FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Martin

Principal: Timothy Aitken

SAC Chair: Crystal Steward

Superintendent: Nancy Kline

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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

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)
Principal	Timothy Aitken	Elementary Education - B.S. Educational Leadership and Policy - M.S		5	N/A
					2011- Grade A Mastery Reading 85 % Math 85% Science 75% Writing 96% Did not meet AYP (87% of criteria met) Did not meet ED in Math and Reading Did not meet SWD in Math and Reading 2010- Grade B Mastery Reading 85% Math 81% Science 71% Writing 83% Did not meet AYP (90% of criteria met) Did not meet ED Math and Reading

Assis Principal	Terri Marder	Elementary Ed - B.A. Couseling and Psychoogy - M.S. School Administration - M.S.		9	proficiency Did not meet SWD Math and Reading proficiency Did not meet ED Writing proficiency. 2009- Grade A Mastery Reading 88% Math 85% Science 67% Writing 89% Did not meet AYP (97% of criteria met) Did not meet ED Math proficiency 2008- Grade A Mastery Reading 89% Math 90% Science 81% Writing 93% Did not meet AYP (95% of criteria met) Did not meet SWD Reading and Math proficiency 2007- Grade A Mastery Reading 87% Math 86% Science 67% Writing 83% Did not meet AYP (95% of criteria me)

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	Lauren Gifford	B.S.E M.Ed Elementary Education ESol Reading Endorsement Family and Consumer Services	2	3	2011-2012 School Grade: A; FCAT High St. Reading: 76, Math 71, Writing 76, Science 69, Learning Gains Reading 63, Learning gains Math 69, Lowest 25% Reading 66, Lowest 25% Math 58, AYP Yes, Met 100. 2010-11 School Grade: A; FCAT High St. Reading: 93, Math 90, Writing 81, Science 84, Learning Gains Reading 74, Learning gains Math 63, Lowest 25% Reading 74, Lowest 25% Math 66, AYP Yes, Met 100.
RTI	Chris Cline	Degree: Bachelors in Specific Learning Disablitlites Certifications: ESE K-12; Elementary Ed K-5; ESOL	1		2011-2012 School Grade: A; FCAT High St. Reading: 76, Math 71, Writing 76, Science 69, Learning Gains Reading 63, Learning gains Math 69, Lowest 25% Reading 66, Lowest 25% Math 58, AYP Yes, Met 100.

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	Implement a school-wide mentoring program with professional development.	Administration	On-Going	
2	Identified open positions and reviewed resumes of HQ applicants from HR Novus	Administration	On-Going	
3	Establishing a culture of shared leadership, respect, and professionalism	Administration	On-Going	

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
N/A	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
39	5.1%(2)	38.5%(15)	23.1%(9)	33.3%(13)	20.5%(8)	51.3%(20)	2.6%(1)	10.3%(4)	56.4%(22)

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
Jennifer Towell	Christina Ford	Clinical Educator Trainer and experienced teacher	Bi-monthly meetings Provide model lessons
Kathleen Considine/ Gina Vigil	Alexandra King Sandra Meunier	Coordinator of Gifted/Mainstream Consultant	Monthly meetings with district's gifted teachers for the purpose of collaboration. Provide opportunities for classroom observations at other school sites.
Kristina Jackson	Nicole Badurek	Experienced Teacher; Former TOY	Bi-monthly meetings Provide model lessons
Administration	Ginger McCormick	Experienced Teachers	Bi-monthly meetings Provide model lessons

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.

Timothy Aitken, Terri Marder, Chris Cline, Joy Willison

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 team meets every Tuesday afternoon to discuss students experiencing difficulty in meeting core standards. In addition, an update of progress monitoring is ongoing for students in the lowest quartile who are not responding to differentiated instruction at the core level.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The leadership team members serve on various SIP sub-committees. The committees meet monthly to review the implementation of SIP strategies and the MTSS members review student needs, design intervention strategies, and monitor progress.

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.

Current data-warehouses are: LLI, PMI,PMRN, and RtIB

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

RtI Coach schedules weekly grade-level student support team (SST) meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

At the above mentioned SST meetings we will be reviewing RtI procedures, data collection, progress monitoring, and student acheivement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Timothy Aitken, Principal
Terri Marder, Assistant Principal
Jennifer Towell, Kindergarten
Vicki Wells, Kindergarten
Crystal Steward, First Grade
Sarah Gast, Third Grade
Bruce Nickel, Third Grade
Tiffany Reddick, Fourth Grade
Terri Brown, Fourth Grade
Heather Padgett, Fifth Grade
Renard Martin, Related Arts
Elizabeth Martin, Media Specialist

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

Bimonthly meetings are held with the Reading/Literacy Leadership Team to discuss vertical planning needs; address individual and school-wide grade level curriculum needs; address scheduling for core curriculum and related arts programs; and to respond to professional development needs of the staff.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT/Reading Team for 2012-13 include the following:

1. To plan necessary professional development for staff focused on balanced literacy and socialized learning;
2. To monitor the PBIS school-wide progress;
3. Provide job-embedded professional development for staff on innovative high-yield instructional strategies

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.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring FCAT Levels 1 and 2 will DECREASE by 10%. The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring FCAT levels 4 and 5 will INCREASE by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (23/85 students)achieved level 3 proficiency in Grade 3; 26% (23/89 students) achieved level 3 proficiency in Grade 4; 28% (27/96 students) achieved proficiency in Grade 5.	We are anticipating 32% (86/270 kids) will score in the proficency level 3 in grades 3-5.

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT F&P, District 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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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:	Based on the anticipated percentage of students scoring in FCAT levels 1-3, we project that 41% of students will score in levels 4-5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (41/85 students) achieved proficiency in Grade 3; 48% (43/89 students) achieved proficiency in Grade 4; 47% (46/96 students) achieved profiency in Grade 5.	Based on the anticipated percentage of students scoring in FCAT levels 1-3, we project that 41% of students will score in levels 4-5.

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluaation forms, minimum of one survey
2	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT F&P, District 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:	
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:	80% of students will make a learning gain in reading on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (179 students) made a learning gain in reading.	80% (194)of students 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	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT F&P, District Benchmarks, FAIR
2	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluaation forms, minimum of one survey

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:	80% (12/15)of students in the lowest quartile will make a learning gain in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (10/15 students) made learning gains.	80% (12/15)of students 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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT F&P, District Benchmarks, FAIR

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Reduce achievement gap by 50% in a six year period					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	83	85	87	88	90	

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:	Reduce achievement gaps in sub groups in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 77% Hispanic: 68%	White: 79% Hispanic: 73%

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	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT, F&P, District Benchmarks, FAIR
	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings,	Lesson plans, observations

2		teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons		observations	
3	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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:	Reduce achievement gaps in this sub group in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ELL: 64%	ELL: 68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT, F&P, District 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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Reduce achievement gaps for this sub group by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
SWD: 40%	SWD: 62%

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT, F&P, District 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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Reduce acheivement gaps for this sub group by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ED: 71%	ED: 76%

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT F&P, District Benchmarks, FAIR

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
Introduce Elements of Common Core modeled through CES	All	Administration	School-wide staff	Early Release	Use of protocols in classrooms; monitored through observations	Administration

protocols						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attend CES Fall Forum	Registration: $375 x 4 = $1,500 Hotel: 119 x 2 rooms x 3 nights = $714 Airfare: $250 X 4 people = $1000	SAC	$3,214.00
			Subtotal: $3,214.00
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: $3,214.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In K-2, 43% (12/28) were proficient In 3-5, 36% (5/14) were proficient
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
In K-2, 43% (12/28) were proficient In 3-5, 36% (5/14) were proficient	

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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:	In K-2, 11% (3/28) were proficient In 3-5 71% (10/14) were proficient

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

In K-2, 11% (3/28) were proficient
In 3-5 71% (10/14) were proficient

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	In K-3 14% (4/28) were proficient In 3-5 57% (8/14) were proficient

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In K-3 14% (4/28) were proficient
In 3-5 57% (8/14) were proficient

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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:	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 20% (16 students).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (43/85 students) achieved level 3 in Grade 3; 36% (32/89 students) achieved level 3 in Grade 4; 38% (37/96 students) achieved level 3 in Grade 5.	47% (128)of students will achieve proficiency at 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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	Navigating, planning with and teaching two curricula with legitimate obligations to both.	Provide professional development opportunities where we can identify commonalities between both currirula, and learn, understand, and apply the practices	Coaches, Teachers, and Administration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lessons, Observations
4	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and observations	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms

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% (108/270)of students will achieve level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT math assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (18/85 students) achieved above proficiency at grade 3; 33% (30/89 students) achieved above proficiency at grade 4; 32% (30/96 students) achieved above proficiency at grade 5.	40% (108/270)of students will achieve level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT math assessment.

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	Teaching skills in isolation	Open the schedule to encourage depth over coverage, introduce problem-based lessons which incorporate pre-teaching, review, and the application of current skills relative to real-world problems.	Adminstration, Teachers, and Coaches	Professional conversations, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
2	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
3	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and observations	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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:	75% (138/185)of students will make a learning gain on the 2012 FCAT math assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (126/185) made a learning gain.	75% (138/185)of students will make a learning gain on the 2012 FCAT math assessment.

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluaation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching skills in isolation	Open the schedule to encourage depth over coverage, introduce problem-based lessons which incorporate pre-teaching, review, and the application of current skills relative to real-world problems.	Adminstration, Teachers, and Coaches	Professional conversations, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and observations	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms

		working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.			

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:	80% of students (16/20) in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (14/20 students) in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains in mathematics.	80% of students (16/20) in the lowest 25% will make learning gains 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	Teaching skills in isolation	Open the schedule to encourage depth over coverage, introduce problem-based lessons which incorporate pre-teaching, review, and the application of current skills relative to real-world problems.	Adminstration, Teachers, and Coaches	Professional conversations, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
2	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and	Walkthroughs, classroom

3		earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.		observations	observations, PD evaluation forms

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Reduce achievement gap by 50% in six years.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71	74	77	80	83	

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:	Reduce achievement gaps in sub groups in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 73% Hispanic: 59%	White: 76% Hispanic: 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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations,PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT, F&P, District 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 subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Reduce achievement gaps in sub groups in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ELL: 43%	ELL: 68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An over-reliance on following with fidelity the sequenced guide of the basal reader.	Provide professional development models,opportunities to apply,reflect, and retool strategies around balanced literacy.	Reading Coach, Teachers, Administration	Data analysis, professional dialogue at school-based meetings, lesson planning	FCAT, F&P, District Benchmarks, FAIR
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations,PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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:	Reduce achievement gaps in sub groups in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
SWD: 37%	SWD: 51%

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	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and observations	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms

		working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.			
2	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
3	Teaching skills in isolation	Open the schedule to encourage depth over coverage, introduce problem-based lessons which incorporate pre-teaching, review, and the application of current skills relative to real-world problems.	Adminstration, Teachers, and Coaches	Professional conversations, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations

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:	Reduce achievement gaps in sub groups in reading relative to CLOP by 50% in six years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ED: 60%	ED: 55%

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	Teaching skills in isolation	Open the schedule to encourage depth over coverage, introduce problem-based lessons which incorporate pre-teaching, review, and the application of current skills relative to real-world problems.	Adminstration, Teachers, and Coaches	Professional conversations, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
2	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
3	Whole group, direct instruction	In a problem-based environment, teachers earn small-group guided instruction time dedicated to differentiation because students are workers for, not recipients of, knowledge. So, while the students are working/learning the teacher is coaching/guiding based on students' needs.	Administration and Teachers	Professional meetings, conversations, and observations	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms

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
Introduce Elements of Common Core modeled through CES protocols	All	Administration	School-wide staff	Early Release	Use of protocols in classrooms; monitored through observations	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attend CES Fall Forum	Registration: $375 x 4 = $1,500 Hotel: 119 x 2 rooms x 3 nights = $714 Airfare: $250 X 4 people = $1000	SAC	$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 Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 10% (28/96 students).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

42% (40/96 students) scored a level 3.	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 10% (28/96 students).

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations

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:	35% (34/96)of students will achieve at level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (27/96 of students) received a 4 or higher.	35% (34/96)of students will achieve at level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science Assessment.

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 hands on materials to teach physical science.	Continue the implementation of a science lab for fifth grade students to participate in hands-on, "Loose in the Lab" activities focusing on physical science and Steve Spangler's activities.	Classroom teacher, science lab teacher	Teachers will review students' written explanations in their science notebooks to check for understanding of the covered concepts.	Benchmark Tests
2	Teaching subjects in isolation	Open the master schedule to encourage teachers to allow students to gain content depth over coverage and provide opportunities for transdisciplinary lessons	Adminstration	Professional dialogue, data team meetings, observations	Lesson plans, observations
3	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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
Introduce Elements of Common Core modeled through CES protocols	All	Administration	School-wide staff	Early Release	Use of protocols in classrooms; monitored through observations	Administration

Science Budget:

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

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. Writing Goal #1a:	90% (80/89) of the students will achieve at level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (68/89) are scoring a 3 or higher in writing	90% (80/89) of the students will achieve at level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writes

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	Inconsistent implementation of high-yield strategies school-wide	Targeted professional development relative to current best practices Provide each student with a writing resource binder. Develop student pride and ownership in their writing work by displaying student artifacts. Use rubrics for self and peer-assessment and feedback. Writing across all content areas	Reading Coach, MTSS Coach, and Administration	Data analysis	Walkthroughs, classroom observations, PD evaluation forms, minimum of one survey

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
Introduce Elements of Common Core modeled through CES protocols	All	Administration	School-wide staff	Early Release	Use of protocols in classrooms; monitored through observations	Administration
Lucy Calkins	3-4	Writing Coach	Staff in 3rd and 4th grades	Fall Semester	School-wide writing prompts	Classroom teachers and Administration

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

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:	94% maintained attendance at or above 90%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94% maintained attendance at or above 90%.	95% of studentss will maintain attendance at or above 90%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
160 or 30% students were absent 10 or more days.	No more 10% (53) of students will be absent in excess of ten days.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
93 students were tardy in excess of 10 times.	No more than 50 students will be tardy in excess of 10 times.

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	Diminished connections between the school and the attending families where parents and students are valued as partners in education	PBiS, School-based out-reach programs such as Micah's Backpack, back-to-school nights, curriculum nights, PTA-sponsored family events, school-based attendance incentives for students and parents	Data Entry, Guidance, Administration, Teachers	Improved attendance	Parent Surveys, Pinnacle

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

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

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:	NA
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
0	0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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						

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

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:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	95% of parents will participate in school activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
87% participated last year.	95% of parent participation.

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	inconsistent communciation exchanges between home and school through grade-levels	Network with PTA, Pal City Chamber of Commerce, and other family-based organizations to promote school-based activities and agency resources.	Guidance, Adminstration, Teachers	Increased parent involvement and attendance an local events	Parent survey

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:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM 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	Attend CES Fall Forum	Registration: $375 x 4 = $1,500 Hotel: 119 x 2 rooms x 3 nights = $714 Airfare: $250 X 4 people = $1000	SAC	$3,214.00
Mathematics	Attend CES Fall Forum	Registration: $375 x 4 = $1,500 Hotel: 119 x 2 rooms x 3 nights = $714 Airfare: $250 X 4 people = $1000	SAC	$0.00
				Subtotal: $3,214.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $3,214.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	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 9/17/2012)

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

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

Martin School District
CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	90%	81%	84%	348	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	74%	63%			137	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?	74% (YES)	66% (YES)			140	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					625	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Martin School District
CRYSTAL LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	90%	84%	66%	330	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%	68%			133	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?	40% (NO)	67% (YES)			107	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					570	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested