with our contracted writing consultant to train teachers. 3. Model and coach teachers in the implementation of "Write from the Beginning".

3. Facilitator or leader: Nancy Prizito, Kristi Lickleiter, Mandy Rowland, Terrie Norris, Curriculum Coach

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

1. District writing specialist
2. Contracted writing consultant
3. Literacy Coach

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

1. District trainings are scheduled in the Fall of 2013
2. Five trainings by our contracted writing consultant will be scheduled on the following dates: 8/28, 10/15, 11/13,

1/14 and 2/4

3. On-going modeling throughout the school year with identified teachers

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

1. Teacher will receive inservice points at the completion of the training.
2. Review of the student writing portfolios and writing samples
3. Coach Logs documenting classroom visits and teacher conferencing Person Responsible: 1. District Writing Specialist
2. Contracted Writing Consultant
3. Literacy Coach

Item 7: Follow St Lucie County Literacy Routines with fidelity

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 75% (81) of students in grade 4 will score a 4.0 proficiency level or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

Lack of student's ability to use conventions of writing, grammar and sentence structure.

Students will increase time on task in writing across all curriculum

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): Follow St Lucie County Literacy Routines with fidelity

3. Facilitator or leader: Nancy Prizito, Mandy Rowland, Terrie Norris, Dana Worthington

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

1. Classroom Teachers
2. Literacy Coach
3. Instructional Partner
4. Administration

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

1. On-going
2. Daily

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

1. Classroom Walkthroughs
2. Student Writing Samples Person Responsible: 1. Classroom Teachers
2. Literacy Coach
3. Instructional Partner
4. Administration

Item 8: Teachers will attend professional Development to strengthen skills in teaching Write from the Beginning.

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

By June 2014, 75% (81) of students in grade 4 will score a 4.0 proficiency level or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

Lack of appropriate implementation of the "Write from the Beginning" curriculum due to new teachers.

Professional Development for our district writing curriculum, "Write from the Beginning" will be provided to new teachers.

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): Teachers will attend professional Development to strengthen skills in teaching Write from the Beginning.

3. Facilitator or leader: Nancy Prizito, Terrie Norris, Dana Worthington, Many Rowland

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

1. Contracted writing consultant
2. Literacy Coach

3. Administration
4. Instructional Partner
5. Classroom teachers
6. Media Specialist

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

Ongoing with Contracted Writing Consultant throughout 2013-14 school year.

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

School-wide student writing samples Person Responsible: 1. Contracted writing consultant

2. Literacy Coach
3. Administration
4. Instructional Partner
5. Classroom teachers
6. Media Specialist

Item 9: Create monthly STEM design challenges

1. Related Goal, Barrier and Strategy:

In 2013-14, 100% of all 3-5th grade classrooms will conduct a monthly STEM Design Challenge.

Teachers are not aware of STEM initiative and how to create STEM Design Challenges.

Teachers will work with Science Resource Teacher and Math Coach to develop STEM design challenges.

2. Topic, focus, and content (action step): Create monthly STEM design challenges

3. Facilitator or leader: Mary Bishop Michele Beckford

4. Participants (e.g., Professional Learning Community, grade level, schoolwide):

1. Administration
2. Math Coach
3. Science Resource Teacher
4. Instructional Partner
5. Classroom Teachers

5. Target dates or schedule (e.g., early release day, once a month):

Monthly

6. Strategies for follow-up and monitoring, including person responsible:

1. Lesson Plans
2. Student created design challenge products

Person Responsible: 1. Administration

2. Math Coach
3. Science Resource Teacher
4. Instructional Partner
5. Classroom Teachers

V. Budget:

A. Based on the strategies identified during the problem-solving process, create a budget for each school-funded activity including:

Item 1: 1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding. 3. The Literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 4. The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.

1. Related Goal, Barrier, Strategy, and Action Step:

By June 2014, 52% (158/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

A lack of Common Core Standards (k-2) and Standards Based Instruction (3-5) knowledge present new learning for instructional staff to gain a full understanding of each standard to be delivered with fidelity.

Instructional staff will be provided professional development in College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading and Text Complexity as well as the process of unpacking a standard for standards based instruction.

1. Administration observation of effective implementation with feedback. 2. Teacher lesson design reflecting Common Core understanding. 3. The Literacy coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. 4. The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.

2. Type of resource: Technology

3. Description of resources: Technology Teacher, Curriculum Coach, Rosetta Stone, Imagine Learning, Common Core Literacy Training, Instructional Methods Training, After-School tutoring through 21st Century. Literacy Coach, Supplemental reading materials, Classroom Reading supplies

4. Funding source: Title One

5. Amount needed: \$172,481.00

Item 2: 1. Professional development by Math Coach 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework

1. Related Goal, Barrier, Strategy, and Action Step:

By June 2014, 58% (218/303) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.

According to the results of the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment and current student abilities as indicated on the IEP's, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3-5 students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Base Ten and Fractions

Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives.

1. Professional development by Math Coach 2. Professional development by Instructional Partner 3. Modeling and observations with feedback utilizing the SLC Framework

2. Type of resource: Personnel

3. Description of resources:

4. Funding source: Title One

5. Amount needed: \$106,076.00

Item 3: Teachers will attend professional Development to strengthen skills in teaching Write from the Beginning.

1. Related Goal, Barrier, Strategy, and Action Step:

By June 2014, 75% (81) of students in grade 4 will score a 4.0 proficiency level or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

Lack of appropriate implementation of the "Write from the Beginning" curriculum due to new teachers.

Professional Development for our district writing curriculum, "Write from the Beginning" will be provided to new teachers.

Teachers will attend professional Development to strengthen skills in teaching Write from the Beginning.

2. Type of resource: Professional Development

3. Description of resources:

4. Funding source: Title One

5. Amount needed: \$10,700.00

Item 4: Create monthly STEM design challenges

1. Related Goal, Barrier, Strategy, and Action Step:

In 2013-14, 100% of all 3-5th grade classrooms will conduct a monthly STEM Design Challenge.

Teachers are not aware of STEM initiative and how to create STEM Design Challenges.

Teachers will work with Science Resource Teacher and Math Coach to develop STEM design challenges.

Create monthly STEM design challenges

2. Type of resource: Other

3. Description of resources: Math Coach, Technology Resource Teacher, replace obsolete computers in 5th grade, Common Core Math standards stipends for PD, FCTM conference, Family Workshop materials

4. Funding source: Title One

5. Amount needed: \$6,850.00