

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor  
K-12 Public Schools  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Osceola

Principal: John Campbell

SAC Chair: Heidi Dawson

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

Last Modified on: 9/17/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

*Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's 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)	# of Years at Current School	# 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	John Campbell	B.S. Psychology M.S. Educational Administration	6	16	History at Sunrise reflects constant growth as evidenced in the 6 year history. The school earned three B's and the last two years have earned A's
Assis Principal	Cara Colovos	B.S. Mass Communications, M.S. Varying Exceptionalities, Educational Leadership	3	10	Last three years at Sunrise, the school has earned an A grade

### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's 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)	# of Years at Current School	# 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)
Language Arts	Diane Turner	B.S. Elementary Education, M.S. Elementary Education, Ph.D Ed. Leadership, E.D. Ed. Leadership	6	6	Sunrise Elementary has improved from the B grade in its first three years and letter grade of an A the last three years.
Math/Science	Tracy Shenuski	B.S. Elementary Education, M.S. Ed Leadership	1	1	At Thacker school B to C, Cypress Elementary, school went from C to an A and met AYP Sunrise Elementary has maintained its A status through leadership shown this last year.

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	All instructional staff of Sunrise Elementary School are highly qualified. New hires for the past couple of years have had to meet criteria for highly qualified teachers.	John Campbell	Complete currently	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

## 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
61	6.6%(4)	49.2%(30)	27.9%(17)	16.4%(10)	24.6%(15)	100.0%(61)	19.7%(12)	9.8%(6)	68.9%(42)

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan 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
No data submitted			

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Assistant Principal, School Counselor, Literacy Coach, Learning Resource Teacher

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

The RtI Leadership team conducts bi-monthly or at the least monthly meetings to review student data especially those students who are identified as a Tier 2 or 3 student. As the team reviews relevant data recommendations are made to continue or stop at given Tier.

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?

There is clear integration of the SIP and RtI because the academic and behavioral goals are schoolwide. The SIP is a collaborative effort and the whole staff (PSS and Instructional) are involved. The support is based on the student need. Students performing outside of the 80% passing rate instructional support is given respectively. The higher the Tier, the more support.

#### 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.

The core curriculum pieces are the state adopted materials with clear professional development when particular text/materials are adopted. Our behavioral system referred to as Sensational Behavior Reinforcement (SBR) Program.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Grade level meetings will be used to in-service teachers on the RtI process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Literacy Coach, teacher representation from each grade level, Media Specialist

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

Meetings held first Wednesday of the month to discuss, plan, and implement yearly events sponsored by the Literacy Council.

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

50th Literacy Day - Integration of literature activities throughout day(50th day of school).  
Fundraising to raise funds to sponsor the Summer Reading Program and Book Giveaway for Literacy Night.  
Literacy Night - communicate with parents, teachers and students through teacher-directed literacy activities.  
Vocabulary Word Walls - grade level vocabulary displayed/and presented on announcements.  
Vocabulary Parade - annual parade school-wide celebration of words.  
Summer Reading Program - Council uses funds to purchase books for every student to take home and read over the summer.

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

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

**\*Grades 6-12 Only**

**Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.**

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

**\*High Schools Only**

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

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

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

**Postsecondary Transition**

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The disaggregated scores on the FCAT reflected a 2% decline or (73% at level 3 or higher) from the previous school year and we will address this decline.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2011 FCAT Reading showed 73% of our population reading at a level 3 or higher.	We will show a minimal of 3% for the 2012 school year which will reflect 76% of our population scoring a 3 or higher..

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No barrier with the general population.	Will continue to use state adopted reading curriculum to teach Next Generation Standards	Administration, Literacy Coach	Diagnostic tools, end of unit test, formatives, CWTs, Monitor Lesson Plans for 90 minute Reading period	FAIR, Chapter Test, Mini-assessments, Formatives, Lesson Plan Documentation

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Due significant number of students scoring at a 4 or higher on the FCAT, we will be challenge the students in a Gifted/High Achievement classroom environment and encourage reading challenges.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
We are seeing an average of 35% of our students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades scoring at level 4 or higher consistently.	We would like to see our intermediate grades show 40% higher scoring at level 4 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining interest in examining different genres and maintaining academic focus in other academic areas.	Through our Media Center and with the effort of our Media Specialist we will again compete in Battle of the Books, Reading Mentors, and Book of the Month challenges.	Administration, Literacy Coach	Participation	Gifted Placement, Participation in challenges and awards.
2	Motivation to get involved with extracurricular activity	Implement a student club called Future Problem Solvers	3rd and 5th grade Gifted Teachers	Participation	Active involvement and placement in local and state competition

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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  
Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  
Reading Goal #3a:

Will focus our attention on deficient reading areas arrived at through data disaggregation and increase gains by at least 2% .

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The reading results on the FCAT showed a 8% increase in our students making learning gains.	As a result of our efforts this year we will increase to at least 68%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Promotion and participation	Will use morning announcements and teacher recommendation for participation.	Administration, Media Specialist	Participation rates	Competition outcomes, Formative and FCAT results

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:

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:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	With another drop in learning gains in the Reading area, we are poised to offer a series of interventions to address reading so that we will show significant increases in 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2011 FCAT Reading showed 54% of our population showed learning gains vs. 60% in 2010.	Our 2012 goal will be to improve performance at this level to 60%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Growth to the expected level a significant increase of 16% points.	After population has been identified, our teachers will focus on frequent progress monitoring to ensure reading skills are being mastered, Triple iii will be in place, Extended Learning opportunities expanded to am and pm	Literacy Coach/ Asst. Principal	Data meetings across all grade levels, RTI engagement to make sure students are being monitored with fidelity	FAIR, chapter test, running records, formatives, CWTs



Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal #				
		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	Economically Disadvantaged and ESOL were the two subgroups not making AYP in Reading. These groups will be targeted through use of ODMS and progress monitoring on a bimonthly basis to insure reading deficiencies are met.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% of the ESOL population and 65% of the Economically Disadvantaged scored below last years results by 6 and 3 points respectively.	Goal is to move these populations from these levels by at least 5% respectively.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Remediation outside the school day.	Offer both before and after school remediation.	Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach	Participation rates in Extended Learning, Differentiated Instruction, Direct instruction by teacher	Progress Monitoring weekly through Oral Reading Fluency, running records, CWTs

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	AYP will be met with this subgroup and will be reflected in the FCAT results in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
An average of 30% of our current 4th & 5th grade ELL students scored below a level 3 on the FCAT	We will reduce this average by a minimum of 5%, thus bringing the average below 25%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historically poor ELL achievement	Continue the pull out small group instruction, cluster ELL populations for more effective teaching and remediation, pilot a	Administration, Literacy Coach	Target this population and progress monitor weekly, lab and pull out schedule monitored more frequently	Formative, English in a Flash weekly reports

	combination class addressing NES students in 2nd, 3rd grade with a bilingual, ESOL endorsed, certified teacher		
--	--	--	--

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Not a large enough population to target for AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% of our current 4th and 5th graders at a level one in reading.	Will significantly reduce this by at least 10% thus raising this group to reflect a level two or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Historical data	Provide a continuum of ESE services incorporating a Resource Room, clustering classrooms for better support facilitation and co-teaching	Administration, Learning Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach, V.E. teachers	Lesson plan construction reflecting differentiated instruction, RTI process in sync	Progress Monitoring with FAIR, Treasures Reading and IEP goals, CWTs

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Our 4th and 5th graders will make AYP in this subgroup by increasing the percentage from 65% to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% of the 4th and 5th graders were scoring at Level 3 and above for 2011.	In 2012, our 4th and 5th graders will improve by showing 5% increase scoring a minimum of 70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inadequate learning gains by the ED population	To enlist the support of parents by having Parent Information more readily available in print and on-line as tutorials, Extended Learning Opportunities offered more frequently	Administration, Literacy Coach	Feedback from print and on-line opportunities not made available before	Surveys, on-line hits,

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of Reading Goals*

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal # 1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Our 3rd-5th grade students will continue to show growth in the overall FCAT Math score by meeting or exceeding the state average.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Our current combined results reflected a three percent decrease to 74% scoring at a level 3 or higher.	Based on the 2011 Math results our students will continue the positive trend of growth by at least 3 percentage points.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	No barrier anticipated with the second year of Go Math	Continue the second year of implementation of Go Math Program in all grade levels	Learning Resource Teacher, Administration	Monitor lesson plans, keep the 60 minute period uninterrupted, use exemplary practices and manipulatives where practical	Harcourt and Riverside Formative Assessments at designated times, CWTs, lesson plan documentation

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	The FCAT Math results this year will reflect the 3rd-5th graders scoring Level 4 or higher in Math will meet or exceed the district and state averages.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

37% of our 3rd-5th graders scored Level 4 or higher.	For the 2011 FCAT Math, our goal will reflect at least 42% of our 3rd-5th graders will score at a Level 4 or higher.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None for this targeted group	Will encourage participation in Math Olympiad and Future Problem Solvers	Gifted teachers, Learning Resource Teacher	Identify students for these activities through test results, interest level, etc.	Actual participation in the before and afterschool activities
2	None anticipated for this group	Will focus our efforts on students identified in the Level 4 or 5 in the Math section of FCAT and encourage enrichment activities through differentiation.	Learning Resource Teacher, Math Council	Lesson Plans reflecting focus on higher order math skills, Participation rates in competition, teacher reflection	Progress monitoring, Formative Assessments, Competition results, CWTs

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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	Based on the 2012 FCAT results the percent of 4th and 5th graders making Learning Gains in Math will meet or exceed the district and state averages.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2011 Math Learning Gains went up by 1% points to 66%.	Based on the 2012 FCAT 70% or higher will show learning gains in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None	Use of Go Math, Compass Odyssey, and FCAT Explorer. In addition we will incorporate iii and offer Extended Learning opportunities during the day or specifically during block	Administration, Learning Resource Teacher, Math Teachers	Focus more on the technology piece with Go Math on-line	Go Math Destination, Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, CWTs, Formatives

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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	Based on the 2012 FCAT the percent of 4th and 5th graders in the Lowest Quartile making Learning Gains will meet or exceed the district and state averages.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011 FCAT Math 70% of our 4th and 5th graders made Learning Gains. This reflects a 7 point increase.	Based on the 2012 FCAT 75% or higher will make Learning Gains in the lowest 25 percentile.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None	Provide for and active iii using Voyager Compass on-line, student grouping in all three grade levels, Extended Learning Opportunities during the day.	Administration, Learning Resource Teacher, Math teachers	Participation in Extended Learning, monitoring RTI routinely	Participation rates with Voyager Math, Extended Learning participation, Progress Monitoring with established formatives



Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	Based on the 2012 FCAT the percent of 4th and 5th graders making Learning Gains in Math will meet or exceed district or state averages. The ethnic subgroups will make AYP requirements.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Our 4th and 5th graders did not make learning gains to satisfy the target set by NCLB.	Based on the 2012 FCAT Math, our goal is that all ethnic groups make AYP with the curricular supports put in place.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL group dynamic	Continue iii support and exemplary instructional practices within specific learning environments	Administration, Learning Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers	Identify students not making AYP last year, Lesson Plans reflecting rigor and support	Formative Progress Monitoring Assessments

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	Based on the 2012 FCAT Math the percent of 4th and 5th graders making Learning Gains will meet or exceed district and state averages. The ELL subgroup will make the AYP requirements.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011 FCAT 57% of our 4th and 5th graders made Learning Gains in Math, but is was below the 2010 level by 3%. Therefore the ELL population did not show adequate growth however.	Our ELL group will make gains sufficient to show growth for the 2012 year in Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL group dynamic & NES focus	Continue cluster classrooms, with a focus on NES or lowest quartile	Administration, Learning Resource Teacher, ELL cluster teachers	Identify students not making AYP last year, Lesson Plans reflecting rigor and academic support, LEP meetings	Formative Progress Monitoring Assessments

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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	This subgroup not large enough to be calculated for AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the FCAT Math results over 34% of our SWD scored a level one on this section, but population not large enough to count.	The 4th and 5th grade population will reduce the percentage of students falling in the level one range by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Academic achievement not consistent among all ESE groups	Provide a continuum of services for our SWD population, Cluster classroom for better focus and time on task, co-teach as is practical, Extended Learning opportunities incorporated in the school day and not after school	Administration, LRS, VE teachers	Lesson plans, Differentiated instruction, RtI	Progress Monitoring Assessments such as Go Math, Formatives

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	The percent of 4th and 5th graders making Learning Gains in Math will meet or exceed district and state averages on the FCAT in 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2010 FCAT 14% of our 4th and 5th graders showed no learning gains in Math and this group did not make AYP.	AYP will be met by improving the number of 4th and 5th graders by 5% in this subgroup.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Learning Gains focus on this subgroup since one grade level is positioned to make gains	Target the 5th graders who did not show AYP by offering a leveled approach to teaching Math, participation by parents with the on-line Go Math material	Administration, LRS, Math teachers	Participation in Extended Learning Opportunities, On-line tutorial, evening Math Nights	Participation rates, Go Math on-line, Extended Learning participation, CWTs

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		Based on the 2012 FCAT the percent of 5th graders scoring Level 3 or higher in Science will meet or exceed district or state averages.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Based on the 2011 Science FCAT 57% of 5th grade students scored at or above Achievement Level 3 which was a 4 point increase.		Based on the 2012 FCAT 61% of our 5th graders will score a Level 3 or higher in Science.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Background knowledge limitation	Incorporate Missions Lab as they align to the district content timeline.	LRS, Science Council, Science teachers	Better alignment of Next Generation Standards Teachers will facilitate implementation of correlation of science standards	Science Assessments, Daily Observations by coach, Progress Monitoring with Formative Assessments, CWTs
---	---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

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:				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.				

Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

## Writing Goals

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

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:

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	Based on 2012 FCAT Writes the percent of 4th graders scoring Level 4.0 or higher will meet or exceed district or state averages.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011 FCAT Writes, 91% of our 4th grade students scored at or above the Level 4.0 which was a 7 point increase.	Based on the 2012 FCAT Writes, at least 92% of our 4th graders will score at or above Level 4.0

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Schoolwide consistent implementation	Continue with the PDA Writing schoolwide to allow for consistency	Literacy Coach, Administration	Lesson Plans reflecting PDA Writing daily	Lesson Plan Documentation, CLWs, Osceola Writes Formative Assessments

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Average Daily Attendance for K-5 will be at least 95%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Average daily rate of attendance was 95% in 2011.	Average daily rate of attendance will be 96% for the 2011-2012.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2011 we had 10 students or less than 2% of population had 10 or more absences	Would like to see this drop to 1% in 2012
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

30 students had 10 or more tardies in 2011.		Would like to see this reduced by 25% in 2012.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Past behaviors from parents	Our Attendance Committee will monitor closely on daily basis and provide multiple incentives for perfect attendance	Assistant Principal	Review weekly attendance patterns and follow up with Truancy Officer routinely	Attendance Committee notes, interventions, Stretch For Excellence Recognition of Quarterly Perfect Attendance

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00



## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:		Out of School and In-School Suspensions will stay below 4% of the school population.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
The number of In-School Suspensions totaled 36 or 4% of school population.		Based on the current trend, the 2010-2011 discipline data the In-School Suspension rate will remain at less than 4% of school population.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
In 2009-2010 we had 36 students or 4% of school population with In-School Suspensions.		Number will be reduced by 25% or 9 students.			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
In 2009-2010 we had 22 students or 2.5% of school population with Out-of-School Suspensions.		In 2010-2011 we would like to reduce the number by 7 or 1%.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Same as above.		Same as above.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	School wide behavior system followed by all	Continue with Sensational Behavior Reinforcement System which educates, reinforces expectations, and rewards students through Stretch For Excellence	Principal, Guidance Counselor	Monthly Behavioral Council Meetings to review effectiveness of program	Quarterly Recognition of Positive Behavior and data on ODMS

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Based on the 2012 Parent Climate Surveys, a 95% or better satisfaction rate will be evident on the significant sampling of surveys.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
An average of 94% of our parents indicated they were satisfied with the overall mission of the school.		At least 95% of our parents surveyed in 2012 will show satisfaction with the overall mission of the school.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Communication of school mission	Improve communication with parents by focusing on mission through website and monthly newsletters	Administration	Methodically track all materials and methods of communication	Survey results in the Spring
2	Inadequate monthly SAC/PTO Attendance	Recruit parents to participate in our monthly SAC and PTO Meetings through our school newsletters and communicating through school events to increase participation. Encourage staff attendance as well.	Administration, PTO Officers, SAC Officers	Continued recruitment, IRIS alerts for upcoming meetings.	Shown increased participation at PTO and SAC meetings between parents and staff combined.

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 (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00



## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (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 citizens 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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year



# AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012  
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011  
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Osceola School District SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	73%	74%	91%	57%	295	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	66%			132	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	56% (YES)	70% (YES)			126	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Osceola School District SUNRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	77%	84%	53%	289	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	65%			131	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	54% (YES)	63% (YES)			117	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					537	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested