

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: FOUR CORNERS CHARTER SCHOOL

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Denise Thompson

SAC Chair: L'Tasha Huyghue

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: 9/28/2012

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

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)
Assis Principal	Kenneth Toppin	Bachelor of Science- Sojourner-Douglass College and Master of Science- coppin State University. Certifications: Educational Leadership (All Levels)and Social Science (5-9)	4	2	2009/2010 A - Math proficiency 73%,Reading proficiency 76%, Science proficiency 45%, Writing proficiency 86%. LG - Reading 70%, Math 73%- Lowest 25%- Reading 60%, Math 78% AYP-All subgroups made AYP in Reading and Math except the Economically Disadvantaged who did not make AYP in Reading.2010/11 math proficiency 70%,LG- 61%,lowest 25% 54% Reading 74%, LG-65%, lowest 25% 67%, Writing 87% Science 51% 2011/12 proficiency 74% reading, LG-68%,lowest 25%-61% math 71%, LG-70%, lowest 25%-67%, writing 87%,Science 52%
					2006/2007 D to B Math proficiency 52%, Reading 63%, Science 22%, Writing 77%. LG -Reading 71%, Math 67%- Lowest 25%- Reading 72%, Math 71% AYP- Hispanic, Econ. Disadvantaged, and ELL did not make AYP. 2007/2008 B to A Math Proficiency 59%, Reading proficiency 70%, Science proficiency 44%, Writing 86%. LG- Reading 62%, Math 68%- Lowest 25%- Reading

Principal	DeniseThompson	Bachelor of Science and Master of Science (Nova Southeastern University. certifications:Elementary Ed(1-6), Specific Learning Disabilities (K-12) and Educational Leadership (All Levels)	12	6	65%, Math 73%- AYP -Hispanic, Econ. disadvantaged, and ELL did not make AYP. 2008/2009 A - Math proficiency 66%, Reading proficiency 73%, Science proficiency 48%, Writing proficiency 90%. LG-Reading 72%, Math 75%- Lowest 25%-Reading 73%, Math 75% AYP- Hispanic, Econ Disadvantaged and ELL students made AYP through Safe Harbor. The Hispanic population decreased the number of students below grade level from 52 to 42 in Reading and from 59 to 51 in Math. The Econ. Disadvantaged went from 45 to 38 students elow grade level in Reading and from 57 to 45 in Math. The ELL students went from 64 to 52 in Reading and from 70 to 58 in Math. 2009/2010 A - Math proficiency 73%,Reading proficiency 76%, Science proficiency 45%, Writing proficiency 86%. LG - Reading 70%, Math 73%- Lowest 25%- Reading 60%, Math 78% AYP-All subgroups made AYP in Reading and Math except the Economically Disadvantaged who did not make AYP in Reading. 2010-2011 A-Math Proficiency 70%, Reading Proficiency 74%,Science Proficiency 51%,Writing Proficiency 87% LG-Reading 65%, Math 61% Lowest 25% Math 54%, Reading 67% AYP-Hispanic 65&61%,ED 65 &64%,and ELL 48&50% did not make AYP in Reading or Math. White population made AYP in Reading 79%, but not in Math 75%. 2011/12 proficiency 74% reading, LG-68%,lowest 25%-61% math 71%, LG-70%, lowest 25%-67%, writing 87%,Science 52%
-----------	----------------	---	----	---	--

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)
Reading/Math	Karima Ezzair	Bachelors in English K-12, Masters in Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed	5	1	2009/2010 A - Math proficiency 73%,Reading proficiency 76%, Science proficiency 45%, Writing proficiency 86%. LG - Reading 70%, Math 73%- Lowest 25%- Reading 60%, Math 78% AYP-All subgroups made AYP in Reading and Math except the Economically Disadvantaged who did not make AYP in Reading.2010/11 math proficiency 70%,LG- 61%,lowest 25% 54% Reading 74%, LG-65%, lowest 25% 67%, Writing 87% Science 51% 2011/12 proficiency 74% reading, LG-68%,lowest 25%-61% math 71%, LG-70%, lowest 25%-67%, writing 87%,Science 52%

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	1. Teacher Recognition Activities 2. Continuous Professional Development 3. Merit Pay for Performance 4. Highly Qualified Assessment Teams 5. Mentors for New Teachers	CRT/TLC, Assistant Principal, Principal	6/2013	

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
0	N/A

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
60	8.3%(5)	36.7%(22)	35.0%(21)	3.3%(2)	8.3%(5)	100.0%(60)	13.3%(8)	0.0%(0)	46.7%(28)

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
1)Jesi Cartegena 2)Cindy Ogletree 3)Cathy Ness 4)Joe Childers 5)Krista Holycross 6)Nelrose Stewart 7)Karima Ezzair 8)Joe Childers 9)Jeff Maday 10)Anna Diesem 11)Jean Smith 12)Kylie Root 13)Karima Ezzair	1)Zeidy Pena 2)Amanda Simpson 3)Andrea Snipes 4)Saffiya Baksh 5)Jennifer Richard 6)Carmen Bauske 7)Christopher Baltazar 8)Joseph Winters 9)Justine Nelson 10)Alejandra Beisel 11)Tera Moses 12)Audree Torrez 13)Jessica Hernandez	Team Leader Team Leader Team Leader SA cohorts Team Leader Team Leader Team Leader Leading Edge Student Service Knowledge Team Leader SA Cohort Audree Torrez TLC	1)Assistance with planning and instructional strategies 2)Ongoing professional development 3)Group sharing of Professional Experiences and Feedback on instruction 4)Supporting Team Activities for encouragement 5)A Teacher Lead Coordinator (Karima Ezzair) to assist with achieving success.

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.

Principal- Oversees the RTI process to ensure adherence to the guidelines and procedures. Participates in the parent meetings and implements school-based plans/activities based on data to maximize the success of classroom implementation.

RTI Coach - Provide Guidance to teachers regarding the process and facilitate the RTI meetings.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate) - Provide Benchmark and FAIR assessment data. Instructs students in the core curriculum for Tier 1. They use Kaleidoscope, Early Interventions in Reading, Reading Mastery Signature, and Corrective Reading. In Math, Do the Math and Number Worlds are used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Collaborate with academic resource team for extra assistance. Study Island, Riverdeep, and AXAL computer programs will be used as supplemental academic resources.

ESE Teacher - Works collaboratively with the teacher in our inclusion model. They may go into a co-teach situation of support for Tier 3 students.

Reading Coach - Provides the teacher with training on curriculum and assessment resources. Is the liaison between the school and district academic personnel. she will assist with the FAIR testing process for early detection of students below grade level. Organize baseline data and put it into individual student plans for tracking progress.

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 focus of the team meeting will be centered around reviewing data and problem solving to accurately make decisions for at risk students. Team will meet bi-weekly to collaborate on instructional resources, share what worked for them, and decide on the next approach in each individual student plan for success. This will ensure consensus and create a cohesive RTI Leadership Team.

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?

Representatives from the RTI Leadership Team attended the SAC meeting. The SIP was divided amongst all stakeholders. School goals were discussed and the RTI team submitted action steps and teaching strategies to assist at-risk students.

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.

Baseline Data: Benchmark Testing, FAIR, ECHOS, and FCAT are used for Reading Mathematics, Science, and Writing. A Functional Behavior Assessment is conducted through observation. Data, which includes frequency; duration; and on-task behavior is collected if there is a behavioral concern.

Progress Monitoring: Academic- PMRN, Individual Tracking Sheets, Study Island, IXL, and specific content area testing. Behavior- Behavior Intervention Plan is used to monitor and track undesired behaviors.

Midyear: Academic- FAIR, Benchmarks Behavior- Contingent upon severity of behavior. Might include continuous tracking of behavior or referral for testing.

End of the Year: Academic- FAIR, FCAT Behavior- Evaluation of data and determination of continuation of FUBA-BIP.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Every year, professional Development will be provided on RTI. This year that inservice took place on 8/15/2011. The faculty is also given the option to take any RTI professional development courses through Osceola, Lake, Polk, or Orange County.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Our school-based literacy team consists of Denise Thompson-Principal, Ken Toppin-Assistant Principal, Krista Holycross and Jeseira Cartagena-CRT, Cathy Ness and Karima Ezzair-Reading Coaches, and Karima Ezzair-Teacher Lead Coordinator.

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

The team meets once a month. The roles/functions of the team are to:

- 1)figure out where learners are
- 2)define procedures and processes
- 3)provide teachers with professional resources and professional development
- 4)monitor the fidelity of lesson plans

5)analyze student data and develop a plan of action for improvement

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

The major initiatives of the team this year will be to:

- 1)Ensure more hands-on and real life experiences are being given to students
- 2)refine teaching practices and meet the needs of individual students.
- 3)use tools for data collection analysis and deeper problem solving.
- 4)Define ways to improve AYP for minority students

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*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.

Four Corners provides a plethora of inservices to our teachers regarding theory and ways to improve literacy. Assessments are used to drive Reading instruction and Walkthroughs are conducted regularly to ensure schoolwide implementation. The Reading Coach works with all teachers on strategies to improve phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

*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:	75% of level 3 students will increase their level of proficiency in reading to a level 4 or 5 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance is 65%(427) students achieved proficiency in reading.	The expected level of performance is 68%(468) of students will obtain reading proficiency.

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 Balancing all of the content area to make sure proficiency is maintained.	Collaboration, Differentiated instructional techniques, and goal setting.	CRT, Teacher, Reading Coach, Admin Team	Data graphing.	Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT
2 1) Students failing to use appropriate comprehension strategies. 2) Language Barriers 3) Students assuming responsibility for their work. 4) Critical thinking skills not utilized	1) Underlining keywords 2) Utilizing ESOL Strategies 3) Class/Grade level school-wide jobs to promote leadership 4) Explicit instruction using Blooms Taxonomy	All teachers	1) Monitoring of academic progress and assessments	Benchmark Mini-assessments computer-based skill assessments
3 Absences, more non-fiction books needed, Lack of motivation.	Reading every night and summarizing material read, Weekly Vocabulary Lists, Use of study Island, FCAT Explorer, Peer Tutoring,	Teachers, CRT, Reading Coach, Registrar, Administration	Achievement Tracking, Personal Learning Plans with goals monitored.	Quizzes, Daily Journals, Benchmarks, FAIR.

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:	70% of students will maintain or improve their reading level by meeting new literacy challenges.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance is 19%(113) students achieved a level 4 in reading.	The expected level of performance is 25% (141) students will achieve a level 4 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
1	Ensuring content is always above ability level, yet has attainable success criteria defined.	Provide constant challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for inquiry and real-life problem solving.	Teachers, Reading Coach, CRT	Observation of student motivation and success.	Benchmarks, FCAT
2	maintaining reading level due to new literacy challenges.	1)professional development on NGSSS. 2)Higher Level Blooms Taxonomy strategy use 3)schoolwide incentive program for reading.	Reading Team, CRT	1)Increased Reading minutes 2)individual progress tracking 3)Essential Questions answered at the end of lessons.	1. mini-assessments 2. AR Tests 3.Study Island
3	Absences,Lack of exposure to higher level reading material.	Book Reports, Study Island,FCAT Explorer, Higher Level Vocabulary, Extra Reading Themed Projects.	Teachers, Reading Coach, CRT, Administration, Registrar	Progress monitoring forms, achievement graphs.	Quizzes, Reports, Benchmarks, FAIR, FCAT practice passages.
4	1)Lack of motivation to Read 2)Inability to read independently 3)Determining student category interest	1)Praise and Rewards 2)Individual Project with Rubrics 3)Utilize an Interest inventory	Teachers, Reading Coaches, CRT's	1)Data Analysis of Results 2)Informal Assessments and Evaluations 3)Leadership Roles assigned in cooperative groups	1)Formal and Informal observations 2)FAIR/FCAT/ Discovery 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:

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:	74%(516) of students will make a learning gain in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(502) of students in grades 3-8 made Learning Gains in reading.	76%(530) of students in grades 3-8 will make a Learning Gain 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
1	Student motivation	Create an individual plan based on data for each student.	Teacher, CRT	Constant goal setting and monitoring	Personal Learning Plans
2	1)Lack of comprehension of Reading material on the appropriate grade level	1)Chunking the reading components to ensure comprehension.	Teachers, CRT's, Media Clerk	1)ongoing analysis of assessment data	FAIR/FCAT/Discovery
3	ineffective strategy usage when testing	model effective reading strategies. Provide group sessions on the appropriate use of reading strategies increase reading minutes.	Teachers, Team,CRT	Reading Progress Tracking through Study Island, Reading Logs, and AR.	1. AR Tests 2. Mini-assessments 3. Benchmark
4	Absences, ESOL/ESE assistance, Lack of Parental Support, and Motivation.	Consistent Homework Completion, Vocabulary and FCAT practice, Study Island,FCAT Explorer.	Teachers,CRT, Reading Coach,Administration, Registrar	Progress Monitoring Form and Academic Achievement Graphs.	Quizzes, Benchmark, FAIR, Reading Journal.

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:	70% of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(82) of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in reading.	72%(88) of the lowest 25% will make a learning gain 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
1	Parent permission to increase academic minutes in lieu of a special.	Provide additional minutes in academic content area of weakness.	Reading/math resource team, ESOL teachers	Graph of skill mastery and academic success.	SIS, Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT, classroom assessments.
2	lack of basic skills such as vocabulary, comprehension, or decoding.	Supplemental Instruction, Reading Groups focused on individual student weaknesses and differentiated instruction.	Teachers, Reading Team	Tracking mastery of individual skills	Study Island, Reading Mastery and Early Interventions questions, mini assessments.
3	Absences, ESOL and ESE assistance, Lack of motivation, and parental support.	Intensive Reading for all Level 1's and 2's, Coach Books, consistent completion of Homework, Vocabulary Development and Study Island.	Teachers, Reading Team, CRT, Administration, Registrar	Progress Monitoring and Achievement Graphs showing growth.	Reading Journal, Quizzes, Benchmark, FAIR
4	1)Poor preparation for learning to read 2)low learning ability 3)no value of literacy 4)limited reading experience	1)Tutoring 2)Intensive focus on literacy instruction 3)Supplemental instruction 4)real life experiences tied to reading content	Teachers, CRT's, Reading Coaches, Team Leaders	Ongoing analysis of data assessment to determine effectiveness	FAIR, Benchmark, Probes, mini assessments, FCAT

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 #					
	We have a Reading Goal of 77% for the 2012-13 school year					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65%					

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:	87% of all subgroups will make AYP in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(502) of ethnicity students made AYP in Reading.	87%(606) of ethnicity students will make AYP 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
1	Improve Parental Involvement amongst the minority population.	Develop a Multicultural Committee to target specific parents and get them involved in their child's education process to improve AYP. Provide Translators for all PTC/SAC events	Administrative Team, Multicultural Committee	Parent Volunteer Hours logged through OASIS. Attendance log for school events.	SIS System Sign-in Sheets
2	Absences, ESOL assistance.	Organize Reading Journal, Increase vocabulary, SRA, increase reading of non-fiction material	CRT, Reading Coach, Reading Teachers, Registrar, administration	Reading Scores Graphs, academic monitoring through Benchmark, PLP's.	Vocabulary Quizzes, Benchmark, FAIR, Daily Journal Check

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:	52%(63) of ELL students will make AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(88) of ELL students made AYP.	73%(96) of ELL students will make AYP

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	Mastering subject area content and a new language simultaneously.	Use more non-linguistic representations in the classroom and technological support.	Teachers, CRT, ESOL department, administrative team.	Graphing data to show improvement in content areas.	Cella, classroom assessments, benchmark tests, FAIR, and FCAT.
2	Absences, ESOL assistance.	Exposure to higher Vocabulary, graphic organizers, peer tutoring, visual aides, SRA.	CRT, Reading Coach, Reading Teachers, Registrar, administration	Academic Achievement Graphing.	Benchmark, FAIR, weekly quizzes, reading journal, comprehension passages.
	1) Teachers not utilizing	1) ELL instructors will use	ELL	Data Tracking points	Mini-assessments

3	appropriate strategies for ELL students	supplemental curriculum with ELL support strategies	teachers/assistants	and probes
---	---	---	---------------------	------------

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:	52%(16) will make AYP in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%(14) SWD made AYP in Reading.	55%(17) SWD will make AYP 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
1	Student Motivation, self-worth, and accomplishment	Give assignments ahead of time, shorten assignments, modify time, reward system, vary assessments.	Teacher, RTI Coach, ESE teachers, admin team	Teacher Tracking of skill mastery, Observation of motivation and success.	classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks
2	Absences, paperwork coming late for new SWD children.	Broaden vocabulary, Daily Reading Journal,	Reading Coach, CRT, Reading/ESE Teachers, Registrar, administration	Academic Achievement monitoring and Graphing.	Vocabulary quizzes, daily journal checks.

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:	68%(411) of the economically disadvantaged subgroup made AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(387) of economically disadvantaged made AYP	71%(430) of economically disadvantaged students will make AYP.

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	Socioeconomic Factors	Increase parental opportunities to help at school. Parenting assistance through student services. Provide resources for education when needed.	Teachers, PTC, administration	Student success in the classroom and parental involvement in school activities.	OASIS volunteer system, attendance logs.
2	lack of specific skills and exposure to higher level vocabulary and or reading strategies.	provide leveled readers to increase vocabulary while increasing fluency and comprehension skills. Supplemental instruction	Reading Team, Teachers	Progress monitoring, individual skill tracking.	mini-assessments, Study island, benchmark
	Absences, receiving	Broaden vocabulary, daily	Reading teachers,	Academic Achievement	Vocabulary

3	information on new students late.	reading journal, provide extra assistance through tutoring and intensive classes.	CRT, Reading Coach, Registrar, administration	graphs.	quizzes, daily journal check, benchmark, FAIR.
4	1)Deprivation of Print Material 2)Limited exposure to experiences 3)Student/parental excuses	1)Provide Regular access to print 2)Cultural events/projects and real-life experiences 3)Student/Parent Accountability	Admin Team CRT's, Teachers,	Progress monitoring and tracking	progress and report cards, Benchmark, FAIR, classroom assessments

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
1)Common Core Reading 2)concept Question Board 3)Explicit instruction and comprehension	k-8/Reading	Karima Ezzair and Cathy Ness	Schoolwide	ongoing	Observations, Lesson Plans	Reading Coaches, CRT's

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Voyager Learning	Curriculum for At Risk Students	operational budget	\$5,800.00
			Subtotal: \$5,800.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Study Island	Standards Based Assessment Instruction	general budget	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
voyager Learning	Online	general budget	\$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: \$9,300.00

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:			60%(97) of ELL students will be proficient in listening/speaking		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
40%(64)					
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	1)Intimidation due to lack of confidence 2)Lack of language knowledge 3)Lack of Motivation	1)Play card games with native language and english 2)Use of English conventions 3)Rewards	ELL teachers, teachers	Observation, Assertiveness, Language quizzes	Cella

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:			50%(81) of ELL students will be proficient in English		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
31%(50)					
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	1)lack of support due to uneducated and non-english speaking parents 2)Inform parents about educaton for adults	1)inform parents about educaton for non-english and limited english speaking adults	ELL Department	Parent conference, surveys, and workshops	Receiving feedback from parents via survey and calculated percentages

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal # 3:			60%(97) of ELL students will be proficient in writing		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					

38%(61)

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	1)poor spelling and grammar	2)Use of online resources such as Spelling City, Study Island	Teacher, ELL Teachers	Tracking scores	Writing rubrics, spelling tests

CELLA 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 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:	74%(267) students will score a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%(116)of students scored a level 3 in mathematics.	65%(529) students will score a level 3 on the FCAT math test.

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 Balancing all of the content area to make sure proficiency is maintained.	Collaboration, Differentiated instructional techniques, and goal setting.	CRT, Teacher, Reading Coach, Admin Team	Data graphing.	Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT
2 comprehending higher level math questions	provide math challenge camp to focus on challenging questions and increase hands-on activities	CJ Haynes	individual student tracking, classroom walkthroughs, Study Island Student Report	content area assessments, computer assessments
3 Absences, ESOL/ESE assistance, Student interest level, and motivation.	Use of differentiated instruction, structured notetaking, use of IXL, Study Island, intense and extensive motivational techniques, parental involvement, broaden mathematical vocabulary, intensive mindset in fundamental math, viable pace in instruction.	CRT, Math Teachers, Registrar, Administration	Progress monitoring, data disaggregation, team meetings.	Benchmarks, standard based assessments, FCAT
4 1)Lack of basic math skills	1)timed facts 2)learning math properties and formulas	CRT's, Teachers	Tracking to ensure mastery	Various 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 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:	40%(144) of students will score a level 4 in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 28%(101)students achieved math level 4	35%(126)of students will achieve a level 4 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	Ensuring content is always above ability level, yet has attainable success criteria defined.	Provide constant challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for inquiry and real-life problem solving.	Teachers, Reading Coach, CRT	Observation of student motivation and success.	Benchmarks, FCAT
2	familiarity with challenging math content and vocabulary	vocabulary games offer Alg. 1 for HS credit and add more challenging questions as bellringers	math teachers,CRT	continuous progress monitoring	Vocabulary assessments,mini-assessments,benchmark,exit cards
3	Student motivation,student turnover.	Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, focus on independent instruction in 7th and 8th grades using Pre-Alg. or Alg and grade level curriculum.	Math Teachers,CRT	Team Meetings, Progress monitoring.	Benchmark,FCAT
4	1)Insufficient practice	1)Study Island or IXL	Teachers	Continuos analysis of practice problems	Proficiency in study island and IXL

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:	78%(282) of students will make a Learning Gain in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(260) of students made a Learning Gain in mathematics.	75%(271) of students will make a Learning Gain in mathematics.

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	Student motivation	Create an individual plan based on data for each student.	Teacher, CRT	Constant goal setting and monitoring	Personal Learning Plans
2	1)Lack of comprehension of Reading material on the appropriate grade level	1)Chunking the reading components to ensure comprehension.	Teachers, CRT's, Media Clerk	1)ongoing analysis of assessment data	FAIR/FCAT/Discovery
3	specific skill mastery	focus on individual student weaknesses through differentiated instruction.	teachers,CRT	Classroom walkthroughs and individual student tracking	study island,IXL report, benchmark,mini-assessments
4	Tardiness,absences	Practice on Study Island,Differentiated Instruction	Math Teachers,CRT, Registrar,Administration	Progress monitoring and data analysis	quizzes and tests
5	1)inadequate homework completion	1)Rewards for completion of homework assignments	Teachers	Tracking and Process of revision	Tracking Chart of homework turned in.

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:	60%(42) of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(45) of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain in mathematics.	66% (46)of students in the lowest 25% will make a learning gain.

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	Parent permission to increase academic minutes in lieu of a special.	Provide additional minutes in academic content area of weakness.	Reading/math resource team, ESOL teachers	Graph of skill mastery and academic success.	SIS, Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT, classroom assessments.
2	exposure to higher math vocabulary and comprehension of mathematical questions.	Math Resource Team focuses on specific skills. Vocabulary Games Tutoring	Teachers, Math Resource Team	Individual Progress monitoring, evaluation of improvement on individual weaknesses	mini-assessments, Study Island assessments, IXL assessment
3	Tardy and Absences.	Practice on Study Island, Math Club in the morning and afternoon, differentiated instruction.	Math Teachers, CRT, Registrar, Administration	Progress monitoring and data analysis	Various assessments
4	1)lack of basic math skills 2) retention of the math skill taught 3)student can't do math applications	1)Practice of facts 2)continuous review 3)real-life connections	Math Teachers, CRT's	1)100% on test strip to move on the next 2)homework 3)manipulatives	test strips tracking informal and formal assessment

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 #					
	In six years, FCCS will reduce the achievement gap by 55% (181) 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	20%(72)	25%(90)	30%(108)	35%(126)	40%(144)	

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:	73%(509)of students will make AYP in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%(481)of students made AYP in Mathematics.	76%(530) of students will make AYP in Mathematics.

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	Improve Parental Involvement amongst the minority population.	Develop a Multicultural Committee to target specific parents and get them involved in their child's education process to improve AYP. Provide Translators for all PTC/SAC events	Administrative Team, Multicultural Committee	Parent Volunteer Hours logged through OASIS. Attendance log for school events.	SIS System Sign-in Sheets
2	Cultural Diversity	Differentiated Instruction, Positive Reinforcement through incentives	Math Teachers, CRT	Self-Progress monitoring and data analysis	Benchmark and diagnostic testing.

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:	70%(70) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%(50) of ELL students made satisfactory progress.	60%(60) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress

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	Mastering subject area content and a new language simultaneously.	Use more non-linguistic representations in the classroom and technological support.	Teachers, CRT, ESOL department, administrative team.	Graphing data to show improvement in content areas.	Cella, classroom assessments, benchmark tests, FAIR, and FCAT.
2	Language Barrier, cultural Awareness	Differentiated instruction, visual aides, manipulatives	Math teachers, CRT	Self-progress monitoring, data analysis	Diagnostic testing, Benchmark, FCAT

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:	59%(18) of SWD students will make AYP in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

50%(16) of SWD students made AYP in Mathematics.			60%(19) of SWD students will make AYP in Mathematics		
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	Student Motivation, self-worth, and accomplishment	Give assignments ahead of time, shorten assignments, modify time, reward system, vary assessments.	Teacher, RTI Coach, ESE teachers, admin team	Teacher Tracking of skill mastery, Observation of motivation and success.	classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks
2	Visual, hearing, or physical restrictions	Differentiated Instruction, Structured notetaking, manipulatives	Math teacher	Self progress monitoring, data/diagnostic, team meeting, teacher progress monitoring	Benchmark, diagnostic tests, standards based assessments
3	Visual/Hearing, Physical Difficulties	Differentiated instruction, structured notetaking, IXL, Coach, manipulatives	math Teachers, CRT	Self-Progress monitoring, data analysis, Team meetings, whole class progress monitoring	Benchmarks, diagnostic testing, standards-based 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	68%(257) of ED students will make AYP in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(242) of ED students made AYP in Mathematics.	71%(268) of ED students will make AYP in Mathematics.

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	Socioeconomic Factors	Increase parental opportunities to help at school. Parenting assistance through student services. Provide resources for education when needed.	Teachers, PTC, administration	Student success in the classroom and parental involvement in school activities.	OASIS volunteer system, attendance logs.
2	Absences	Provide extra assistance during school hours, Positive Reinforcement, Parent meetings	Registrar, Assistant Principal, Teachers	Monitor through SIS	Terms input

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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:	70%(263) students scored a level 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38%(143) of students scored a level 3	56%(211)will make a level 3

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	Balancing all of the content area to make sure proficiency is maintained.	Collaboration,Differentiatedinstructional techniques, and goal setting.	CRT, Teacher, Reading Coach, Admin Team	Data graphing.	Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT
2	Attendance lack of background knowledge Student retention	structured notetaking, tutoring classes, motivational techniques, parental involvement	Math teachers	Progress monitoring	Various 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 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:	65%(245)scored will score a level 4
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52%(175) scored a level 4	59%(222) will score a level 4

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	Ensuring content is always above ability level, yet has attainable success criteria defined.	Provide constant challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for inquiry and real-life problem solving.	Teachers, Reading Coach, CRT	Observation of student motivation and success.	Benchmarks, FCAT

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:	80%(302) will make a learning gain in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76%(287)made learning gains in math	78%(294) will make a learning gain 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	Student motivation	Create an individual plan based on data for each student.	Teacher, CRT	Constant goal setting and monitoring	Personal Learning Plans
2	1)Lack of comprehension of Reading material on the appropriate grade level	1)Chunking the reading components to ensure comprehension.	Teachers, CRT's, Media Clerk	1)ongoing analysis of assessment data	FAIR/FCAT/Discovery
3	1)student retention 2)lack of background knowledge	motivation, structured notetaking, differentiated instruction	math teachers, CRT	Progress monitoring	assessment

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

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:	30%(28) of the lowest 25% will make a learning gain
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(24)of the lowest 25% made a learning gain	35%(33) of the lowest 25% will make a learning gain

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	Parent permission to increase academic minutes in lieu of a special.	Provide additional minutes in academic content area of weakness.	Reading/math resource team, ESOL teachers	Graph of skill mastery and academic success.	SIS, Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT, classroom assessments.
2	attendance lack of background knowledge	Differentiated instruction, structured notetaking	Math teachers, CRT's	student feedback	assessments

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%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal #					
	In six years FCCS will reduce our achievement gap by 55%					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

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:	Any subgroups not making satisfactory progress in math, will increase their achievement score by 50 points or better at the end of school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
All subgroups had satisfactory performance.	65 point increase for any subgroup not achieving a gain.

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	Improve Parental Involvement amongst the minority population.	Develop a Multicultural Committee to target specific parents and get them involved in their child's education process to improve AYP. Provide Translators for all PTC/SAC events	Administrative Team, Multicultural Committee	Parent Volunteer Hours logged through OASIS. Attendance log for school events.	SIS System Sign-in Sheets
2	Comprehension of mathematical questions	Focus on specific skills, use vocabulary games, and tutoring	Teachers, math team	Individual progress monitoring, evaluation of improvement on individual weaknesses	mini-assessments, Study Island, IXL 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:	57%(22) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%(17)of ELL students made progress in math	50%(19)of ELL students will make satisfactory progress 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	Mastering subject area content and a new language simultaneously.	Use more non-linguistic representations in the classroom and technological support.	Teachers, CRT, ESOL department, administrative team.	Graphing data to show improvement in content areas.	Cella, classroom assessments, benchmark tests, FAIR, and FCAT.

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:	65%(10) students will make satisfactory progress in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(8) students made satisfactory progress in math	59%(9) students made satisfactory progress 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	Student Motivation, self-worth, and accomplishment	Give assignments ahead of time, shorten assignments, modify time, reward system, vary assessments.	Teacher, RTI Coach, ESE teachers, admin team	Teacher Tracking of skill mastery, Observation of motivation and success.	classroom assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks
2	Visual, hearing, or physical restrictions	Differentiated Instruction, Structured notetaking, manipulatives	Math teacher	Self progress monitoring, data/diagnostic, team meeting, teacher progress monitoring	Benchmark, diagnostic tests, standards based 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	70%(308) Of our economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(291) of students made satisfactory progress in math	68%(299) will make satisfactory progress 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	Socioeconomic Factors	Increase parental opportunities to help at school. Parenting assistance through student services. Provide resources for education when needed.	Teachers, PTC, administration	Student success in the classroom and parental involvement in school activities.	OASIS volunteer system, attendance logs.
2	homelessness no electricity attendance lack of school supplies	Differentiated instruction, extra assistance, tutoring, positive reinforcement, school supplies provided through donations	Student Services Coordinator, PTC, math teacher, CRT's	team meetings, diagnostic data	progress monitoring

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	100% of students will score at or above level 3 on the Algebra EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% of students were at or above a level 3 on the Algebra EOC	100% of students will score at or above a level 3 on the algebra EOC

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	Lack of prior knowledge (pre-alg), new student expectations	Focus on developing relationships and clear rules/procedures, Close skill gaps	Math teachers, Administration	Progress monitoring, data analysis and tracking	Benchmark, formative assessment

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	90%(26) of students will score a level 4 on the Algebra EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85%(22) students scored a level 4 on the Algebra EOC	85%(25) students will score a level 4 on the Algebra EOC

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	New student expectations, absences	Focus on developing relationships, rules, and procedures. Build on Mathematical Strengths	math Teachers, Administration	Progress monitoring, Data analysis and tracking	Benchmark, formative assessment

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # In six years the school will reduce its achievement gap by 70%(77) preparing more students for algebra.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	27%(29)	37%(40)	47%(51)	57%(62)	67%(73)	

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:		100%(29) of all Algebra students will pass the Algebra 1 EOC			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
100%(27) of Algebra students passed the Algebra 1 EOC		100%(29) of Algebra students will pass the Algebra 1 EOC			
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	Skill gap	Remediation of skills	Math teacher	data analysis, baseline test of strategies	mini assessments, benchmarks,

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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:					
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 subgroup:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:		100% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress in algebra			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		100% of students with a disability taking Algebra will make satisfactory progress.			
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	Lack of confidence	motivation techniques accessible math tools/manipulatives	math teachers	Student monitoring, student discussion	Benchmark, Formative Assessment

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	100% of ED students will pass the Algebra EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% of ED students taking Algebra 1 made satisfactory progress and passed the EOC	100% of all ED students taking Algebra will pass the EOC

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	homelessness electricity	Extra time in labs provided at school	Computer teacher, math teacher	Computer assessment graphing to show progress	mini assessments, benchmarks

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	
---	--

Geometry Goal #2:				
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 Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal #				
	3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 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"/>

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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 subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
---	--

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 subgroup:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:				
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 subgroup:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:				
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						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Envision Math	Elementary Curriculum	general curriculum	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$15,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Penda learning	Computer based	general budget	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
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: \$20,000.00

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. Science Goal #1a:	33%(34) of 5th and 42%(54)of 8th grade students will be proficient in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

29%(30) of 5th grade and 37%(36) of 8th grade students obtained proficiency on the Science FCAT.		35%(45) of 5th grade and 44%(45) of 8th grade will make a level 3 on the Science FCAT.		
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 Balancing all of the content area to make sure proficiency is maintained.	Collaboration, Differentiated instructional techniques, and goal setting.	CRT, Teacher, Reading Coach, Admin Team	Data graphing.	Benchmark, FAIR, FCAT
2 language barriers fear of science hands-on demonstrations	research validated vocabulary strategies, ESOL modifications, Utilizing creative ideas	Science teachers, CRT, admin	data discussions and individual student tracking of content area weaknesses.	Study Island, Benchmark, mini-assessments on contact.
3 Limited time in block, ESE/ESOL assistance	Hands-on activities, small groups, teacher demonstrations, Vocabulary Development	Science teachers	Teacher observation and data analysis	Benchmark, Science Projects, Interactive Science Notebook, 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 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:	32%(33) of 5th and 48%(49)8th grade students will score a level 4 on the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9%(9)of 5th and 9%(12)8th graders scored a Level 4 on the Science FCAT	15%(15)of 5th and 30%(39)8th grade students will be above proficiency.

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	Ensuring content is always above ability level, yet has attainable success criteria defined.	Provide constant challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for inquiry and real-life problem solving.	Teachers, Reading Coach, CRT	Observation of student motivation and success.	Benchmarks, FCAT
2	ESOL/ESE assistance, small groups	Hands-on experiments to reinforce, instructional focus calendar, teacher demonstrations	Science Teachers	Teachers Observation and data analysis	Benchmark, Formative Assessments
3	Lack of confidence Poor study habits	Broaden scientific knowledge, reward system for success on assessments	Science teachers	Tracking system	mini-assessments, Benchmark

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
Computer-based program	science computer based activities	general budget	\$1,200.00
ScootPad	common core concept banking with customizable practice, proficiency tracking, student messaging, and homework	Free online resource	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$1,200.00
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: \$1,200.00

End of Science Goals

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.		96% of students will achieve a level 4.0 or higher in writing			
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
87% of students scored a 3.5 or higher in writing.		93% of students will achieve AYP(FCAT Level 4.0 or higher) 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
1	All new fourth grade team. Student motivation to write	provide intense professional development Chunk writing elements Peer collaboration, Consistent teacher feedback to increase motivation using FCAT writing scoring rubric	CRT, admin, TLC	Writing tracking sheets. Students tracking progress	Utilize write score for eval mid-yr. Scored and timed essays
	Non-mastery of grade level content,	completing practice exercises followed by	All teachers	Writing tracking sheets.	Peer editing log, writing journals,

2	grammar, spelling, vocabulary to meet grade level and higher expectations.	reviewing assessments and reteaching.		Students tracking progress	FCAT
3	ability to apply the conventions of English	Additional assignments requiring english conventions, peer editing, writing centers with focus on details	Language Arts teachers, CRT's	Writing tracking sheets Review of weekly writing assignments	Score acquired on the rubric

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
Four square for new teachers	All	Meghan Nemeth, Justine Nelson	All new teachers and 4th & 8th teachers	Oct. 2012	Writing score tracking	Teachers, CRT's

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
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	55%(67) of students will score a level 3 on the EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/a	45%(55) of students will score a level 3 on the EOC

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	Students lacking knowledge of the US government system	Real-life government processes acted out in the classrooms	Civics teacher	Observation of government processes in the classroom environment.	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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	35%(43) students will score a level 4 on the EOC
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	40%(49) students will score a level 4 on the EOC

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
	Real- life experiences	Mock elections, bill signings.	Teachers	Group presentations	Rubric outlining effective use of

1					governmental processes in groups.
---	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

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
Teaching Middle school Civics	7th/ Civics	district inservice	Civics instrutors	Aug.2012	Progress Tracking	Admin, Civics teachers

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Textbook adoption	Civics, Economics, and Geography	general budget	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$15,000.00
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: \$15,000.00

End of Civics 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:	To increase the attendance to 97%(1030) students
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

The current attendance rate is 95%(1009)	The expected rate of attendance is (96%)1020
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
The current number of students with excessive absences was 25.	The expected number of students with excessive absences is 10.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The current number of students with excessive tardies was 20.	The expected number of students with excessive tardies is 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	Polk County Transportation	Appeal for another Polk County Bus or grant to be written for an additional bus	Ken Toppin Registrar	Decrease in tardies and increased attendance rate	Student Information System (SIS)
2	Parental Enforcement	Parental contract stating attendance will impact enrollment status. Enforce removal.	Administration, Registrar	Monitor Terms	Teacher attendance records, SIS and district attendance records

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
Advertising	Newspaper ads and enrollment sessions, Enrollment incentives	general budget	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
			Grand Total: \$5,000.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

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:		To decrease the number of student suspensions by utilizing proactive strategies to reduce inappropriate behaviors.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
We had 15 in- school suspensions in 2012.		We expect to have 10 in-school suspensions in 2013.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
15		10			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
We had 11 out of school suspensions in 2012.		We expect to have 10 out of school suspensions in 2013.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
11		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	Home support	to teach social-problem solving skills to students through CHAMPS and the PBS program.	Ken Toppin	Monitoring of suspensions data.	# of referrals in SIS.

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
Rewards programs	incentives for positive student behavior	PTC	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
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: \$2,000.00

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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>We will increase parental involvement by 20% (200) parents.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

We had 3500 parental hours logged			We expect to have 4,000 parental hours logged		
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	Parents work schedules	Create a list of ways parents can involve themselves in the school by assisting with thing at home.	Volunteer Coordinator	Monitoring of volunteer hrs.	Approval of the Golden School Award for the 2012-2013 school year.

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			60%(77) of 8th grade students will score a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 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	Understanding the various content. Difficulty with STEM concepts	Free tutoring, STEM clubs, summarizing science information	Science teachers and CRT's	Teacher prepared diagnostic tests	FCAT, Benchmark

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

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE CTE 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						

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

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
Reading	Voyager Learning	Curriculum for At Risk Students	operational budget	\$5,800.00
Mathematics	Envision Math	Elementary Curriculum	general curriculum	\$15,000.00
Civics	Textbook adoption	Civics, Economics, and Geography	general budget	\$15,000.00
Suspension	Rewards programs	incentives for positive student behavior	PTC	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$37,800.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Study Island	Standards Based Assessment Instruction	general budget	\$3,500.00
Mathematics	Penda learning	Computer based	general budget	\$5,000.00
Science	Computer-based program	science computer based activities	general budget	\$1,200.00
Science	ScootPad	common core concept banking with customizable practice, proficiency tracking, student messaging, and homework	Free online resource	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$9,700.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	voyager Learning	Online	general budget	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance	Advertising	Newspaper ads and enrollment sessions, Enrollment incentives	general budget	\$5,000.00
				Subtotal: \$5,000.00
				Grand Total: \$52,500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" 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 (Uploaded on 10/8/2012)

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.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC members will address student achievement and monitor the processes in place to obtain goals.

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 FOUR CORNERS CHARTER SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	70%	87%	51%	282	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	65%	61%			126	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?	67% (YES)	54% (YES)			121	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					529	
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 FOUR CORNERS CHARTER SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	73%	86%	45%	280	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	70%	73%			143	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?	60% (YES)	78% (YES)			138	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					561	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested