FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ACADEMY AT THE FARM

District Name: Pasco

Principal: Donald Ray Polk

SAC Chair: Susanne Larkin

Superintendent: Heather Forentino

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/10/2012

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)
Principal	D. Ray Polk	Bachelor's Degree	3	2	10-11 A grade, AYP not met 11-12 A grade, AYP not met

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.

	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)
No data submitted					

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	Regularly scheduled meetings with beginning teachers (either new to the school or to the profession) to inform them of school policies and procedures, professional responsibilities,best practices, and provide overall support. Veteran teacher mentors are assigned to all new teachers at the school.	Mentor Liason	Ongoing as needed	
2	Interviewing process involves all teachers so a team decision can be made as to which potential candidate is the best fit for the position.	Administration	Ongoing as needed	
3	A positive work culture is created with open communication between staff and administration through a team approach. Recognition of positive achievements through "shout-outs" at faculty meetings and "drops in the bucket" on an on-going basis	All staff and Administraton	Ongoing as needed	
4	Staff development that is relevant and promotes teachers sharing and learning from one another.	Staff Development Coordinator and Administration	Ongoing as needed	

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 - All of our teachers are highly qualified	

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
35	2.9%(1)	31.4%(11)	31.4%(11)	34.3%(12)	17.1%(6)	100.0%(35)	5.7%(2)	2.9%(1)	51.4%(18)

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
Amanda Reutimann	Heather McKendree	Master teacher is an experienced educator and works with a similar population of students	Monthly meetings and support as needed.
		Same subject area and similar	

Kimberly Ladd	Maxine Medina	population of students; Master teacher is an experienced educator and Dept. Head for subject area taught by new teacher	Monthly meetings and support as needed.
Nancy McKendree	Adeline Ward	Mentoring teacher is an experienced educator with similar populations of students	Monthly meetings and support as needed
Janet Nathe	Samantha Beatty	Mentoring teacher is an experienced educator	Monthly meetings and support as needed
Michele Durden	Sandy Feldman	Mentoring teacher is an experienced educator in subject area	Monthly meetings and support as needed
Sandi Hoenigman	Jude Spear	Mentoring teacher is experienced in ESE education	Monthly meetings and support as needed
Jill Jolly	Robyn Crist	Mentoring teacher is an experienced educator with similar populations of students	Monthly meetings and support as needed
Virgil Jones	Angelina Confalone	Mentoring teacher is an experienced educator with similar populations of students	Monthly meetings and support as needed

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.

Administrative team: Polk,Dwyer, Flournory, Hobby
RtI Intervention Specialist: Jones
ESE Team: Hoenigmann, Spear, Carroll, Jones
Department Heads: Reading, Math, Science, Writing, Social Studies
Classroom teachers

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

The RTI team will review universal screening data at the beginning of the year. Next, the Progress Monitoring data will be reviewed. The team will then plan for interventions that are needed and work them into the daily schedule. Those implementations will be assessed regularly to record progress and/or make changes as necessary.

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 RTI Leadership team is involved in the implementation of the SIP at several levels:
- School wide and grade specific data is analyzed to identify student achievement levels
-Assessment strategies are developed according to the school assessment calendar.
-Data is reviewed and progress is monitored regularly
-Needed interventions are planned for and implemented
-Implementation of RTI assessments are completed
-Professional development that supports our RTI implementation is planned.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

> The Department Heads will review data quarterly (Pearson reports, FAIR, CORE K12, school assessments, etc). Intervention plans will be adjusted according to the data results. Information will be shared with the faculty through quarterly data meetings.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> Targeted staff will be trained on how to collect and analyze data. Staff can also participate in trainings offered through the county.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> Quarterly data meetings to see if interventions are still appropriate.
> Arrange trainings, as necessary, for support staff and teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The school-based Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of the Director, Teamleaders, and Department Heads for Science, Math, Writing, Reading and Social Studies.

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

> This team meets once a month to analyze data and develop strategies to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. They observe the instructional strategies of the staff, the grouping and additional support given to students, and the progress made towards meeting the school improvement plan goals and objectives throughout the year.

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

> The LLT will monitor the implementation of differentiated instruction and formative assessment strategies across the curriculum to assure that all students' academic needs are met. They will focus on implementing best practice strategies in reading and how to make connections by incorporating those strategies into all content areas. The Writing program will focus on writing across the curriculum and a continuum will be developed for a school-wide plan. They will suggest training opportunities for teacher improvement and give feedback on instructional practices in the classrooms. A school-wide focus on informational text as a supplement to the reading series will be put in place to prepare for the future implementation of Common Core Standards. In addition, two Scholastic Book Fairs will be scheduled and a motivational program through Reading Counts will be implemented to encourage reading by all 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

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

> Literacy and writing strategies are implemented across the curriculum. Teachers were trained in Differentiated Instruction and Formative Assessment and are using those strategies in every content area. Students are encouraged to default to reading anytime class work is completed.

*High Schools Only

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

Postsecondary Transition

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:	Differentiated instruction, activities, and assessments need to be provided to meet the needs of our students. We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classrooms.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (74) of students achieved proficiency in reading.	31% (76) of students will achieve proficiency 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	Teachers are not providing adequate differentiated activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Strategies will address learning styles and levels of academic development to meet the needs of students.	teachers admin dept.head	walk through data, student work, lesson plan review	FAIR Walk-Throughs Observations Lesson Plans
2	Maintain students who are proficient.	Advanced curriculum and/or enrichment groups to challenge students	teachers, IAs	data obtained by reading teacher	FAIR, Pearson Successmaker reports, 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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	We will provide learning support in classroom, differentiated instruction, and supplement core curriculum
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16 % (1)of students scored level 4,5, and 6 in reading on Florida Alternate Assessment.	19% (1) of students will score Level 4,5, or 6 in reading on Florida Alternate 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	Support staff are in need of additional training.	Motivating Unmotivated Students PD training	ESE staff, classroom teachers	data meeting to review progress	formative assessments, teacher observation

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:	The percentage of students achieving above proficiency levels on FCAT in reading will increase.	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
37% (92) of students achieved high standards in Reading.	40% (98) of students will achieve high standards in Reading.	

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Teachers are not providing adequate differentiated instruction, activities, and assessments to meet the needs of high-achieving students.</td><td>Teachers will use differentiated instruction and activities to challenge high achieving students.</td><td>team leader admin teachers dept head</td><td>Walk-Through Classroom Observation Assessment Data Student Work</td><td>FAIR Progress Monitoring Differentiated Classroom Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Core curriculum does not correlate to FCAT 2.0 and Treasures curriculum does not challenge proficient readers.</td><td>Daily emphasis on higher level thinking skills, fluency and comprehension. Teachers will use novel units and other supplementary materials to challenge students.</td><td>classroom teachers, support staff, department head</td><td>lesson plans, constant analysis, classroom observation and walk throughs</td><td>Formative and summative assessments, end of novel tests, unit assessments, FAIR</td></tr>
</table>

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:	The number of students scoring at or above a Level 7 on Florida Alternate Assessment will increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (7)of students scored at or above Level 7 on Florida Alternate Assessment.	91% (6) of students will score 7 or above on Florida Alternate Assessment.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Maintaining and demonstrating independent reading level skills.</td><td>Skills based small groups, differentiated instruction</td><td>classroom teacher, ESE staff</td><td>monitor data</td><td>Florida Alternate assessment, classroom observation, formative and summative assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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:	Students need to be adequately prepared to be successful at the next grade level.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (85) of students made Learning Gains in Reading.	81% (88) of students will make Learning Gains 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	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	team leader dept head admin teachers	Beginning and end of year data,teacher observation	FAIR FCAT Reading Series Assessments
2	Students lack exposure to nonfiction text and testing/content vocabulary.	In grades k-8 instruction will focus on nonfiction text and testing vocabulary in a meaningful manner	classroom teacher, support staff, department head	evaluate student data	FAIR, classroom assessments including summative and formative
3	Students need reinforcement in reading at home.	Promote SRC programs and reward students who reach SRC goal.	classroom teacher, department head	monitor points earned and books read by students	SRC management software

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:	We will address student needs through support staff, differentiated instruction, and appropriate IEP goals.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (7) of students made learning gains in Reading on Florida Alternate Assessment.	In 2013, 89% (6) of students will make learning gains in Reading on Florida Alternate 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	Balancing time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals.	Productive teacher collaboration	ESE staff, classroom teachers, administration	observation/ documentation of progress made toward IEP goals	Florida Alternate Assessment, formative and summative 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:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Reading Strategies need to be taught across the curriculum.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (51) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading.	70% (53) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains 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	Teachers are not teaching grade-specific reading strategies across the curriculum.	Teachers will target specific reading strategies and teach them in all subject areas.	Teachers Team Leaders Dept Heads	Lesson Plans Student Work Assessments Class Observations	Reading Assessments: FAIR, FCAT, Reading Series
2	Attendance, tardiness, student motivation and participation	Implement new tardy policy, offer afterschool homework help/ study group in middle school, utilize best practices to engage students in learning PD - Motivating Unmotivated Students	administration, classroom teachers	monitor student progress quarterly	TERMS, teacher observation, classroom assessments
3					

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 # Every year, for the next 6 years, AATF will increase number of proficient students by 4%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	72%	76%	80%	84%	88%	

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:	By utilizing best practices and differentiated instruction, the number of white and hispanic student not proficient in reading will decrease by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 30% (52)of white students and 13% (4) of hispanic students were not making satisfactory progress in reading.	27% (51)of white students and 10% of hispanic students (3) will not be making satisfactory progress 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	Students often enroll in our school performing/working below grade level.	small groups, differentiated instruction, best practices	classroom teacher, department head	monitor student data quarterly	FAIR, classroom assessments and observation

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:	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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of students in the SWD subgroup will show gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percentage of students below level in Reading, in the total population tested, was 29%(77); the percentage of Students With Disabilities (SWD) not meeting standards was 60%(25).	By June 2012, the Students With Disabilities (SWD) not meeting standards will reduce to 56% (24).

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	Effective monitoring	TIER 1 SWD will receive 90 minutes of reading daily.	Literacy Team	Data Analysis, walk throughs	FAIR assessments, Lexile, Pearson Successmaker, Reading Series Assessments, GRADE
2	Effective monitoring of student achievement data	TIER II SWD will receive 120 minutes of reading daily	Literacy Team; RTI Resource	Data Analysis, walkthroughs, Learning Lab schedule, small group instruction	FAIR, Lexile, Lexia, Pearson Successmaker, Triumphs Assessments
3	Effective delivery of remedaition techniques, teacher training (staff development),scheduling of students	TIER III SWD will receive support facilitation, mainstream consult and/or instructional support an additional 90 minutes a week	Literacy Team; ESE teachers; RTI Resource	Data analysis, walkthroughs, Learning Lab schedule, small group instruction	FAIR, Lexile, Lexia, Triumphs, GRADE, My Reading Coach Reports
4	Providing high quality, research based instructional supports in the classrooms.	Closely screen students to determine which students need closer monitoring or additional intervention strategies.	Literacy Team; ESE teachers; RTI Resource	Review FCAT records, FAIR data, Lexile, Lexia, Triumphs, GRADE, My Reading Coach Reports	Increase of student acheivement based on the data received from the FCAT records, FAIR data, Lexile, Lexia, Triumphs, GRADE, My Reading Coach Reports

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:	The percentage of students in ED subgroup, showing improvement in Reading, will increase in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
The percentage of students in the ED subcategory who are reading below grade level is 74% (60).	By June 2013, there will be a decrease in the number of students who are reading below grade level to 71% (58).

	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	Effective monitoring	Tier 1 ED will receive 90 minutes of reading daily.	Literacy Team	Review of test data observations/ walk throughs	FAIR Assessment, Lexile Data
2	Effective monitoring of student achievement data	Tier 2 ED will receive additional reading instruction.	Literacy Team, RTI Resource	Data Analysis, Walk Throughs, Learning Lab Schedule, Computer Assisted Instruction, Individual and/or small group instruction	FAIR Assessment, Lexile, Lexia and/ or GRADE, Pearson Successmaker
3	Effective delivery of remediation techniques, teacher training (staff development),scheduling of students	Tier 3 ED Students will receive support facilitation, mainstream consultation, and an additional 90 minutes of Reading Instruction per week in the Learning Lab	Literacy Team RTI Resource ESE Teacher	Data Analysis, Walk Throughs, Learning Lab Schedule, Computer Assisted Instruction, Individual and/or small group instruction	FAIR Assessments, Lexile, Lexia, and/or GRADE, Pearson Successmaker
4	Core curriculum does not consistently provide differentiated instruction in reading strategies at the appropriate level of cognitive complexity.	Instructional staff will utilize training received in differentiated instruction.	team leader, classroom teacher	walk throughs, lesson plans, classroom observation	FAIR, Summative and formative 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
Schoolwide use of SRC program	k-8	Kim Ladd	school-wide	Quarterly	teacher will analyze student participation	classroom teacher
Focus on informational (nonfiction) text	k-8	Kim Ladd	school-wide	quarterly department meetings	group discussions, and analyzation of student data	classroom teacher
Motivating Unmotivated Students	K-8	Aliya Killion	All teachers	Beginning January 2013	teacher observations	Classroom teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Support for Tier level students	Treasures workbooks	Textbook funds	$1,200.00
			Subtotal: $1,200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pearson Successmaker; My Reading Coach; Lexia Reading	Reading Software	Technology	$7,500.00
			Subtotal: $7,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Motivating Unmotivated Students	Aliya Killion FL Inclusion Network - University of South Florida	Professional Development	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incorporating Informational Text into curriculum	Scholastic Magazines: SCOPE; Action; Storyworks	Reading Dept	$800.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
			Grand Total: $9,500.00

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:	Student(s) will increase Listening/Speaking score by a minimum of 10 points during the current school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language No/Limited access to native language support at home and in school. Limited opportunities to practice during the day.	Use of best practices in the classroom. Highly qualified teachers who are ESOL endorsed/certified. Increased opportunities to use language during the day.	ESOL Resource teacher Classroom teacher	Teacher evaluations/observations	CELLA FCAT Reading

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:	Student(s) will increase their Reading score by a minimum of 20 points during the current school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language No/Limited access to native language support at home and in school.	Use of best practices in the classroom. Highly qualified teachers (ESOL endorsed/certified). Parent involvement.	ESOL Resource teacher Classroom teacher	Student data from classroom assessments. Teacher evaluations/observations.	CELLA FCAT Reading

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

	3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Student(s) will increase Writing scores by a minimum of 10 points during the current school year.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language No/limited access to native language support at home and in school. No/limited opportuniites to practice during the day.	Use of best practices in the classroom. Highly qualified teachers (ESOL endorsed/certified). Parent involvement.	ESOL Resource teacher Classroom teacher	Classroom assessments Teacher evaluations/observations	CELLA FCAT Writes

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School-wide focus on informational text	Scholastic ACTION magazine, Scholastic SCOPE magazine, and Scholastic Storyworks magazine	Reading Budget	$800.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $800.00

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:	We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classrooms. We will address math deficiencies through RTI process by monitoring data and scheduling intervention math blocks.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students achieving Level 3 in math is 28%(37).	Expected Level of Performance is 31%(42).

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 having learning gaps.	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. RTI strategies for at risk students	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, and in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Pre/Post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/Middle of the Year/End of the Year Assessments
2	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will incorporate small group centers into their instruction.	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, and in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Maintain students who are proficient.	Advanced curriculum and/or enrichment groups.	Teachers/Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, and in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Pre/Post tests Formative assessments
4	Students enroll in our school below grade level.	Math intervention, approved software programs, review of skills	Classroom teachers/administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, and in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make	Pearson SuccessMaker Formative and summative assessments Pre/post tests Core K-12

				necessary adjustments to student instruction.	
5	Motivation of students to obtain desired results	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach	Chapter tests Benchmark 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:	Learning support in classroom, differentiated instruction, supplemental material
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percentage of students scoring Level 4, 5 or 6 on the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment in Mathematics was 67% (2).	Expected level of performance 50%(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
1	Support staff are in need of additional training.	Low teacher/staff student ratio, differentiated instruction to meet needs, small groups that are skills based	ESE staff/Classroom teacher	Data meeting to review progress	Formative assessments Florida Alternate 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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Teachers will enrich and challenge students with technology and special projects.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 33%(44) of students are achieving above proficiency.	Expected level of performance for the current year is 36% (48).

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	Teachers need to increase enrichment activities at higher levels of complexity.	Teachers will offer additional enrichment activities to advanced students to extend their learning.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments	Post tests Core K-12

					to student instruction.
2	FCAT 2.0 is more difficult making it harder to maintain levels 4 and 5	Daily emphasis on higher level critical thinking skills	Classroom teachers/instructional assistants	Monitoring by team leaders	FCAT Formative and summative assessments
3	Differentiate instruction for above average students	Utilize Go Math! enrichment material Special projects to extend the content	Classroom teachers/instructional assistants	Monitoring by team leaders	FCAT Formative and summative 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Learning support in classroom, differentiated instruction, supplemental material
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percentage of students scoring Level 7 or higher on the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment in Mathematics was 33% (1).	Expected level of performance 50% (1).

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining/demonstrating independent math level skills	Low teacher/staff student ratio, differentiated instruction to meet needs, small groups	ESE staff/classroom teacher	Data meeting to review progress	Formative assessment Florida Alternate 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Students making Learning Gains in mathematics will increase from 74%(67) to 77% (70).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 74% (67) of students are making learning gains in math	The expected level of performance for students making learning gains this year is 77%(70).

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	FCAT 2.0 is more difficult, making it harder to obtain proficiency	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. Lessons taught by differentiated instruction	Math Dept. Head	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and	Post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/Middle of the Year/End of the Year Assessments

		in order to target student growth. After school tutoring			administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	
2	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will provide small group centers	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, inclass formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12
4	Motivation of students to obtain desired results.	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum.	Classroom Teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach.	Chapter tests. Benchmark 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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Address student needs through support staff, differentiated instruction, appropriate IEP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students making learning gains 100%(3).	Students expected to make learning gains 100%(2).

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 time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals.	Productive teacher collaboration.	ESE staff/classroom teachers/administration	Observation/documentation of progress made toward IEP goals	Florida Alternative Assessment Formative and summative 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:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2012, 71%(17)of students in the lowest quartile made gains. In 2013,74%(18) of students in the lowest quartile will make gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 71%(17) of students in lowest 25% are making learning gains in mathematics.	In 2013, 74%(18)of students in the lowest 25% will be making 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	Students enroll in our school below grade level	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. Lessons taught by differentiated instruction in order to target student growth. After school tutoring	Classroom teachers/Math Dept. Head	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/Middle of the Year/End of the Year Assessments Formative and summative assessments
2	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will provide small group centers and/or instruction.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12
4	Motivation of students to obtain desired results.	Complete movtivation training and implement strategies into curriculum.	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach.	Chapter tests Benchmark 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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 81% of students will be proficient in math by 2016-2017. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62%	66%	70%	74%	78%	

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:	In 2012, 77%(59)of white students and 58% (7) of hispanic students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. In 2013, 80%(62)of white students and 61%(7) of hispanic students will will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 77%(59)of white students and 58%(7) of hispanic students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, 80%(62)of white students and 61%(7)of hispanic students will make satisfactory progress 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	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will integrate small group centers into instruction	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K12, and in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
2	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students enroll in our school below grade level	Math interventions, Pearson Successmaker programs, review skills not mastered	Classroom teachers/administration	Data meetings	Pre/post tests Core K12 Formative and summative assessments Pearson Successmaker

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:	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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In 2012, 61% (20) Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. In 2013, 64% (21) Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 61% (20) Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, 64% (21) Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress 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	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will integrate small group centers into instruction.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (pre/post tests, Core K-12, and in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
2	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students enroll in our school below grade level	Math interventions, Pearson Successmaker programs, review skills not mastered	Classroom teachers/administration	Data meetings	Pre/post tests Core K-12 Formative and summative assessments Pearson Successmaker
4	Motivation of students to obtain desired results	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach	Chapter tests Benchmark assessments

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:	We will raise expectations of instructional practices in all classrooms. We will address math deficiencies through RTI process by monitoring data and scheduling intervention math blocks.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	Students achieving Level 3 in math is 28%(37).	Expected Level of Performance is 31%(42).

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 having learning gaps.	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. RTI strategies for at risk students. After school tutoring.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data, (Core K12 and in-class formative assessments)to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Pre/post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/End of Year Assessments
2	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will incorporate small group centers and/or instruction into their lesson plans.	Classroom teachers/Administration	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, and in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Maintain students who are proficient.	Advanced curriculum and/or enrichment groups. Advanced coursework	Classroom teachers/Math Dept. Head/Administration	Data meetings to review progress.	Post tests Formative assessments Core K-12
4	Students enroll in our school below grade level.	Math intervention, approved software prgrams, review of skills	Classroom teachers/Administration	Data meeting to review progress	Pearson Successmaker reports Formative and summative assessments
5	Motivation of students to obtain desired results	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum.	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach	Chapter tests Benchmark 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:	Learning support in classroom, differentiated instruction, supplemental material
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percentage of students scoring Level 4, 5 or 6 on the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment in Mathematics was 67% (2).	Expected level of performance 50%(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
1	Support staff are in need of additional training.	Low teacher/staff student ratio, differentiated instruction to meet needs, small groups that are skills based.	ESE staff/Classroom teacher	Data meeting to review progress	Formative assessments

Florida Alternate 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:

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #2a:	Teachers will enrich and challenge students with technology and special projects.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 33%(44) of students are achieving above proficiency.	Expected level of performance for the current year is 36% (48).

		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	Teachers are not providing enrichment activities at higher levels of complexity.	Teachers will offer enrichment activities to advanced students to extend their learning.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (Core K12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress.

Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction. | Post tests

Core K-12 |
| 2 | FCAT 2.0 is more difficult making it harder to maintain levels 4 and 5 | Daily emphasis on higher level critical thinking skills | Classroom teachers/instructional assistants/team leaders | Monitoring by team leaders | FCAT

Formative and summative assessments |
| 3 | Differentiate instruction for above average students | Utilize Go Math! enrichment material

Special projects to extend the content | Classroom teachers/instructional assistants/team leaders | Monitoring by team leaders | FCAT

Formative and summative assessments |
| 4 | Motivation of students to obtain desired results | Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum. | Classroom teachers | Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach | Chapter tests

Benchmark 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:

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	Learning support in classroom, differentiated instruction, supplemental material

Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
The percentage of students scoring Level 7 or higher on the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment in Mathematics was 33% (1).	Expected level of performance 50% (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
1	Maintaining/demonstrating independent math level skills	Low teacher/staff student ratio, differentiated instruction to meet needs, small groups	ESE staff/classroom teacher	Data meeting to review progress	Formative assessment

Florida Alternate 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:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3a: | Students making Learning Gains in mathematics will increase from 74%(67) to 77% (70). |
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| Currently 74% (67) of students are making learning gains in math | The expected level of performance for students making learning gains this year is 77%(70). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	FCAT 2.0 is more difficult, making it harder to obtain proficiency	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps.

Lessons taught by differentiated instruction in order to target student growth.

After school tutoring.

Intensive math for Tier III students | Math Dept. Head | Teachers will review data (Core K-12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress.

Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction. | Post tests

Core K-12

Beginning of the Year/Middle of the Year/End of the Year Assessments |
| 2 | Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity. | Teachers will provide small group centers | Math Dept. Head/ Administration | Teachers will review data (Core K-12, inclass formative assessments) to track student progress. | Post tests

Core K-12 |
| 3 | Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level. | School-wide utilization of lateral planning | Math Dept. Head/ Administration | Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction. | Post tests

Core K-12 |
| | Motivation of students to | Complete motivation | Classroom | Teachers will analyze | Chapter tests |

4	obtain desired results.	training and implement strategies into curriculum.	teachers.	chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach.	Benchmark 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Address student needs through support staff, differentiated instruction, appropriate IEP goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students making learning gains 100%(3).	Students expected to make learning gains 100%(2).

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 time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals.	Productive teacher collaboration.	ESE staff/Classroom Teachers/Administration	Observation/documentation of progress made toward IEP goals	Florida Alternative Assessment Formative and summative 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2012, 71%(17)of students in the lowest quartile made gains. In 2013,74%(18) of students in the lowest quartile will make gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 71%(17) of students in lowest 25% are making learning gains in mathematics.	In 2013, 74%(18)of students in the lowest 25% will be making 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	Students enroll in our school below grade level	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. Lessons taught by differentiated instruction in order to target student growth. After school tutoring. Intensive math for Tier	Classroom teachers/Math Dept. Head	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, in-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/End of the Year Assessments

		III students.			
2	Teachers need to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will provide small group centers and/or instruction.	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction.	Post tests Core K12
4	Motivation of students to obtain desired results	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter results and make necessary adjustment for review and/or reteach	Chapter tests Benchmark 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 # By 2016-2017, 86% of students will be proficient in math. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	72%	75%	78%	81%	84%	

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:	In 2012, 77%(59)of white students and 58% (7) of hispanic students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. In 2013, 80%(62)of white students and 61%(7) of hispanic students will will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 77%(59)of white students and 58%(7) of hispanic students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, 80%(62)of white students and 61%(7)of hispanic students will make satisfactory progress 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	Students enroll in our school below grade level	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accommodate learning gaps. Lesson taught by differentiated instruction in order to target student growth. After school tutoring. Intensive Math Classes for Tier 3 students	Classroom teacher/Math Dept. Head	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, In-class formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction	Post tests Core K12 Beginning of the Year/End of the Year Assessments
	Teachers need to provide	Teachers will provide	Math Dept.	Teachers will review data	Post tests

2	small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	small group centers and/or instruction.	Head/Administration	(Core K-12, in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Core K-12
3	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/ Administration	Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction.	Post tests

Core K12 |
| 4 | Motivation of students to obtain desired results | Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum | Classroom teachers | Teachers will analyze chapter results and make necessary adjustment for review and/or reteach | Chapter tests

Benchmark 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: | 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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5D: | N/A |
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

		Person or Position	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Balancing time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals.	Productive teacher collaboration	ESE staff/classroom teachers/administration	Observation/cocumentation of progress	Formative and summative 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:	In 2012, 61% (20) Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. In 2013, 64% (21) Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 61% (20) Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, 64% (21) Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress 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	FCAT 2.0 is more difficult, making it harder to obtain proficiency.	Data analysis of pre-assessments in order to address the needs of students and accomodate learning gaps. Lessons taught by differentiated instruction in order to target student growth. After school tutoring.	Math Dept. Head	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, inclass formative assessments) to track student progress. Quarterly data meeting with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustments to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12 Beginning of the Year/End of the Year Assessments
2	Teachers needs to provide small-group instruction that differentiates activities at tiered levels of complexity.	Teachers will provide small group centers	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Teachers will review data (Core K-12, in class formative assessments) to track student progress.	Post tests Core K-12
3	Students are not adequately prepared with skills needed to be successful at the next grade level.	School-wide utilization of lateral planning	Math Dept. Head/Administration	Quarterly data meetings with teachers, department head, and administration to review data and make necessary adjustment to student instruction.	Post tests Core K-12
4	Motivation of students to obtain desired results.	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum.	Classroom teachers.	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach.	Chapter tests Benchmark assessments.

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:	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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	100% (11)of students will achieve a Level 4 or higher in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 100% (10) students achieved a Level 4 or higher	In 2013, 100% (11) students will achieve a Level 4 or higher

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Motivation of students to obtain desired results.	Complete motivation training and implement strategies into curriculum.	Classroom teachers	Teachers will analyze chapter test results and make necessary adjustments for review and/or reteach.	Chapter tests Benchmark assessments

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 # N/A 3A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.	N/A

Algebra Goal #3B:	
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 subgroup:

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

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

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

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 :

Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
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
Common Core Trainings	K, 1st, 5th, 8th	Pasco County School Board	Janet Nathe, Virgil Jones, Lori Gauttier	Summer 2012	Incorporate centers into curriculum	Math Dept. Head
Motivation Strategies	All grades	Aliya Killon Florida Inclusion Network University of South Florida	All faculty	Fall 2012	Incorporate motivation strategies into curriculum	Team Leaders
NGSSS, Common Core Standards	K, 1st, 7th and 8th	Florida Conference Teachers of Mathematics	Janet Nathe, Michele Durden, Lori Gauttier	October 2012	Incorporate activities into curriculum/Share trainings with non-attendees during math department meetings	Math Dept. Head

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Pearson SuccessMaker Ascend Math Program	Software Software	Technology budget Technology budget	$2,300.00
Think Central Software	Online resources that correlate with Elementary Math Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
Big Ideas Learning Software	Online resources that correlate with the Middle School Math Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
Pearson Success Net	Online resources that correlate with the Algebra Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
			Subtotal: $2,300.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCTM Conference	Three members of the faculty to attend the Florida Conference Teachers' of Mathematics	Travel budget	$1,500.00
Student motivation trainings	Aliya Killon, Florida Inclusion Network from University of South Florida	Professional development	$0.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,800.00

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:	40% of all 5th (15) and 8th (14) grade students will achieve a Level 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (15) of 5th graders scored a Level 3 33% (13) of 8th graders scored a Level 3	By June of 2013, students scoring a Level 3 in Science will be 30%(15) for grade 5 and 37% (14)for grade 8.

	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	Limited instructional time that requires benchmarks to be covered without the depth required for understanding	Consolidate benchmarks; reduce amount of time in textbook; spend more time applying benchmarks to problem solving, student presentations, and student led discussions	Dept. Head Classroom Teachers	Formative assessment strategies Use of pretests and posttests	FCAT 2.0
2	Many students require remediation	Peer tutoring; before and after school study groups; collaborative learning	Classroom Teachers Paraprofessionals	Formative assessment strategies	FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science 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 science. Science Goal #2a:	There will be an increase in the number of students who achieve a 4 or 5 on the science FCAT

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (10) of 5th graders scored a 4 or 5. 23% (9) of 8th graders scored a 4 or 5	By June of 2013, 29% (11) 5th grade students and 10% (5) 8th grade students will achieve above proficiency in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited number of instructional days/length of class period to allow challenging problem solving activities to foster deeper thinking and enrichment	Incorporation of a modified block schedule to allow for more meaningful lab experiences	Middle School Team Administration	More formal lab reports, data analysis, essay writing, student designed investigations	FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	Address student needs through support staff, differentiated instruction, and appropriate IEP goals

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7	100% (6)of students will score at or above Achievement Level 7

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 time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals	Productive teacher collaboration	Science Dept. Head, ESE staff, classroom teachers, and administration	Observations and documentation	Florida Alternate Assessment, formative and summative 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
District Training on New Generation CARPD	All subject areas	Virginia Hinze	Science Dept Head/Teachers	9/12-12/12	Reading skills will be incorporated into the other curriculum areas	Dept. Head
8th Grade Adv. Science Training	8th Grade Science	District Trainer	Science Dept Head/Teacher	8/12	Selected 8th grade students will participate in the advanced course being offered for the first time this year	Dept. Head

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
Training for Advanced Science Curriculum for 8th grade	District Training	N/A	$0.00
NG CAR-PD Training	Incorporating Reading strategies into other curriculum areas	N/A - District Training	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Replenish lab supplies for the year	Various consumable supplies	Science Dept	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
			Grand Total: $400.00

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring proficiently in Writing will increase from the previous year as demonstrated by the FCAT Writing assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (20) of 8th grade students and 69% (27) of 4th grade students scored proficiently on the FCAT Writing assessment	The expected level of performance for Writing in 2013 will be 72% (30) for 8th grade students and 50% (23) for 4th grade 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	First year of school-wide writing plan incorporation	Increase daily writing time by writinig across the curriculum; follow blueprint of writing continuum across all grade levels	Writing Dept. Head Administration	Observations; Lesson plans; Writing samples	Writing Samples FCAT Writes 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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	67% of students will score proficiently on the FAA in Writing
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (2) students scored at a Level 4 or higher	67% (2) of students will score at a level 4 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	Balancing time required to meet students' needs and IEP goals	Productive teacher collaboration; differentiated instruction; skills groups	Writing Dept. Head ESE Staff Classroom Teachers	Observations Lesson Plans Writing Samples	Writing Samples Formative/summative assessments FAA

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Daily 6-Trait Writing	Curriculum material for practicing writing strategies	Writing Dept. budget	$130.00

			Subtotal: $130.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write to Learn	Scoring/teaching software	Technology budget	$900.00
			Subtotal: $900.00

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
Donna Boyd	Part-time writing resource teacher	Personnel	$5,850.00
School-wide writing plan	K-8 Writing continuum		$0.00
			Subtotal: $5,850.00
			Grand Total: $6,880.00

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:	
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 Civics. Civics 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				

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
Civics Training	7th grade Civics	Training was provided through Pasco County	7th grade Civics teacher	Summer 2012	BOY, MOY and EOY assessments given	Civics teacher and SS Dept. Head

Civics 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 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:	By June 2013, the attendance rate will increase by 1%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The current attendance rate is 96%	The expected attendance rate for the 2012 school year is 97%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
117	Less than 100
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
112	Less than 85

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 are required to drive students to school. No consequences in place for students who are tardy	A sign system is being used to notify parents when their student is tardy and must be walked in by the parent. Students may not enter their homeroom class without a pass. A process is in place of documenting when a student is late and notification is sent to parents.	Data Entry clerk; Administration; Student Services	Quarterly review of tardy data.	TERMS report each quarter showing students and numbers of tardies.
2	Lack of systematic response to students with excessive absences and tardies	Attendance data will be looked at quarterly to track and follow up on excessive absences and/or tardies with phone calls home, administrative letters home, and social worker home visits if needed.	Data Entry clerk; Administration	Quarterly review of attendance and tardy data. Tracking of targeted students.	TERMS report each quarter showing number of absences and tardies for each student.

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
Quarterly attendance and tardy reports	TERMS (system is already in place at the school).		$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
Place signs in front of the school to show when students are tardy	"Sandwich" signs indicating tardy	Safety Fund	$422.06
			Subtotal: $422.06
			Grand Total: $422.06

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:	There is not a significant problem with suspensions at AATF.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	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
1	Inconsistent responses to inappropriate student behavior	A consistent discipline plan will be utilized school-wide that focuses on positive interventions and working to change long-term behaviors. School staff will reinforce character concepts that will be focused on each month.	Administration	Observation; Review of discipline data	Number of discipline referrals

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

Character beads and dollars are given to students who exhibit postitive charcter traits.	Colored beads and binder rings to hold them	Safety budget	$50.00
Lunch with Director at the end of the year for students who have earned all character beads	N/A		$0.00
		Subtotal:	$50.00
		Grand Total:	$50.00

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.*	We will increase the number of volunteer hours served by families and members of the community by 5% (130 hrs)
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
The 2011-2012 number of volunteer hours served by families and members of the community was 2615	By June 2013, family or community members will have served at least 2745 hours at our school.

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	Families and/or community members are not aware of events taking place and opportunities to serve at the school	Increase communication to parents and the community regardng school events through the use of digital and paper messages, the school website,newsletter, marquee, Facebook, teacher web pages, the media and School Connects with our "week at a peek" and other relevent messages.	Administration; student services staff; teachers; technology specialist	Volunteers attending events will sign in at the office.	Raptor Volunteer log
2	Current economic conditions and work schedules make it difficult for many families to attend school events that are taking place.	Vary the schedule of events to include after school, evenings, and weekends to accomodate all families	Administration, PTO	Attendance at events	Raptor Volunteer Log
3	Volunteers are not signing in through the Raptor system	Communicate to event organizers the importance of having volunteers sign in and have personnel available to run the Raptor machine at events	Student Services; event organizers	Volunteer hours will increase	Raptor volunteer log

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:	Recruit an Odyssey of the Mind team to participate in the OM competition
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		Put together a team based on criteria set by adult representatives	OM Faculty Representative Parent Representative Administration	Outcome of team's participation in the competition	Roster of participants and results

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
Registration fees, competition costs	Varies	Principal's Fund	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
			Grand Total: $300.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

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:	All Grade 8 students will complete the state required Career Course during second semester.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None-	Every 8th grader will have this course on their schedule	Administration Career Course teacher	Course grades	Various assessments throughout the course

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)

Improve the attitudes and work ethics of students who are unmotivated in the school environment. Goal:

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
Motivating Unmotivated Students	K-8	Aliya	All K-8 teachers	1/13-3/13	Observation of students who are unmotivated to see if attitude and work habits change	Classroom teachers Administration

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
Motivating Unmotivated Students	Training for teachers	Florida Inclusion Network at the University of South Florida	$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 Improve the attitudes and work ethics of students who are unmotivated in the school environment. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Support for Tier level students	Treasures workbooks	Textbook funds	$1,200.00
CELLA	School-wide focus on informational text	Scholastic ACTION magazine, Scholastic SCOPE magazine, and Scholastic Storyworks magazine	Reading Budget	$800.00
Writing	Daily 6-Trait Writing	Curriculum material for practicing writing strategies	Writing Dept. budget	$130.00
				Subtotal: $2,130.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Pearson Successmaker; My Reading Coach; Lexia Reading	Reading Software	Technology	$7,500.00
CELLA				$0.00
Mathematics	Pearson SuccessMaker Ascend Math Program	Software Software	Technology budget Technology budget	$2,300.00
Mathematics	Think Central Software	Online resources that correlate with Elementary Math Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
Mathematics	Big Ideas Learning Software	Online resources that correlate with the Middle School Math Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
Mathematics	Pearson Success Net	Online resources that correlate with the Algebra Curriculum	Textbooks (Six year adoption)	$0.00
Writing	Write to Learn	Scoring/teaching software	Technology budget	$900.00
Attendance	Quarterly attendance and tardy reports	TERMS (system is already in place at the school).		$0.00
				Subtotal: $10,700.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Motivating Unmotivated Students	Aliya Killion FL Inclusion Network - University of South Florida	Professional Development	$0.00
CELLA				$0.00
Mathematics	FCTM Conference	Three members of the faculty to attend the Florida Conference Teachers' of Mathematics	Travel budget	$1,500.00
Mathematics	Student motivation trainings	Aliya Killon, Florida Inclusion Network from University of South Florida	Professional development	$0.00
Science	Training for Advanced Science Curriculum for 8th grade	District Training	N/A	$0.00
Science	NG CAR-PD Training	Incorporating Reading strategies into other curriculum areas	N/A - District Training	$0.00
Improve the attitudes and work ethics of students who are unmotivated in the school environment.	Motivating Unmotivated Students	Training for teachers	Florida Inclusion Network at the University of South Florida	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,500.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Incorporating Informational Text into curriculum	Scholastic Magazines: SCOPE; Action; Storyworks	Reading Dept	$800.00
CELLA				$0.00
Science	Replenish lab supplies for the year	Various consumable supplies	Science Dept	$400.00
Writing	Donna Boyd	Part-time writing resource teacher	Personnel	$5,850.00
Writing	School-wide writing plan	K-8 Writing continuum		$0.00
Attendance	Place signs in front of the school to show when students are tardy	"Sandwich" signs indicating tardy	Safety Fund	$422.06
Suspension	Character beads and dollars are given to students who exhibit postitive charcter traits.	Colored beads and binder rings to hold them	Safety budget	$50.00
Suspension	Lunch with Director at the end of the year for students who have earned all character beads	N/A		$0.00
STEM	Registration fees, competition costs	Varies	Principal's Fund	$300.00
			Subtotal: $7,822.06	
			Grand Total: $22,152.06	

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j̇n Priority	j̇n Focus	j̇n Prevent	j̇n NA

Are you a reward school: j̇n Yes j̇n No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/3/2012)

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.

 No. Disagree with the above statement.

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

Our Board of Directors serves as our SAC Committee. Neither teachers nor education support employees sit on the Board due to a conflict of interest. However, BOD meetings are held each month in the Sunshine and teachers, education support employees, students, and all members of the public may provide input to discussions.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Pasco School District
ACADEMY AT THE FARM
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	74%	83%	65%	300	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%	78%			148	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?	78% (YES)	81% (YES)			159	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					607	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Pasco School District
ACADEMY AT THE FARM
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	75%	83%	58%	291	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	63%	74%			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?	54% (YES)	58% (YES)			112	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					540	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested