FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JOE HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Cathay Abreu

SAC Chair: Nicole Canavan

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

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)
		BS - Elementary Education – Auburn University MS – Elementary Education – Nova			Principal of Joe Hall Elementary 2011-2012 School Grade: A High Standards in Reading: 70% High Standards in Mathematics: 69 % Learning Gains: Reading 73% Math 75% Learning Gains Lowest 63%: Reading: 81% Principal of Joe Hall Elementary 2010-2011 School Grade: A High Standards in Reading 91% High Standards in Mathematics: 92% Learning Gains: Reading 69% Math 69% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 68% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 75% Principal of Joe Hall Elementary 2009-2010 School Grade: A High Standards in Reading 89% High Standards in Mathematics: 90%

Assis Principal	Cathay Abreu	Southeastern University Gifted Endorsed Certification in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University	5	9	Learning Gains: Reading 71% Math 69% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 61% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 67% Principal of Joe Hall Elementary 2008-2009 School Grade: A High Standards in Reading 86% High Standards in Mathematics: 88% Learning Gains: Reading 73% Math 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 65% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 63% Vice Principal of William Turner Technical Arts Senior High School 2007-2008 School Grade: C High Standards in Reading 43% High Standards in Mathematics: 74% Learning Gains: Reading 52% Math 75% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 52% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 67%
Assis Principal	Ruben Morales	BS Elementary Education, Nova Southeastern University MS-Reading, Nova Southeastern University Specialist: Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University	1	2	Assistant Principal of Coconut Palm K-Academy 2011-2012 School Grade: A High Standards in Reading: 70% High Standards in Mathematics: 69 % Learning Gains: Reading 73% Math 75% Learning Gains Lowest 63%: Reading: 81% Assistant Principal of Coconut Palm K-Academy 2010-2011 School Grade: C High Standards in Reading 54% High Standards in Mathematics: 65 % Learning Gains: Reading 60% Math 69% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 67% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 77% Assistant Principal of Dr. Edward Whigham Elementary 2009-2010 School Grade: B High Standards in Reading 65% High Standards in Mathematics: 63% Learning Gains: Reading 64% Math 59% Learning Gains Lowest 25%: Reading: 67% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 67% Teacher Trainer 2008-2011

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	1. Implement Teachers' Professional Learning Community	Principal	June 2013	
2	2. Promote participation in seeking National Board Certification	Principal	June 2013	
3	3. Participate in student teaching programs	School Counselor	June 2013	
4	Provide In-House Professional Development	Reading Coach	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0- Out of Field 2- Not Highly Effective	PD Courses will be completed. Support being provided by peer teacher.

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
42	0.0%(0)	11.9%(5)	54.8%(23)	33.3%(14)	38.1%(16)	83.3%(35)	2.4%(1)	14.3%(6)	69.0%(29)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

N/A

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.

Joe Hall Elementary School's MTSS/RtI Team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist, Reading Coach, ESE Department Chairperson, Mathematics/Science Leaders, and School Counselor.

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 MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets five times per year: at the beginning of the year, following each of three FAIR assessments, and at the end of the year. Based on the district MTSS/RtI model, school site staff will meet as needed to identify and target intervention for students. The MTSS/RtI team will schedule data chat meetings to include teachers, school psychologist, and administrators.
The MTSS/RTI Team will work with the LLT Team and grade level chairpersons to ensure students are attending appropriate level interventions. Student data will be monitored. Collected data will be used to guide instruction. Administrators will ensure commitment and allocate resources; Teachers will improve instruction for all students through collaboration; and team members will build staff support.

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 MTSS/RtI Team will discuss and review data acquired through needs assessments. Each SIP goal will be analyzed and data pertaining to that goal reviewed. Regular adjustments will be made based on newly acquired data. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will address the academic and behavioral concerns as needed.

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.

Data is analyzed several times during an academic year: at the beginning of the school year, at the end of the first, second, and third grading period, at the end of the school year, and when FCAT 2.0 and SAT-10 scores arrive at the school. Grade levels meet with the Assistant Principal and discuss weaknesses and strengths of their particular students. Data Protocols Forms are completed and particular strategies are reviewed and best practices shared.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Analyzing data is an ongoing professional development component at Joe Hall Elementary School. As data is acquired, grade levels meet in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and discuss findings, look for trends, and share best practices. All teachers will be trained in the implementation of the Voyager Intervention Program and Success Maker Intervention Program in
August /September.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Cathay Abreu, Principal
- Ruben Morales, Assistant Principal
- Hilda Montes, Reading Coach/Counselor
- Javier Abella, Mathematics Leader
- Ana Martin, Science Leader

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

The aforementioned positions have been included because they are integral in the designing, implementing, reviewing and revising (as needed based on data) of the academic initiatives carried out during the school year. The LLT team will meet bimonthly to collaboratively plan the school-wide focus to promote literacy and reading/mathematics/science and writing achievement across the curriculum. The LLT will conduct Data Chats to guide instruction thus improving teaching practice and student achievement.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT during the 2012-2013 year will include the use of Lesson Study, AR, Examining Student Work, Success-Maker (K-2)), and Implementation of Big 6 in ESOL, Mathematics, and Science, and Word of the Day.

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.

<div style="border:1px solid #ccc; height:40px;"></div>

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

<div style="border:1px solid #ccc; height:40px;"></div>

*High Schools Only

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

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

<div style="border:1px solid #ccc; height:40px;"></div>

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

<div style="border:1px solid #ccc; height:40px;"></div>

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

<div style="border:1px solid #ccc; height:40px;"></div>

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading test indicate that 28% of the students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency by 3 percentage points to 31%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%(88)	31% (99)

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	The area of deficiency as noted in the 2012 FCAT was Reading Application.	Utilize Interim Data to increase differentiated Instruction. Teachers will use A.R. to increase reading comprehension proficiency levels.	MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	Monitoring through data chats and class visitations. One grade for Target A.R. Points One grade per nine weeks average.	Interim Data A.R. Reports 2013 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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Reading Goal #1b: The results of the 2011-2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 53% of the students achieved Learning Gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to58 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%(8)	58% (9)

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	1b.1. Students have shown lack of ability to utilize critical thinking strategies across text.	1b.1. Use higher order task cards in combination to classroom accommodations noted on IEP.	1b.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	1b.1. Instructional Progress Inventory Data MSST/RtI Team	1b.1. Classroom projects and assignments 2013 Florida Alternative

| | | | | Monitoring achievement of IEP goals | 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Reading Goal #2a: The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 39%of the students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency by 1 percentage point to 40 %
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39%(123)	40%(128)

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	2a.1. Students lack the ability to answer higher order comprehension questions.	2a.1. Utilize higher order strategies and Webb's Depth of Knowledge to increase critical thinking across texts.	2a.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	2a.1. IPI data Use of rubric during classroom observation	2a.1. Classroom projects and assignments 2013 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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Reading Goal #2B: The results of the 2011-2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 33% of the students achieved Learning Gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve Learning Gains by 3 percentage points to 36 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(5)	36%(5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. Students lack vocabulary skills.	2b.1. Use of reading manipulatives and activities found in FCRR (Florida Center Reading Research) along with use of classroom accommodations noted on IEP to increase vocabulary skills.	2b.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	2b.1. IPI Data MSST/RtI Team Monitoring achievement of IEP goals	2b.1. Classroom projects and assignments 2013 Florida Alternative 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 reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Reading Goal #3A: The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 72% of the students achieved Learning Gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve Learning Gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (152)	77% (162)

<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>3b.1.

Teachers had difficulty implementing Unique Learning during the instructional day due to time restraints.</td><td>3b.1.

Implementation of Unique Learning for 30 minutes per day.

Teachers will implement a rotation system during DI/Centers Time.</td><td>3b.1.

MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team</td><td>3b.1.

Administration and MSST/RtI team collaborate to support schedules that will allow 30 minute per day student participation on Unique Learning.

Monitoring achievement of IEP goals</td><td>3b.1.

Software Management Reports

2013 Florida Alternative Assessment</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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Reading Goal #3B: The results of the 2011-2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicate that 104% of the students achieved Learning Gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve Learning Gains by 0 percentage points to 0%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
104% (10)	0% (0)

<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>3b.1.

Teachers had difficulty implementing Unique Learning during the instructional day due to time restraints.</td><td>3b.1.

Implementation of Unique Learning for 30 minutes per day.

Teachers will implement a rotation system during DI/Centers Time.</td><td>3b.1.

MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team</td><td>3b.1.

Administration and MSST/RtI team collaborate to support schedules that will allow 30 minute per day student participation on Unique Learning.</td><td>3b.1.

Software Management Reports

2013 Florida Alternative Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | Monitoring achievement of IEP goals | |

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 Goal #4: The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 63% of the students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains. Our goal for the -2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains for students in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage point to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (33)	68% (36)

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	4a.1. Students require a structured intervention tool implemented with fidelity due to their current standing in the lowest 25%.	4a.1. Provide Intervention to Tier II students using Voyager pull-out 30 minutes daily for grades 3-5.	4a.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	4a.1. Monitor lesson 5 and 10 of Voyager units of study and adjust intervention as needed.	4a.1. Software Management Reports 2013 FCAT 2.0

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of reading non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70	73	75	78	81	

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:	In June 2012, 70% (209) of the Hispanic subgroup were identified as not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Reading. Our goal is to increase student proficiency in the Hispanic subgroup by three percentage points to 73% (218) by providing appropriate interventions and remediation.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: 70% (209) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: 73% (218) Asian: N/A American Indian: 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
1	An area in need of improvement was noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment was Category 2 – Reading Application in the Hispanic student subgroups.	Utilize appropriate text that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including information, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining, explain, identify main idea whether implied or stated, make inferences and draw conclusions. Target student for the afterschool tutoring program throughout the school year.	MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	Review Formative Assessments reports as well as intervention assessments to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention quarterly	Software Management Reports 2013 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 48% (21)of the students ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency of the students in the ELL subgroup by 18 percentage points to 66%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%(21)	66%(29)

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	5C.1. Students lack skills in phonics and reading comprehension.	5C.1. Implement activities from FCRR in ESOL. Use FCAT NGSSS task cards in grades 4 and 5 and CCCS task cards in grade 3.	5C.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	5C.1. Monitor results through results of interim assessments.	5C.1. 2013 FCAT 2.0 SESAT/SAT 10 Interim Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 41% (28) of the students SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency of the students in the SWD subgroup by 5 percentage point to 46% (32)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(28)	46%(32)

	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	5D.1. Students require a structured intervention tool implemented with fidelity to increase Reading Comprehension	5D.1. Provide Intervention relevant to student IEP using SRA Corrective Feedback pull-out 30 minutes daily. Implement I-Ready with fidelity. Teachers will assign specific skill lessons. Further teachers will monitor student progress, make needed adjustments, and use results to guide instruction	5D.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	5D.1 Monitor SRA Corrective Feedback And I-Ready software program usage. Discuss student progress during data chats. Use data to guide instruction.	5D.1. Classwork, scored exams, and Edusoft Reports. 2013 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 69% (160) of the students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency of the students in the ED subgroup by 2 percentage points to 71% (165).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%(160)	71%(165)

	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	5E.1. Limited time for technology usage has hindered student progress as the students do not have computers at home.	5E.1. Use Success Maker consistency through scheduled computer lab time. Allow students to check out Idea Pads (mini lap tops). Use Ticket to Read (K-2) Reading Plus (grades 3-5) for daily home learning.	5E.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	5E.1. Monitor through through software data management system.	5E.1. Monthly Software Data Management Reports. 2013 FCAT 2.0

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
Data Review	K-5	Assistant Principal, or designee	Classroom Teachers/ Intervention Team	Monthly	Data Protocols	Principal
Specific Software Related Training	K-5	MTSS/RTI Team LLT Team	Classroom Teachers/ Intervention Team	Quarterly	Software Reports	Principal/Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.1	A.R.Program	School Based Funding	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
5.D	Hourly Personnel	School Based Funding	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,500.00

End of Reading Goa

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 57% of students achieved proficiency Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
57% (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	1.1. Limited time for technology has hindered student progress.	1.1. Students in K-3 will use Waterford and students in grades 3-5 will use SuccessMaker to improve listening and speaking	1.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	1.1. Monitor data reports; conduct monthly data chats; use data to guide instruction.	1.1. CELLA 2013 SESAT SAT 10

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 32% of students achieved proficiency Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 34%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
32% (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	2.1. Students require additional instructional time outside the regular school day.	2.1. Implement higher order thinking strategies through Common Core Curriculum Standards during after school tutorial.	2.1. MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	2.1. Monitor results through data chats on interim assessments	2.1. CELLA 2013 SESAT SAT 10

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 36% of students achieved proficiency Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 38%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
36% (54)	

	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
	2.1. Lack of focus on specific writing topics is evident.	2.1. Implement monthly narrative and expository writing.	2.1. ESOL Chairperson MTSS/RTI Team Literacy Team	2.1. Monitor results through data chats on monthly writing assessments	2.1. State Rubric to score monthly writing

1		Teachers will conference with the students on a regular basis to improve writing skills.			CELLA 2013

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Math test indicate that 29%of the students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency by 3 percentage points to 32%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (92)	32% (102)

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	1a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT is math application.	1a.1 Implement Computer Lab Schedule to ensure usage of Success-Maker and Gizmos, further targeting specific needs.	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1a.1 Review software reports bi-weekly	1a.1. Data Reports 2013 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment indicate that 40% of the students scored at levels 4, 5, 6 in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains By 5 percentage points to 45%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (6)	45% (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	1b.1. Students require small group instruction.	1b.1. Resource and Inclusion classes will be implemented in order to reduce pupil teacher ratio.	1b.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1b.1. MTSS/RtI Team Monitoring achievement of the IEP goals.	1b.1. 2013 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Math test indicate that 38% of the students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency.

Mathematics Goal #2a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency by 1 percentage point to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (121)	39% (124)

	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	2.1. As noted on the 2011 FCAT administration, student learning gains did not increase in mathematics fpr level 4 and 5 students.	2.1. Implementation of SuccessMaker for 15 minutes per day. Teachers will implement a rotation system during DI/Centers Time.	2.1. RtI Team	2.1. Administration, RtI team collaborate to support schedules that will allow 15 minute per day student participation on SuccessMaker.	2.1. Software Data Management System Reports 2012 FCAT
2	2a.1. As noted on the 2012 FCAT administration, student learning gains did not increase in mathematics for level 4 and 5 students.	2a.1. Implementation of SuccessMaker for 15 minutes per day. Teachers will implement a rotation system during DI/Centers Time.	2a.1 MTSS/RtI Team	2a.1. Administration, MTSS/RtI Team collaborates to support schedules that will allow 15 minute per day student participation on SuccessMaker.	2a.1. Software Data Reports 2013 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment indicate that 33% of the students scored at or above level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains by 3 percentage points to 36%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (5)	36% (5)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. Students have shown a lack of ability to reason abstractly and quantitatively. In addition, a lack of ability to use of appropriate tools strategically has been noted.	2b.1. Use of math manipulatives to solve problems as per math series, Go Math.	2b.1. MTSS/RtI Team	2b.1. MTSS/RTI Team Monitoring achievement of IEP goals.	2b.1. Math journals 2013 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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Math test indicate that 74% of the students in achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (157)	79% (168)

<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	3a.1. Students require a structured intervention tool, implemented with fidelity, to target student specific deficiencies noted in the 2011-2012 FCAT.	3a.1. Use FCAT Coach Next Generation as supplemental material during D.I. Instruction in grades four and five. Use CCCS coach as supplemental material during D.I. instruction for third grade students	3a.1. MTSS/ RtI Team	3a.1. Monitor formal and informal assessments and adjust academic goals.	3a.1. Quarterly Assessments 2013 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2011-2012 Alternate Assessment indicate that 92% of the students achieved learning gains in math. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains by 3 percentage points to 95%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (9)	95% (10)

<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	3b.1. Students had difficulty making sense of problems and solving them.	3b.1. Students will use manipulatives pertaining to lessons in Math series, Go Math.	3b.1. MTSS/RtI Team	3b.1. Monitor formal and informal assessments and adjust academic goals.	3b.1. 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Math test indicate that 81% of the students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve learning gains of the students in the lowest 25% by 5 percentage

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (45)	86% (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	4a.1. Students require additional instruction outside of the regular school day.	Implement before and/or after school tutoring three times per week, targeting benchmarks where students demonstrate weakness.	MTSS/RtI Team	Conduct data chats to review benchmark assessments and review on-going progress as per program evaluation.	Edusoft Program evaluations. 2013 FCAT 2.0

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of mathematically non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	72	74	77	79	82	

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 June 2012, 69% (206) of the Hispanic subgroup were identified as not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Our goal is to increase student proficiency in the Hispanic subgroup by nine percentage points to 73% (218) by providing appropriate interventions and remediation.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: 69% (206) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: 73% (218) Asian: N/A American Indian: 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
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment was Category 2 –Number: Fractions, Base Ten, Expressions, Equation, and Statistics in the Hispanic subgroup.	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole	MTSS/RtI Team	Reviewing lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, monitoring student grades.	Edusoft Program evaluations. 2013 FCAT 2.0

		numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals. Target students for the afterschool tutoring program throughout the school year.			

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:	The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Math test indicate that 54% (24) of the students in the ELL Subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve performance of the students in the ELL Subgroup by 12 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (24)	66% (29)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>5C.1. Limited vocabulary of key mathematical terms has hindered student progress.</td><td>5C.1. Implement mathematical word of the day school-wide. Students will work with the word through out the day by applying it to real life and context as guided by their classroom teacher.</td><td>5C.1. MTSS/RtI Team</td><td>5C.1. Monitor through Classwork and assessments.</td><td>5C.1. 2013 FCAT 2.0 Classwork, scored exams, Edusoft Reports.</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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Math test indicate that 44% (30) of the students in the ED Subgroup achieved AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(30)	57%(39)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>5E.1. Limited economic resources hinder student progress as students don't have computers at home and therefore cannot</td><td>5E.1. Use scheduled computer lab time with consistency. Allow students to check-out Idea Pads (mini lap tops).</td><td>5E.1. MTSS/RtI Team</td><td>5E.1. Conduct data chats to review benchmark assessments and classroom assessments.</td><td>5E.1. Edusoft Reports 2013 FCAT 2.0</td></tr>
</table>

	supplement curriculum by using district 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Math test indicate that 67% (155) of the students in the ED Subgroup achieved AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(155)	68%(158)

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	5E.1. Limited economic resources hinder student progress as students don't have computers at home and therefore cannot supplement curriculum by using district software.	5E.1. Use scheduled computer lab time with consistency. Allow students to check-out Idea Pads (mini lap tops).	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Team	5E.1. Conduct data chats to review benchmark assessments and classroom assessments.	5E.1. Edusoft Reports 2013 FCAT 2.0

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa

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
Use of NGSSS Support Material for DI and Interventions	4-5	Math Liaison	Classroom Teachers, Intervention Team	October Curriculum Meetings	Walkthroughs/Observation	Assistant Principal/Principal
Data Review	K-5	PLC Leaders	Classroom Teachers, Intervention Team	Monthly	Data Protocols	Assistant Principal/Principal
CCCS Support Material	K-3	Math Liaison	Classroom Teachers, Intervention Team	Curriculum Meetings	Walk Through/Observations	Assistant Principal/Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics Goal #5b & #5c	LED Badges for Word of the Day	EESAC	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
			Grand Total: $100.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science test indicate that 34% of the level 3 students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency of these students by 4 percentage point to 38%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (42)	38% (46)

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	1a.1. Students have shown a deficiency in higher order thinking.	1a.1. Conduct classroom hands-on, lab experiments aligned with adopted series, Scott Foresman	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1a.1. Lab Logs, lesson plans, benchmark assessments	1a.1. Edusoft Reports 2013 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:	
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
1	1b.1. Students have shown deficiencies in science due to the lack of hands on activities and experiments.	1b.1 Conduct weekly classroom inquiry labs and experiments. Implement Unique learning for Science.	1b.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1b. Maintain Science Inquiry Logs.	1b.1. 2013 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:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Science test indicate that 16% of the level 4 and 5 students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to improve proficiency of these students by 2 percentage point to 18%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (20)	18% (22)

		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	2a.1. Lack of evidence of the scientific process skills is evident across grade levels.	2a.1 Students will participate in school-wide Science Fair	2a.1. Principal/AP; Science Committee	2a.1. Individual Science Projects will be evaluated using science rubric.	2a.1. Projects Final Product 2013 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:	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	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

				Monitoring	Strategy	
1		2b.1. Students have shown deficiencies in the scientific process. This deficiency may be due to lack of scientific explorations through meaningful inquiry based instruction.	2b.1. Provide students opportunities to interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands on lab activities and classroom discussions to reinforce higher order thinking skills. Students will participate in the school wide Science Fair.	2.1. MTSS/RtI Team	2b.1. Individual Science Fair Projects will be evaluated using science rubric. Monitoring Acievement of the IEP Goals	2b.1. .2013 Florida Alternate Assessment Test

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
PLC focus on increasing Scientific Thinking through Common Core curriculum	K-5	PLC Leader	School-wide	Early Release PLC scheduled date	Monitor PLC logs	Principal
PLC focus on Developing Science Projects using Science Process Skills	K-5	PLC Leader	School-wide	Early Release PLC scheduled date	Monitor PLC logs	Principal

Science Budget:

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

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing test indicate that 86% of fourth grade students achieved a level 3 or higher proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain proficiency of these students to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (91)	87% (93)

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	1a.1. Lack of focus on specific writing topics is evident across grade levels.	1a.1. Implement Monthly School-wide Writing. Teachers will conference with the students on a regular basis to improve writing.	1a.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1a.1. Report one score for each narrative and expository writing per month. Review Monthly Data Reports during data chats.	1a.1. Monthly Data Report 2013 Writing 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 4 or higher in writing. Writing 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
	1b.1. Students lack basic writing skills and vocabulary necessary to be successful writers.	1b.1. Implement monthly writing prompts. Implement unique learning for writing.	1b.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1b.1. Review monthly writing prompts and data reports. Monitoring achievement	1b.1. Unique Learning 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

				of IEP goals.	
1		Teacher will implement a rotation system during D.I. time to provide additional writing instruction through conference sessions			

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
	Attendance Goal #1:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 96.41% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, teachers, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.91% (588)	96.41% (591)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
184	175
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
116	110

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Some parents are unfamiliar with attendance policies.	1.1. Provide information on district guidelines and procedures during open house, through written communication, through website and connect-eds.	1.1. Assistant Principal Counselor Classroom Teachers	1.1. Weekly updates to administration by counselor and classroom teachers.	1.1. Teacher communication logs CST lots Attendance Rosters

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
Truancy Prevention	K-5	Attendance Chair	School-wide	Quarterly	Develop Truancy Prevention Program	Assistant principal

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
3	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1	1
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

| | | | Person or | Process Used to |

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Some parents and students are unfamiliar with the Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. All parents and students will be provided the Code of Student Conduct.	1.1. Guidance Counselor Assistant Principal	1.1. Monitor parent contact log for evidence of communication with parents and students	1.1. Parent Contact 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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:
1. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase Parental Involvement in School-wide Activities by 10 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
32%	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	1.1. Lack of awareness and understanding on curriculum programs and test taking skills.	1.1. Host quarterly family nights to provide parents with information related to curriculum programs test taking skills and effective home learning habits.	1.1. School Administration	1.1. Monitor sign in sheets to determine number of families attending	1.1. Sign in sheets

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
PTA aligned to National Standards	PTA	Mentor School	PTA Membership	October 2012	Communication Logs	Assistant Principal

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the total number of third – fifth grade students participating in the school Science Fair.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The total number of third – fifth grade students participating in the Science Far during the 2011-2012 school year was 250. Not enough scientific process experiences were provided in the classrooms.	1.1. Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking through the implementation of inquiry-based activities and/or mathematics problem solving activities.	1.1. Administrators and Science Liaison	1.1. Administrators and Science Liaison will monitor implementation of science labs through classroom visitations and science journals.	1.1. Formative: Science Journals Summative: Log of student participation in the 2012-21013 School Science Fair.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Scientific Process	3rd – 5th Grade	Science Liaison	3rd – 5th Grade	November 6, 2012	Science Journals and Lab Logs	Administrators and Science Liaison

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1.1	A.R.Program	School Based Funding	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	5.D	Hourly Personnel	School Based Funding	$2,500.00
				Subtotal: $2,500.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Mathematics Goal #5b & #5c	LED Badges for Word of the Day	EESAC	$100.00
				Subtotal: $100.00
				Grand Total: $3,600.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

◌ Priority	◌ Focus	◌ Prevent	◌ NA

Are you a reward school: ◌ Yes ◌ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/13/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Supplemental Materials	$100.00

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
JOE HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	92%	93%	80%	356	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	69%	69%			138	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?	68% (YES)	75% (YES)			143	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					637	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
JOE HALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	90%	98%	65%	342	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	71%	69%			140	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?	61% (YES)	67% (YES)			128	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					610	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested