FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: J. J. FINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Alachua

Principal: Kathleen B. Valdes

SAC Chair: Monta Burt

Superintendent: Dr. W. Daniel Boyd, Jr.

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/12/2012

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	Kathleen B. Valdes	Education, Florida State University; Master of Education-Educational Leadership, University of Florida; Principal Certification State of Florida ESOL Endorsed	3	3	2011-2012 J.J. Finley Elementary Grade: A AYP: N/A 2010-2011 J.J. Finley Elementary Grade: A AYP: 79% 2009-2010 J.J. Finley Elementary Grade: A AYP: 85% 2008-2009 Irby Elementary School Grade: A AYP: 97% 2007-2008 Irby Elementary School Grade: B AYP: 87% 2006-2007 Hidden Oak Elementary School Grade: A AYP: 100%

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	Regular meetings of new teachers with Leadership Team.	Principal	On-Going	
2	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	Principal	On-Going	
3	Team leaders and CRT participate in interviewing process for all new hires.	Principal	On-Going	
4	Maintain close relationship with University of Florida and St. Leo University as they provide interns, practicum students, and volunteers to our school.	All Faculty & Staff	On-Going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	2.3%(1)	30.2%(13)	32.6%(14)	34.9%(15)	62.8%(27)	100.0%(43)	11.6%(5)	14.0%(6)	39.5%(17)

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
			Planned mentoring activities focus on

Dagni Christian	Brittaney Juarez	The pairing of Mentor and Beginning Teacher is based on the experience and training of each mentor coach, including grade level and subject (s) taught	completion of the District Beginning Teacher Program through weekly one on one conferencing, observations, and feedback. In addition, each mentor coach will meet with her assigned teachers in a small group six times a year. These meetings, individually or in small group, will focus on training and modeling engaging curriculum strategies and research-based behavior management strategies.

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

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Pull out tutorials are provided daily for students in need of remediation. A para tutor provides supports to students under the direct supervision of classroom teachers. The FCIM coordinator helps teachers collect and analyze data.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the use of district literacy coaches, mentor coaches and digital educators.

Title III

The school and district work together to coordinate supplementary materials and services to improve the education of immigrant and English language learners. We are the elementary ESOL center school for our district.

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates peacemaking skills, steps for creative conflict resolution, and taking responsibility for personal health.

Nutrition Programs

The school participates in the district's "Summer Feeding" program.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

The school provides our ELL families with information regarding English class offerings in the community.

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal—Kathy Valdes
CRT—Tami Delaney
BRT—Johnny Cromwell
GC—Kathy Grantham
CIMS—Eileen Stephens
Title 1—Eileen Stephens, Kim Gregg
Teacher Rep—Stefanie McLeod
ESE teacher—Beverly Noll
School Psychologist—Maria Alvarez

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 SBLT will meet quarterly as a team to review new data available for the grade levels based upon FAIR, Reading Benchmarks, and school-wide on-going progress monitoring probes. Several members of the team are assigned as grade level team members to meet regularly with teams during their grade level meetings. These SBLT members will meet with their grade level teams the week after new data has been made available from FAIR, benchmark tests, and school-wide on-going progress monitoring probes. This will allow the grade level teams to take a more personal approach to reviewing their grade level data, especially since some students leave to go to other classrooms for gifted enrichment, math, science or ESOL reading classes during a portion of the day

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 role of the SBLT has been to complete a mapping of resources available to meet student needs, analyze the staff training needs based upon available intervention resources, and structure a school-wide intervention plan incorporating established interventions and newly purchased interventions that were chosen based upon need through student data analysis.
Principal—is the leader in coordinating the SBLT efforts, and assigned roles for continuing the school-wide intervention plan and on-going progress monitoring. She ensures that the identified areas of need within the staff needs survey will be addressed through well-planned and regularly implemented PLCs in specific content areas (diagnostic measures, using intervention materials with fidelity, entering on-going progress monitoring data, understanding and utilizing that data).
Curriculum Resource Teacher—provides teachers with data from district adopted screening and benchmark assessments. She will review the data regularly with the SBLT to further tailor the types of programs and intervention resources that are adopted for implementation at their school.
Behavior Resource Teacher—Utilized district data that is only accessible by BRTs to work with the guidance department to identify and analyze behavior issues for students for the implementation of small group and individual social skills training and/or counseling. He will work with his assistant to maintain regular progress monitoring data for students receiving Tier 3 interventions for behavior. He will regularly report on behavioral data to the SBLT to ensure that each grade level is able to access behavior resources and information for their identified students.
Guidance Counselor—Implements the Tier 1 school-wide social skills instruction in class level guidance lessons. Utilizes student data and teacher input to offer Tier 2 small groups for social skills.
CIMS—Coordinate the dissemination and understanding of progress monitoring data with teachers during grade level team meetings, and assist the SBLT in school-wide planning based upon the student on-going progress monitoring data.
Title 1—Supervises the implementation of Tier 2 small group interventions, and assists with implementation of Tier 3

interventions for struggling students in Tier 2 intervention.

Teacher Rep—Acts as teacher liaison to offer insight into implications of RtI implementation in the classroom. Assists grade level team in regular review of progress monitoring data for her assigned grade level team.

ESE Rep—Delivers Tier 3 interventions and maintains more frequent progress monitoring for students identified as eligible for special education. Assists teachers with intervention recommendations, and offers support in reviewing RtI progress monitoring data for students currently receiving Tier 3 regular education interventions.

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 school will utilize multiple levels of progress monitoring to address the needs of accountability reporting, as well as on-going progress monitoring for tracking intervention efficacy, and student progress in grade specific targeted skills. FCAT and FAIR data will be housed through Infinite Campus and PMRN, respectively—which will be reviewed on a regular basis, as it becomes available. Benchmark data for reading and math with be utilized at the school level through grade level graphing, as well as being disaggregated by district staff for further analysis. Additional on-going progress monitoring has been selected to address grade level appropriate skills where students frequently show a need for intervention.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Teachers received an introductory training in RtI school-wide intervention plan and academic on-going progress monitoring plan. Hands-on computer-based follow-up sessions were scheduled to allow teachers support in utilizing technology for progress monitoring. Further follow-up sessions will be offered by grade level at the discretion of the grade level team leader to review the purposes of on-going progress monitoring, and to assist in disaggregating data on a regular basis. On-going PLC groups are planned that will address the areas of Tier 1 instruction fidelity, diagnostic assessment, intervention implementation, and on-going progress monitoring for students moving throughout the Tiers.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Kathy Valdes, Principal; Tami Delaney, Curriculum Resource Teacher; Eileen Stephens, CIMS and Title 1 Lead Teacher; Jeanie Sabback, Primary Representative; Sasha Abreu, Secondary Representative

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

Meetings occur quarterly to review and refine school wide literacy initiatives.

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

Accelerated Reader Program, school-wide writing plan, Kagan implementation, literacy workstations, intervention materials for tutoring, and data driven instruction.

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.

> The district also hosts a VPK summer program at individual schools. Each elementary school in the district offers a "Kindergarten Round-Up" program in the Spring for parents and children entering Kindergarten the next Fall. The program provides parents with school based information and strategies for reading readiness and parental involvement.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency in reading (60%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%(75) students scored a Level 1 or 2 in reading. 60%(110) students scored Level 3, 4 or 5 in reading.	The number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 or above) in reading will increase to AMO of 65% for 2013.

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 motivation in students to read independently	1.1 Expand Accelerated Reader Program to encourage independent reading. Encourage increased use of goal setting.	1.1 Principal, CRT, Media Specialist	1.1. Monthly AR reports	1.1. AR Progress Reports
2	1.2. Limited vocabulary	1.2. Increase exposure to nonfiction text and implement interactive word walls.	1.2. Principal, CRT, Media Specialist, Classroom Teachers	1.2. Review vocabulary assessments	1.2 FAIR, Treasures tests, ongoing progress monitoring probes
3	1.3. Limited time to instruct necessary skills/standards	1.3. Use of data to inform instruction	1.3. Principal, CRT, CIMS, Classroom Teachers	1.3. Review and analyze data on a weekly basis	1.3. Data Chats, Data Notebooks, Ongoing Progress Monitoring
4	1.4 Need for increased student engagement	1.4 Use of Kagan structures and Edmodo throughout reading block	1.4 Principal, District Kagan Coach, CRT	1.4 Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	1.4 Reading Assessments
5	1.5 Need for increased opportunity for gradual release model (student independence in learning)	1.5 Use of Literacy Workstations/Centers throughout reading block (Daily 5, Debbie Diller)	1.5 Principal, District Reading Coaches, CRT	1.5 Walk Throughs, Lessons Plans	1.5 Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% of students scored a Level 4 or 5 in reading.	65% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) 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	2.1. Lack of motivation in students to read independently	2.1 Expand Accelerated Reader Program to encourage independent reading. Encourage increased use of goal setting.	2.1 Principal, CRT, Media Specialist	2.1. Monthly AR reports	2.1. AR Progress Reports
2	2.2. Limited vocabulary	2.2. Increase exposure to nonfiction text and use of interactive word walls.	2.2. Principal, CRT, Media Specialist, Classroom Teachers	2.2. Review vocabulary assessments	2.2 FAIR, Treasures tests, ongoing progress monitoring probes.
3	2.3. Limited time to instruct necessary skills/standards	2.3. Use of data to inform instruction	2.3. Principal, CRT, CIMS, Classroom Teachers	2.3. Review and analyze data on a weekly basis	2.3. Data Chats, Data Notebooks, Ongoing Progress Monitoring
4	2.4 Need for increased student engagement	2.4 Use of Kagan structures and Edmodo throughout reading block	2.4 Principal, District Kagan Coach, CRT	2.4 Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	2.4 Reading Assessments
5	2.5 Need for increased opportunity for gradual release model (student independence in learning)	2.5 Use of Literacy Workstations/Centers throughout reading block (Daily 5, Debbie Diller)	2.5 Principal, District Reading Coach, CRT	2.5 Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	2.5 Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:	

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase the number of students making Learning Gains in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74%(89) of students in grades 3-5 made Learning Gains in reading.	76% of students in grades 3-5 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	3.1. Lack of motivation in students to read independently	3.1 Expand Accelerated Reader Program to encourage independent reading. Encourage increased use of goal setting.	3.1 Principal, CRT, Media Specialist	3.1. Monthly AR reports	3.1. AR Progress Reports
2	3.2. Limited vocabulary	3.2. Increase exposure to nonfiction text and use interactive word walls	3.2. Principal, CRT, Media Specialist, Classroom Teachers	3.2. Review vocabulary assessments	3.2 FAIR, Treasures tests, ongoing progress monitoring probes.
3	3.3. Limited time to instruct necessary skills/standards	3.3. Use of data to inform instruction	3.3. Principal, CRT, CIMS, Classroom Teachers	3.3. Review and analyze data on a weekly basis	3.3. Data Chats, Data Notebooks, Ongoing ProgressMonitoring
4	3.4 Need for increased student engagement	3.4 Use of Kagan structures and Edmundo throughout reading block	3.4 Principal, District Kagan Coach, CRT	3.4 Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	3.4 Reading Assessments
5	3.5 Need for increased opportunity for gradual release model (student independence in learning)	3.5 Use of Literacy Workstations/Centers throughout reading block (Daily 5, Debbie Diller)	3.5 Principal, District Reading Coaches, CRT	3.5 Walk Throughs, Lessons Plans	3.5 Reading Assessments
6	3.6 Students are reading below grade level	3.6 Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based material (i.e.	3.6 Principal, CIMS, Title 1 Teacher Tutors, Instructional Paraprofessional	3.6 Review of all reading assessments	3.6 Reading Assessments

Rewards, EIR, Phonics for Reading.			

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

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

<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
		No Data Submitted		

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making Learning Gains in reading to the AMO of 65% for 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (19) in the lowest 25% made Learning Gains in reading	65% in the lowest 25% will make Learning Gains in reading.

<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	4.1. Students are reading below grade level	4.1. Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials (i.e. Rewards, EIR and Phonics for Reading)	4.1. Principal, CIMS,Title 1 Teacher Tutors	4.1 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	4.1. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
2	4.2. Inability of parents to provide transportation	4.2. Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with transportation home provided by school	4.2. Principal, CRT, Teachers	4.2 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring) -Attendance Records	4.2. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
3	4.3. Lack of vocabulary	4.3. Increase exposure to nonfiction text and use interactive word	4.3. CRT, Media Specialist,Teachers	4.3. Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress	4.3. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress

| | | | walls. | | Monitoring) | Monitoring Probes |

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 achievement gap will be reduced by 50% by 2017. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	65%	69%	72%	76%	

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:	All student sub-groups will make satisfactory progress in reading (65%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The following percentages of sub-groups are not making satisfactory progress: Asian 50% (9) Black 61% (28) Hispanic 76% (26) Indian 100% (2) White 14% (10)	65% of each student sub-group will make 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	5B.1 Students are reading below grade level	5B.1. Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials (i.e. Rewards, EIR and Phonics for Reading)	5B.1. Principal, CIMS, Title 1 Teacher Tutors	5B.1 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5B.1. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
2	5B.2. Inability of parents to provide transportation	5B.2. Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with transportation home provided by school	5B.2. Principal,CRT, Teachers	5B.2 -Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring) -Attendance records for tutoring	5B.2 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
3	5B.3 Lack of vocabulary	5B.3. Increased exposure to nonfiction text and use of interactive word walls	5B.3. CRT, Media Specialist,Teachers	5B.3 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5B.3 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in reading to 65%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (11) of ELL students scored at or above grade level in reading.	65% of ELL students will score at or above grade level.

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 are below grade level in reading and parents have difficulty providing support at home because of language.	5C.1. Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials	5C.1. Principal, CIMS, Title 1 Teacher Tutors	5C.1 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5C.1. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
2	5C.2. Students unable to attend after school tutoring because of inability of parents to provide transportation	5C.2. Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with transportation home provided by school	5c.2. Principal, CRT, Teachers	5C.2 -Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring) -Attendance Records	5C.2 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
3	5C.3 Lack of vocabulary	5C.3. Increased exposure to nonfiction text and interactive word walls.	5C.3. CRT, Media Specialist,Teachers	5C.3 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5C.3 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Increase the numbers of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress to 65%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (8)of SWD are making satisfactory progress in reading.	65% of SWD will make 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	5D.1 Lack of vocabulary	5D.1 Increased exposure to nonfiction text	5D.1 Principal, Media Specialist, CRT, CIMS, ESE Teacher	5D.1 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, OPM, Progress on IEP Goals)	5D.1 FAIR, Treasures, OPM, IEP Progress
2	5D.2 Need for reading passages targeted to students' specific instructional levels	5D.2 Provide additional reading instruction to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials	5D.2 Classroom Teachers, ESE Teacher, Tutors	5D.2 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, OPM, Progress on IEP Goals)	5D.2 FAIR, Treasures, OPM, IEP Progess

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:			Increase the number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in reading to 65%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
39% (35) economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading.			65% of economically disadvantaged students will make 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	5E.1. Students are reading below grade level.	5E.1. Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials (i.e. Rewards, EIR, and Phonics in Reading)	5E.1. Principal, CIMS,Title 1 Teacher Tutors	5E.1. Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5D.1. FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
2	5E.2. Students unable to attend after school tutoring due to inability of parents to provide transportation.	5E.2. Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with transportation home provided by school.	5E.2. Principal, CRT, Teachers	5E.2 -Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring) -Attendance Records	5E.2 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes
3	5E.3 Lack of vocabulary	5E.3. Increased exposure to nonfiction text and use interactive word walls.	5E.3. CRT, Media Specialist, Teachers	5E.3 Review of assessment data (Treasures, FAIR, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)	5E.3 FAIR, Treasures and Ongoing Progress Monitoring Probes

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 Chats - meetings to review/analyze data to provide data driven, differentiated instruction	One grade level each week (K-5)	Principal. CRt, CIMS, RtI Leadership Team	Principal. CRt, CIMS, RtI Leadership Team, members of each gradel level team	Every six weeks throughout the school year	Ongoing progress monitoring	Principal
Kagan	Each grade level K-5	Principal, CRT, District Kagan Coach	All teachers K-5	Monthly faculty meetings	Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs/snapshots	Principal
Smart Response Training	Kindergarten and 1st grade	District tech coach	All kindergarten and 1st grade teachers	Two dates determined by teams	Ongoing progress monitoring, data chats	Principal
Differentiated Instruction	All teachers	UF Consultant	All teachers	Workday - January 18th	Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs/snapshots	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
REWARDS		Title 1	$200.00
Accelerated Reader Classroom Book Sets		Title 1	$500.00
Kagan Materials		Title 1, ADV, Lottery	$600.00
EIR (Early Interventions in Reading)		Title 1	$300.00
Phonics for Reading		ADV, Lottery	$300.00
Accelerated Reader License		ADV	$2,300.00
			Subtotal: $4,200.00
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
Paraprofessional for extra reading support		Title 1	$7,500.00
After School Tutoring - grades 3-5		Title 1	$2,000.00
Transportation for students in after school tutoring		ADV, Lottery	$500.00
			Subtotal: $10,000.00
			Grand Total: $14,200.00

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:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the number of ELL students proficient in listening/speaking as measured by CELLA will increase by 10%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

41% (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	Students unable to attend after school tutoring because of	Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Review of assessment data (FAIR, Treasures and On Going Progress	FAIR, Treasures and On Going Progress

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	inability of parents to provide transportation	transportation home provided by school		Monitoring) Attendance Records	Monitoring CELLA results
2	Lack of vocabulary	Increased exposure to nonfiction text and use of interactive word walls.	CRT, Media Specialist,Teachers	Review of assessment data (FAIR, Treasures and On Going Progress Monitoring) Attendance Records	FAIR, Treasures, and On Going Progress Monitoring CELLA results
3	Lack of parental involvement.	Provide Back to School Welcome for ELL parents only and school information is sent home in multiple languages.	CRT, ELL Teachers, CIMS	Review of assessments Attendance Records	CELLA results

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:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the number of ELL students proficient in Reading as measured by CELLA will increase by 10%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:
42% (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	Lack of parent involvement	Back to School Welcome for ELL parents only and school information sent home in multiple languages.	ELL Teachers, CRT, CIMS	Review of assessment data Attendance Records	FAIR,Treasures and On Going Progress Monitoring Attendance Records
2	Lack of vocabulary	Increased exposure to nonfiction text and use of interactive word walls.	CRT, Media Specialist,Teachers	Review of assessment data (FAIR,Treasures and On Going Progress Monitoring)	FAIR, Treasures, and On Going Progress Monitoring

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students proficient in writing as measured by the CELLA will increase 10%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
39% (48) of ELL students are proficient in writing

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Lack of language to deal with increased complexity of the 4th grade writing standards	Provide afterschool tutoring to ELL students with transportation home provided by the school	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Review of CELLA and FCAT writing scores as well informal prompts and assessments	CELLA, FCAT and informal assessments

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:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39%(73) students scored a Level 1 or 2 in math. 61%(112) students scored Level 3, 4 or 5 in math.	The number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3 or above) in math will increase to AMO of 65% for 2013.

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 Low level of engagement	1.1 Use of technology--Smart Boards, Smart Response, and VMath. Encourage implementation of math centers and differentiated instruction.	1.1 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	1.1 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs	1.1 On Track, Go Math Assessments
2	1.2 Low level of math vocabulary and number sense	1.2 Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, Reflex Math, Number Worlds and SRA Math	1.2 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	1.2 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments	1.2 OnTrack Go Math Assessments
3	1.3 Lack of parental involvement	1.3 Provide parent workshops and after school tutoring	1.3 Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS	1.3 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	1.3 OnTrack Go Math Assessments
4	1.4 Students have not mastered prerequisite skills	1.4 Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students	1.4 Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors	1.4 Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	1.4 On Track, Go Math Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(75)of students scored a Level 4 or 5 in math.	65% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) 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	2.1 Low level of engagement	2.1 Use of technology--Smart Boards, Smart Response,VMath and Reflex Math. Encourage implementation of math centers and differentiated instruction.	2.1 Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS	2.1 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs	2.1 On Track, Go Math Assessments
2	2.2 Increase higher order thinking skills	2.2 Increase higher ordering questioning strategies through implementation of Go Math, AIMS, and GEMS.	2.2 Principal, Math Instructors, CRT	2.2 Review of Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	2.2 Go Math 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:	
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

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:	Increase the number of students making Learning Gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(96) of students in grades 3-5 made Learning Gains in math.	82% of all students will make Learning Gains in math.

<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>3.1
Students have not mastered necessary prerequisite skills.</td><td>3.1
Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students</td><td>3.1
Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors</td><td>3.1
Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats</td><td>3.1
On Track, Go Math Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>3.2
Low level of engagement</td><td>3.2
Use of technology-- Smart Boards, Smart Response, and VMath. Encourage implementation of math centers, AIMS, GEMS and differentiated math instruction.</td><td>3.2
Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS</td><td>3.2
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs</td><td>3.2
On Track, Go Math Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>3.3
Low level of math vocabulary and number sense</td><td>3.3
Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, Reflex Math, Number Worlds, SRA Math and math word walls.</td><td>3.3
Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS</td><td>3.3
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments</td><td>3.3
OnTrack
Go Math Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>3.4
Lack of parental involvement</td><td>3.4
Provide parent workshops and after school tutoring</td><td>3.4
Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS</td><td>3.4
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats</td><td>3.4
OnTrack
Go Math 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:

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

<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
		No Data Submitted		

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (22)of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	71% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1 Low level of engagement	4.1 Use of technology--Smart Boards, Smart Response, and VMath. Encourage implementation of math centers, AIMS, GEMS and differentiated math instruction.	4.1 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	4.1 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs	4.1 On Track, Go Math Assessments
2	4.2 Students have not mastered necessary prerequisite skills.	4.2 Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students	4.2 Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors	4.2 Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	4.2 On Track, Go Math Assessments
3	4.3 Low level of math vocabulary and number sense	4.3 Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, Reflex Math, Number Worlds, SRA Math and math word walls.	4.3 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	4.3 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments	4.3 OnTrack Go Math Assessments
4	4.4 Lack of parental involvement	4.4 Provide parent workshops and after school tutoring	4.4 Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS	4.4 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	4.4 OnTrack Go Math 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 # The achievement gap will be reduced the 50% by 2017. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	64	65	69	72	76	

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:	All student sub-groups will make satisfactory progress in math (64%)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The following percentages of sub-groups are not making satisfactory progress in math: Asian 39% (7) Black 67% (31) Hispanic 59% (20) Indian 50% (1) White 17% (12)	64% of each student sub-group will make satisfactory progress in math.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></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>5B.1
Lack of parental involvement</td>
<td>5B.1
Provide parent workshops and after school tutoring</td>
<td>5B.1
Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS</td>
<td>5B.1
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats</td>
<td>5B.1
OnTrack
Go Math Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5B.2
Low level of math vocabulary and number sense</td>
<td>5B.2
Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, Relex Math, Number Worlds, SRA Math and math word walls.</td>
<td>5B.2
Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS</td>
<td>5B.2
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments</td>
<td>5B.2
OnTrack
Go Math Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5B.3
Low level of engagement</td>
<td>5B.3
Use of technology--Smart Boards, Smart Response, and VMath. Encourage implementation of math centers, AIMS, GEMS and differentiated instruction.</td>
<td>5B.3
Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS</td>
<td>5B.3
Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs</td>
<td>5B.3
On Track, Go Math Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5B.4
Students have not mastered necessary prerequisite skills</td>
<td>5B.4
Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students</td>
<td>5B.4
Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors</td>
<td>5B.4
Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats</td>
<td>5B.4
On Track, Go Math 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Increase the number of ELL making satisfactory progress in math to 64%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (38) of ELL scored at or above level on FCAT math.	64% of ELL students will score at or above grade level in math.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></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>
</table>

1	5C.1 Students are below grade level in reading and parents have difficulty providing support at home because of language.	5C.1 Provide additional reading instruction during the school day to targeted groups with research based supplemental materials	5C.1 Principal, Title 1 Tutors, CRT, CIMS	5C.1 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	5C.1 OnTrack Go Math Assessments
2	5C.2 Students unable to attend after school tutoring because of inability of parents to provide transportation	5C.2 Provide afterschool tutoring to targeted subgroups with transportation home provided by school	5C.2 Principal, Math instructors, CRT,	5C.2 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs	5C.2 On Track, Go Math Assessments
3	5C.3 Lack of English vocabulary	5C.3 Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, and math word walls	5C.3 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	5C.3 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments	5C.3 OnTrack Go Math Assessments
4	5C.4 Students lack necessary prerequisite math skills	5C.4 Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students	5C.4 Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors	5C.4 Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	5C.4 On Track, Go Math Assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Increase the numbers of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in math to 64%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%(8)of SWD are making satisfactory progress in math.	64% of SWD will make satisfactory progress in math.

<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	5D.1 Low level of math vocabulary and number sense	5D.1 Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, and Calendar Math	5D.1 Principal, CRT, Math Instructors, ESE Teacher, CIMS	5D.1 Review of On Track, Go Math assessments, progress on IEP goals	5D.1 On Track, Go Math assessments, IEP goals
2	5D.2 Low level of math vocabulary and number sense	5D.2 Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students	5D.2 Principal, CRT, Math Instructors, ESE Teacher, CIMS	5D.2 Review of On Track, Go Math assessments, progress on IEP goals	5D.2 On Track, Go Math assessments, IEP goals
3	5D.3 Low level of engagement	5D.3 Use of technology: Smart Boards, Smart Response, V Math, math centers and differentiated curriculum	5D.3 Principal, CRT, Math Instructors, ESE Teacher, CIMS	5D.3 Review of On Track, Go Math assessments, progress on IEP goals, classroom walk throughs	5D.3 On Track, Go Math assessments, 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Increase the number of economically disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in math to 64%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	42% (38) economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math.	64% of economically disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1 Lack of parental involvement	5E.1 Provide parent workshops and after school tutoring	5E.1 Principal, Math Instructors, CRT, CIMS	5E.1 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	5E.1 OnTrack Go Math Assessmen
2	5E.2 Students have not mastered necessary prerequisite skills	5E.2 Provide paraprofessional support to struggling students	5E.2 Principal, CRT, CIMS, Math Instructors	5E.2 Review of On Track and Go Math Assessments, Data Chats	5E.2 On Track, Go Math Assessments
3	5E.3 Low level of math vocabulary and number sense	5E.3 Use of Go Math intervention series, math content readers, Calendar Math, Reflex Math, Number Worlds, SRA Math and math word walls	5E.3 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	5E.3 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments	5E.1 OnTrack Go Math Assessment
4	5E.4 Low level of engagement	5E.4 Use of technology-- Smart Boards, Smart Response, and VMath. Encourage implementation of math centers, AIMS, GEMS and differentiated math instruction.	5E.4 Principal, Math instructors, CRT, CIMS	5E.4 Review of On Track, Go Math Assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs	5E.4 On Track, Go Math Assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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
Collaborative planning and data analysis meetings	K-5	CIMS, CRT, Principal and team leaders	All math teachers	Data Chats and annual grade level planning days	Lesson plans, ongoing progress monitoring	Principal, CIMS, CRT
Math Centers	K-5	District coach	All math teachers	Early release Wednesday in second semester	Lesson plans, classroom walk throughs/snapshots	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental/Intervention Materials		Title 1, ADV, Lottery	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Technology			

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Collaborative Planning		Title 1	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After School Tutoring		Title 1	$2,000.00
Paraprofessional for extra math support		Title 1	$7,500.00
			Subtotal: $9,500.00
			Grand Total: $14,500.00

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:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (49) of students met high standards in science	65% of students will meet high standards 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	1.1. Lack of science vocabulary	1.1. Increase use of nonfiction text, science notebooks, science word walls at all grade levels	1.1. CRT, Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	1.1. Review of library circulation data, On Track assessments, FCAT	1.1. On Track FCAT
2	1.2. Lack of student interest in science text	1.2. Increase student engagement through the use of Kagan, GEMS, AIMS and experiments/inquiries/investigations	1.2. Principal CRT	1.2. Review of lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs, Curriculum Based Assessments	1.2. Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs, Curriculum Based Assessments
3	1.3 Lack of knowledge of available technology resources	1.3. Increase use of Discovery Education and Brain Pop Jr., National Geo, PBS, NASA	1.3. Principal, CRT	1.3. Review of lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	1.3 Review of lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs
	1.4	1.4.	1.4	1.4.	1.4

4	Lack of background knowledge	Provide guest speakers and field trips as part of the science curriculum	Principal	Science Assessments	Science Assessment Scores

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5) in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(24)of students scored a Level 4 or 5 in science.	50% of students will meet high standards 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	2.1. Lack of science vocabulary	2.1. Increase use of nonfiction text, science notebooks, science word walls at all grade levels	2.1. CRT, Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	2.1. Review of library circulation data, On Track assessments, FCAT	2.1. On Track FCAT
2	2.2. Lack of student interest in science text	2.2. Increase student engagement through the use of Kagan, GEMS, AIMS and experiments/inquiries/investigations	2.2. Principal, CRT	2.2. Review of lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs, Science Assessments	2.2. Lesson Plans Classrooom Walk Throughs, Science Assessments
3	2.3 Lack of knowledge of available technology resources	2.3. Increase use of Discovery Education and Brain Pop Jr., National Geo, PBS, NASA	2.3. Principal, CRT	2.3. Review of lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs	2.3 Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs
	2.4	2.4.	2.4	2.4	2.4

| 4 | Lack of background knowledge | Provide guest speakers and field trips as part of the science curriculum | Principal | Science Assessments | Science Assessment Scores |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
AIMS Materials		Title 1	$500.00
Nonfiction texts		Title 1	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
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: $1,500.00

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:	Increase the number of students achieving proficiency in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81%(48) of students achieved Level 3 or higher in writing	85% of students will achieve Level 3 or higher

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of consistency and continuity of the writing program	1.1. Monitor school wide writing plan with grade level rubrics, anchor papers and consistent graphic organizers	1.1. CRT Writing Committee	1.1. Share/update the school wide writing pan	1.1. FCAT Writing, Scored prompts at each grade level
2	1.2 Increased complexity and expectations of fourth grade writing rubric and standards	1.2 Formal writing assessments and rubric scoring of prompts at all grade levels	1.2 CRT Writing Committee	1.2 Review scores of writing prompts	1.2 FCAT Writing Writing Prompt Scores

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review and update school wide writing plan	K-5	CRT	K-5 grade level representatives	1-2 meetings of writing committee	Use of school wide prompts	CRT, Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

Attendance Goal #1:	Increase by 2% the total amount of students in attendance
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.47% of students were in attendance during 2011-2012	97% of students will be in attendance during 2012-2013
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
135 students were absent excessively (10 or more) during 2011-2012	121 students or less will have excessive absences in 2012-2013
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
99 students had excessive tardies (10 or more) in 2011-2012	89 students or less will have excessive tardies in 2012-2013

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 parental support and understanding of the importance of daily attendance	1.1 Biweekly review of students who are absent or tardy on a regular basis	1.1 Principal and Leadership Team	1.1 Parents will be contacted by a member of the Leadership Team	1.1. Infinite Campus attendance reports
2	1.2. Due to excessive tardies, students miss instruction which impacts student achievement	1.2 Focus on consistency of attendance/tardy procedures	1.2 Principal	1.2 Announcement by principal at 7:45 each day regarding time and reminder to teachers to take attendance	1.2 Infinite Campus attendance reports

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	To decrease the number of in-school and out-of school suspensions
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
14 days of in-school suspensions	7 or less in-school suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
4 total students	2 or less students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
15 days of out-of school suspensions	8 days or less of out-of school suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
6 total students	3 or less
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 social and academic readiness	1.1. Implementation of Skill Streaming (social skills curriculum)	1.1. BRT and Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review of discipline referrals	1.1. Discipline referrals (both formal and in-house)
2	1.2 Lack of consistent parent communication/contact	1.2 Improved teacher/parent communication (weekly written documentation in take home folders/planners)	1.2 Principal, Classroom teachers	1.2 Copies of communication tools, parent meetings and climate surveys	1.2 Parent Climate Surveys
3	1.3 Students with repeated discipline events/referrals	1.3 Implement the B.E.S.T. program with targeted students	1.3 Classroom teacher and BRT	1.3 Review of discipline referrals and B.E.S.T. sheets	1.3 Discipline referrals and B.E.S.T. 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
Skill Streaming	K-5	BRT/Guidance	All teachers	Faculty meeting	Review of discipline referrals	BRT, Principal

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 parent participation in school activities by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
73% of parents participate in school activities	70% of parents will participate in school activities

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. Transportation, childcare, times of meetings, language (as we are an ESOL center school)	1.1. Provide childcare, have alternate meeting times, translations available when possible for the languages spoken on our campus, provide transportation	1.1 Title 1 teachers, Principal	1.1. Parent involvement sign in sheets, evaluations, climate surveys	1.1. Evaluations, climate surveys

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
Parent Involvement Modules	K-5/All subject areas	CIMS Facilitator	All faculty and staff	Faculty meetings	Follow up activities from training; parent sign-ins and evaluations	CIMS and Principal
Parent Involvement Book Study-101 Ways to Create Real Family Engagment	K-5/All subject areas	CIMS Facilitator	Instructional staff	Faculty Meetings	Parent sign-ins and evaluations	CIMS and 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:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	REWARDS		Title 1	$200.00
Reading	Accelerated Reader Classroom Book Sets		Title 1	$500.00
Reading	Kagan Materials		Title 1, ADV, Lottery	$600.00
Reading	EIR (Early Interventions in Reading)		Title 1	$300.00
Reading	Phonics for Reading		ADV, Lottery	$300.00
Reading	Accelerated Reader License		ADV	$2,300.00
Mathematics	Supplemental/Intervention Materials		Title 1, ADV, Lottery	$2,000.00
Science	AIMS Materials		Title 1	$500.00
Science	Nonfiction texts		Title 1	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $7,700.00

Technology

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

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Collaborative Planning		Title 1	$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $3,000.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Paraprofessional for extra reading support		Title 1	$7,500.00
Reading	After School Tutoring - grades 3-5		Title 1	$2,000.00
Reading	Transportation for students in after school tutoring		ADV, Lottery	$500.00
Mathematics	After School Tutoring		Title 1	$2,000.00
Mathematics	Paraprofessional for extra math support		Title 1	$7,500.00
				Subtotal: $19,500.00
				Grand Total: $30,200.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ʝ̩ Priority   ʝ̩ Focus   ʝ̩ Prevent   ʝ̩ NA

Are you a reward school: ʝ̩ Yes ʝ̩ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 11/4/2012)

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
Instructional Materials	$5,000.00
Curriculum Planning	$3,000.00
Professional Development	$3,000.00

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

Finley Family Night, Joint PTA/SAC meeting, Curriculum Fair, Review and provide feedback
on the School Improvement Plan and Parent Involvement Plan

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Alachua School District
J. J. FINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	75%	87%	46%	287	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?	70% (YES)	70% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					567	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Alachua School District
J. J. FINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	80%	75%	92%	67%	314	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	72%	68%			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?	73% (YES)	67% (YES)			140	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					594	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested