

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: SUWANNEE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

District Name: Suwannee

Principal: James Simpson

SAC Chair: Anthony Jennings

Superintendent: Jerry A. Scarborough

Date of School Board Approval: 10/9/12

Last Modified on: 11/9/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	James Simpson	BA / MA. Professional certificates in Mathematics (6-9), Spanish (K-12) and Education Leadership at all levels.	1	9	2011-12: Suwannee Middle School, Grade C: % meeting high standards in Reading 50%, Math 46%, Writing 64%, Science 44%. % of students making learning gains in Reading 65%, Math 63%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 63%, Math 61%.
Assis Principal	Gary Caldwell	BS in Industrial Arts/Technology Education, MEd in Education Leadership. Certified in Industrial Arts Education 9-12 and Education Leadership at all levels.	2	9	07-09 Suwannee Middle "B" school status. 2010 and 2011 "C" school status. 2011-2012: Suwannee Intermediate School, Grade C: % meeting high standards in Reading 54%, Math 51%, Writing 76%, Science 39. % of students making learning gains in Reading 59%, Math 59%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading 56%, Math 55%.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Kim Jennings	MEd. in Reading Certified Reading K-12, Elementary Ed. K-6,	2	8	03-07 at Branford Elementary School school went from "B" school to "A" school for last 2 years. 07-10 Suwannee Middle "B" school status for first 2 years and "C" in 2010. In 2010-2011, met 97% of criteria for AYP and school grade of "B" earning 520 accountability points making the school 5 points from an "A" grade. Met the criteria for AYP through Safe Harbor in all subgroups in Reading. Students in the lower quartile in Reading showed 17% growth in learning gains. School showed an increase in achievement and learning gains in all areas that ranged from 3-17%. With the highest gains being in Reading and Writing which ranged from 12-17%.
Math	Renee Bass	MA. in Teaching and Learning Certified Math 6-12, ESE K-12, Business 6-12	4	4	In 2010-2011, met 97% of criteria for AYP and school grade of "B" earning 520 accountability points making the school 5 points from an "A" grade. Met the criteria for AYP through Safe Harbor in all subgroups except White students in Math. Students in the lower quartile in Math showed a 4% gain. School showed an increase in achievement and learning gains in Math that ranged from 3-4%.

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	New Teacher professional learning community to meet monthly	Reading Coach	as needed	
2	Mentoring program for new teachers	Principal	as needed	
3	Reading Coach to model best practices and provide classroom support in Reading	Reading Coach	on going	
4	Math coach to model best practices and provide support in classrooms	District Math Coach	on going	
5	Monthly professional development and data analysis meetings	Principal	6/13	
6	Utilization of content focus maps and curriculum pacing guides	Assistant Principal and curriculum committee	on going	
7	School wide learning improvement team to analyze school wide data and do group decision making with regard to school wide initiatives.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic Coach	monthly	

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
zero	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
39	5.1%(2)	17.9%(7)	33.3%(13)	43.6%(17)	30.8%(12)	100.0%(39)	17.9%(7)	7.7%(3)	97.4%(38)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amanda Coe mentors a first year teacher. Their classrooms are next to each other. They have established a good relationship, thus Mrs. Coe being the mentor is a simple matchup.	Carolina Figueroa-Crooke.	new teacher	weekly meetings, available support to answer questions, offer suggestions. Mentors will assist in data analysis as well.
Kim Jennings mentors a first year teacher. Mrs. Jennings was an instructor of the teacher's at college and therefore a relationship was already established.	Jennifer Stevens	new teacher	weekly meetings, available support to answer questions, offer suggestions. Mentors will assist in data analysis as well.

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 1, Part A provides funds for attendance at professional development workshops, paraprofessionals to work with at risk students and Coaches in Title 1 schools. Title 1 also funds SES services and a district Parent Liaison who coordinates efforts to involve and assist parents in improving their child's education experience.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title 1, Part C is used to provide computer based software, such as Rosetta Stone, to ELL students. It is also used to set up a Migrant community computer lab to assist migrant parents in becoming more computer and English literate.

Title I, Part D

Title 1, Part D funds provide assistance to the district's secondary schools with regard to curriculum. These funds also provide the district with 3 paraprofessionals. The ETT2 funds from Part C provide license renewals for computer software programs and a Technology Integration Specialist.

Title II

Title II funds support the training and implementation of State and District initiatives such as FRI, Writers in Control, and Suwannee THINKS. School based administration and coaches will ensure that these programs are implemented with fidelity. These programs also provide for ESOL endorsements, Renaissance Learning and the required supplies and hardware to implement these programs.

Title III

Title III, Part A funds are used to provide tutors for ELL students and purchase software which will support their academic and language development. These funds also provide for the assessment of ELLs.

Title X- Homeless

Title X funds provide needed services and supplies, such as clothing, school supplies and resources to families in transition, who fall under the McKinney-Vento act.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

n/a

Violence Prevention Programs

Title IV funds will be used to teach the "Too Good for Drugs" curriculum. It also provides funds for Red Ribbon week and other programs that support prevention of violence in and around schools.

Nutrition Programs

The district provides free and reduced prices meals. Nutrition classes are incorporated into Physical Education.

Housing Programs

n/a

Head Start

n/a

Adult Education

n/a

Career and Technical Education

n/a

Job Training

n/a

Other

n/a

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RTI leadership team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, Reading Coach, Math Coach, ESE support facilitators and Psychologist.

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 Leadership team focuses on providing a forum where teachers can discuss strategies for the best ways to meet the needs of students who are at risk. It also provides accountability for teachers to provide documentation of interventions that have been tried. The team meets regularly to screen data, review progress monitoring information and make instructional decisions. The team also helps to identify resources for teachers to best meet the needs of their students.

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

The Leadership team analyzed school data to develop the plan. They will meet with the school advisory council (SAC) to approve the plan and will meet regularly to revisit the plan and ensure that it is being implemented with fidelity

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data:

FAIR (Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading), Previous year FCAT, School-based benchmark assessment - ThinkGate, STAR Reading and Math

Mid Year:

FAIR, School-based benchmark assessment - ThinkGate, STAR Reading and Math

End of Year:

FAIR, School-based benchmark assessment - ThinkGate, STAR Reading and Math

Ongoing:

Benchmark assessments from Florida Achieves- FOCUS website, FAIR, STAR Reading and Math tri-weekly for those students placed in Tier 2 and 3 interventions.

**Data will will analyzed monthly by entire staff. More frequent monitoring will be conducted as needed

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Training will be provided during professional development sessions. These sessions will be held during planning time and on early release days. The trainings will consist of data analysis, evaluation of progress monitoring, data based decision making with regard to instruction and strategies for remediation. The RtI leadership team will evaluate the need for further staff professional development in their regularly scheduled meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The School-Based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) consists of Assistant Pincipal/Curriculum Coordinator, Reading Coach, Library Media Specialist, and classroom teachers.

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

The LLT meets once monthly for an hour after school. It functions as a steering committee for literacy education at the school. It will discuss and steer initiatives such as Literacy week, school wide vocabulary initiates, Ren Place Model school certification in Accelerated Reader, the creation and utilization of a school wide, independent reading rubric and the monitoring and revising of content focus maps.

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

Our school is striving to attain Renaissance Place Model school status in Accelerated Reader. The committee will be working toward achieving this status. They will also be working on increasing vocabulary development and instruction school wide. Lastly, they will work on developing and instituting a school wide independent Reading rubric.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 11/8/2012)

*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.

n/a

*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.

n/a

*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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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](#)

n/a

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:	64% (415) of students in grades 4 and 5 will achieve high standards in Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 54% (350) of students achieved high standards in Reading. This showed a 16% decrease from 2011.	In 2013 it is expected that 64% (415) of students will achieve high standards 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	Percentage of students who are below proficiency when entering 4th grade.	Administer school, district and state assessments and analyze data to drive instruction and remediation	Principal, Assistant principal, academic coaches and classroom teachers	benchmark and progress monitoring data will be analyzed.	STAR, FAIR and ThinGate testing.
2	Percentage of students who are below proficiency when entering 4th grade.	Conduct Parent teacher conferences for students in the lower quartile to explain deficits and make a home school connection.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic coaches	Parent and teacher feedback	STAR, FAIR and ThinGate testing.
3	Students limited understanding of vocabulary and limited background knowledge	1. School wide focus on vocabulary enrichment. 2. School wide initiative to increase background knowledge through educational experiences such as, assemblies, informational videos and field trips when possible.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic Coaches	Students in intervention groups will be STAR tested every 3 weeks to establish a trend line and track progress. All other students will be STAR tested every nine weeks. FAIR data and ThinkGate data will also be analyzed to determine growth.	STAR Reading, Benchmark Assessments 3x per year- Thinkgate and FCAT.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	76% (240) of 4th graders will score a level 4 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% of students achieved level 3 or better..	76% (240) of 4th graders will score a level 4 or better.

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 coming already proficient and not making adequate learning gains	Conduct higher level Reading group to address needs of higher level readers and higher order thinking skills	Principal and Reading coach	School, district and state testing data	STAR, FAIR, ThinkGate and FCAT.
2	Students coming already proficient and not making adequate learning gains	Focus on learning gains and conduct student data chats geared toward higher level achievement for above level students.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic Coach	School, district and state testing data	STAR, FAIR, ThinkGate and FCAT.
3	Not enough time spent on enrichment activities and inferential learning.	Teachers will focus on enrichment during their iii time because lower level students will be pulled out for remediation.	classroom teachers	3x a year benchmark testing, FARI testing, 4x per year STAR testing.	ThinkGate, STAR REading and FAIR

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	69% (450) of 4th and 5th grade students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% of students made learning gains in Reading.	69% (450) of 4th and 5th grade students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not sure of the explicit strategies to use to remediate specific deficit areas.	1. Teachers will be given PD in the area of targeted intervention. 2. Most needy students will go to targeted intervention groups outside the classroom allowing teachers to focus on moving on or above level students. 3. Accelerated Reader will be implemented with fidelity. 5. Monthly meetings will be held to analyze data and provide professional development. 2. FAIR, STAR and ThinkGate data will be closely monitored	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach, Assistant Principal and Principal	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
2	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach, Assistant Principal and Principal	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
3	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in their targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

of improvement for the following group:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	66% (430) of 4th and 5th graders in the lower quartile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% of students who are in the lower quartile	66% (430) of 4th and 5th graders in the lower quartile will make learning gains.

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 entering grade level below proficiency	1. Adminster FAIR assessment and analyze data. 2. Implement Content Focus Maps 3. Conduct students and teacher data chats	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic coach	School, district and state level assessment data.	FAIR, STAR, FCAT and ThinkGate testing
2	Ineffective differentiation and interventions for the lowest performing students.	1. Students will be grouped according to specific reading deficit and receive specific interventions to meet those needs. 2. Data analysis after each FAIR and benchmark assessment. 3. Accelerated Reader will be implemented with fidelity to increase reading stamina. 4. Content Focus maps to integrate more informational texts.	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach, Assistant Principal and Principal	Students in intervention groups will be STAR tested every 3 weeks to establish a trend line and track progress. All other students will be STAR tested every nine weeks.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
	Student motivation and	All stakeholders will make	Classroom	1. Classroom	STAR Reading,

3	confidence is low.	every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
4	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	55% of AA students in grades 4 and 5 will be proficient in Reading, reducing the number of at risk students bu 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
AA- 44% proficient on 2012 FCAT	AA- 55% will be prficient in Reading on the 2013 FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students entering grade level below proficiency	cloesly monitoring progress monitoring data to assure that student are making appropriate growht and are on track to proficiency.	principal, assistant principal and academic coach	school, district and state level assessment data	STAR, FAIR, FCAT and ThinkGate
2	Teachers not effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs and learning style of this population	1. Teachers will incorporate more activities that focus on the tactile/kinesthetic modality of learning. 2. Students will be taught test taking strategies that incorporate these modalities. 3. Teachers will develop	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach, Assistant Principal and Principal	1. Data analysis after each FAIR and benchmark assessment. 2. Accelerated Reader will be implemented with fidelity to increase reading stamina. 3. Content Focus maps to integrate more informational texts.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

		action plans that target these children and identify ways to remediate their areas of weakness			
3	Student motivation and confidence is low	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:		69% of ED students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT, showing a 10% decrease in the percentage of at risk students.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
59% of ED students were below grade level in Reading		69% will be proficient in Reading on the 2013 FCAT.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs and learning style of this population	1. Teachers will be given PD in the area of targeted intervention. 2. Most needy students will go to targeted intervention groups outside the classroom allowing teachers to focus on moving on or above level students. 3. Accelerated Reader will be implemented with fidelity. 5. Monthly meetings will be held to analyze data and provide professional development.	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach, Assistant Principal and Principal	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
2	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
3	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in their targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Reading, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
4	Students lack of motivation and do not understand their own achievement data.	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in their targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Principal, Reading Coach, CRT, Title I Teacher; Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring Student data chats	CIM data. Progress Monitoring three times per year - FAIR, Performance Matters, STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy.

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						

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
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 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:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
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				

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:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient 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
No Data Submitted				

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.
CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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:	61% (395) of all students will achieve high standards in Math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51%(458)	61% (395) of all students will achieve high standards 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	Percentage of students who are below proficiency when entering 4th grade.	Administer school, district and state assessments and analyze data to drive instruction and remediation	Principal, Assistant principal, academic coaches and classroom teachers	benchmark and progress monitoring data will be analyzed.	STAR, FAIR and ThinGate testing.
2	Percentage of students who are below proficiency when entering 4th grade.	Conduct Parent teacher conferences for students in the lower quartile to explain deficits and make a home school connection.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic coaches	Parent and teacher feedback	STAR, FAIR and ThinGate testing.
3	Increase of students coming to 4th grade functioning below grade level in Math	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. Teacher modeling by academic coach and district Math coach.	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments
4	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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:	The number of students scoring 4 and 5 on FCAT will increase by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%	41%

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 coming already proficient and not making adequate learning gains	Focus on learning gains and conduct student data chats geared toward higher level achievement for above level students.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic Coach	School, district and state testing data	STAR, FAIR, ThinkGate and FCAT.
2	Increased number of students lacking basic skills in Math.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. School-wide implementation of Accelerated Math from 8:00-8:30. Students will work on or above grade level as determined by their Star Math diagnostic test.	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments
	Limited opportunities for acceleration for above level students	1. Students will be eligible to take FLVS accelerated Math classes	Classroom teachers, intervention	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments,

3		2. Students will have exposure and opportunity to work in above level Math libraries in Accelerated Math	instructors, administration and academic coach	3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats	FCAT
4	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	69% (450) of students will make learning gains in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	69% (450) of students 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
Students entering 4th grade below proficiency.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments

1		Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. Teacher modeling by academic coach and district Math coach.		4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	
2	Increased number of students lacking basic skills in Math.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 4. School-wide implementation of Accelerated Math from 8:00-8:30. Students will work on or above grade level as determined by their Star Math diagnostic test. 5. Teachers will use skill specific remediation to target areas of weakness.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
3	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25%	
---	--

making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	65% (420) of students in the lower 25%ile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%	65% (420) of students in the lower 25%ile will make learning gains.

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 entering grade level below proficiency	1.Adminster STAR and Thinkgate assessment and analyze data. 2. Implement Content Focus Maps 3. Conduct students and teacher data chats	Principal, Assistant Principal and Academic coach	School, district and state level assessment data.	STAR, FCAT and ThinkGate testing
2	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
3	Increased number of students lacking basic skills in Math	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. Teacher modeling by academic coach and district Math coach.	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments
4	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal #				
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of AA students who are at risk will decrease by 10% from 56% to 46%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%	63%

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 entering grade level below proficiency	closely monitoring data to assure that student are making appropriate growth and are on track to proficiency.	principal, assistant principal and academic coach	school, district and state level assessment data	STAR, FCAT and ThinkGate
2	Ineffective differentiation and intervention.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. Teacher modeling by academic coach and district Math coach.	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments
3	Student motivation and confidence is low.	All stakeholders will make every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
4	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats

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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:		Percent of ED students who are at risk will decrease by 10% from 41% in 2013 to 31% in 2012.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
61%		Percent of ED students who are at risk will decrease by 10% from 41% in 2013 to 31% in 2012.			
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
	Student motivation and	All stakeholders will make	Classroom	1. Classroom	STAR Math,

1	confidence is low.	every effort to support students through positive feedback and frequent praise. Student will be rewarded intrinsically and extrinsically for their big and small successes	teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats.	District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
2	Likely increase in the number of ED students.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. Teacher modeling by academic coach and district Math coach.	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments
3	Students do not understand their own achievement data	Teachers and intervention instructors will conduct monthly data chats with students in thier targeted intervention groups to help students better understand themselves as learners and encourage student motivation.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Progress monitoring 2. Student data chats	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT
4	Increased number of students lacking basic skills in Math.	1. One hour Math block per day. 2. Incorporate use of manipulative 3. Emphasize the Reading / Math connection. 4. Designated Math remediation time each day for 40 min. 5. Instructional focus calendars. 6. Use on investigative inquiry. 7. School-wide implementation of Acclerated Math from 8:00-8:30. Students will work on or above grade level as determined by their Star Math diagnostic test.	Classroom teachers, intervention instructors, administration and academic coach	1. Classroom walkthroughs. 2. Lesson plans 3. progress monitoring 4. Teacher and student data chats	STAR Math, District Benchmark assessments, FCAT

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------	---

No Data Submitted

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		46% of students will meet or exceed the proficiency score in science.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
39%		46% of students will meet or exceed the proficiency score 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	Lack of effective implementation of th NGSSS to the rigor and depth of it's intent.	1. Implement NGSSS 2. 45 minutes daily Science instruction 3. Science CIM assesments 4. Emphasize the Science/REading connection 5. Utilize hands on	Academic coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal, teachers	1. Lesson plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. Benchmark assessments 4. Monthly data and professional development meetings.	FCAT, District Benchmark Assessments

		quiry in Science. 6. Provide teachers with Pd in Scientific inquiry			
2	Students not understanding and being able to apply the concepts learned in Science instruction	Provide a Science coach that will assist students in applying Science content through Scientific inquiry.	Principal, Assistant principal, classroom teachers and Science Coach	1. Lesson Plans 2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. benchmark and CIM assessment data.	Science CIM assessments, Benchmark assessments and FCAT.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
8%		20%			
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 not familiar with the format and level of rigor required on the Science assessment	1. Implement NGSSS 2. 45 minutes of Science daily 3. Provide Real world connections 4. Use hands on Science inquiry 5. Provide training to teachers in Science inquiry	Academic coaches, Principa, Assistant principal	1. lesson plans 2. walkthroughs 3. Science CIM aseements 4. Instructional focus calendars 5. Emphasize Sceince/Reading connection	FCAT, District benchmark assessments
	Students not	Provide a Science	Principal,	1. Lesson Plans	Science CIM

2	understanding and being able to apply the concepts learned in Science instruction	coach that will assist students in applying Science content through Scientific inquiry.	Assistant principal, classroom teachers and Science Coach	2. Classroom walkthroughs 3. benchmark and CIM assessment data.	assessments, Benchmark assessments and FCAT.
---	---	---	---	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	76% (245) of 4th grade students will score a proficient score of 4.0 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance: 39% (313)	2013 Expected Level of Performance: 76% (245) of 4th grade students will score a proficient score of 4.0 or better.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not implementing district writing program with fidelity.	1. In corporate district adopted program K-5 2. Monthly school wide writing prompts. 3. Weekly instructional prompt practice. 4. Follow instructional FOCUS calendar for writing. 5. Implement writing across the curriculum.	Principal, Assistant principal and academic coaches	1. Lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. consultant to visit classrooms and give feedback 4. evaluation of student writing	FCAT, school wide prompts
2	Student motivation and confidence is low.	Local business will sponsor a writing competition to be held each month to encourage students to increase writing proficiency.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coach, Business partners.	Monthly writing prompt data will be analyzed to look for growth.	District writing assessments, monthly writing prompts and FCAT.

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

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:	We will increase our attendance rate by 1% having 94% attendance.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93% (679)	94% (686)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
312	297
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
280	266

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	x	x	x	x	x

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:		The number of students with school suspensions will decrease by 10%			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
n/a		n/a			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
n/a		n/a			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
71		60			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
71		67			
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
	Teachers not	parent conferances(by	Principal, Asst.	Monthly reveiw of	end of the year

1	implementing the school wide behavior system with fidelity	phone, in person or by note) Implement CHAMPS program with fidelity, monthly CHAMPS comiittee meetings, wekly reconition of students who are improving behaviorally.	principal	dicipline and school wide program	suspension report, FOCUS 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						

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		85% of parents will participate in at least one parent involvement activity for the 2010-2011 school year			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
*		85%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents inability to attend night functions	Continue to provide activities that occur after the parents' work day. Schedule events well in advance.	Principal, Asst. principal, Leadership team	number of parents attending	sign in sheets for each event

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
--	---	---	--

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Review activities and events of the school. Gather input and suggestions from community and parents.
--

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Suwannee School District SUWANNEE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	68%	83%	39%	260	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	66%	65%			131	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)	68% (YES)			129	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					520	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Suwannee School District SUWANNEE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	64%	70%	36%	233	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	54%	62%			116	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?	44% (NO)	64% (YES)			108	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					457	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested