Florida Department of Education

DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP)
Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Merrill Road Elementary School	District Name: Duval County Public Schools
Principal: Jennifer T. Gray	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Pete Ison	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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	Jennifer T. Gray	**Degrees** Bachelors of Science: Elementary Education (K-6) Masters of Education: Elementary Education **Certifications** Educational Leadership (K-12) ESOL Endorsement Elementary K-6 Spanish 9-12	3	11	**Principal of Merrill Road Elementary (K-2) in 2011-2012:** Grade A (feeder school to Don Brewer Elementary), Reading Proficiency: 64%; Math Proficiency: 70%, Writing Proficiency: 89%, Science Proficiency: 44%, Reading Gains: 72%, Math Gains: 71%, BQ Reading Gains: 74%, BQ Math Gains: 61%, Reward School **Principal of Merrill Road Elementary (K-2) in 2010-2011:** Grade B (feeder school to Don Brewer Elementary), Reading Proficiency: 81% , Math Proficiency: 82%, Writing Proficiency: 63%, Science Proficiency: 53%, Reading Gains: 67%, Math Gains: 67%, BQ Reading Gains: 48%, BQ Math Gains: 72%, AYP: 85%; Subgroups Not Making AYP in Reading and Math: Total (75% in Reading, 78% in Math); Economically Disadvantaged (69% in Reading, 72% in Math); Black (66% in Reading, 71% in Math) **Assistant Principal of Landmark Middle School in 2006-2010:** 8th Grade House Administrator, Grade A. Reduced disciplinary incidents and SESIR violations.
Assistant Principal	Cynthia Bartley	**Degrees** A.S. General Education, Bachelors of Science Degree in Elementary Education Masters of Education in Educational Leadership	7	7	Assisted leading Merrill Road Elementary to a "B" for the 2011-2012 school year. Assisted leading Merrill Road Elementary to an "A" from 2005-2012.

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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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)

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
1. Teacher Induction Program	PDF, Principal, Asst. Principal	June, 2013
2. Mentor Program/MINT	Principal, Asst. Principal, District Cadre	June, 2013
3. Coaching Cycles (CLC) 8-week lesson studies focused on Common Core	Principal, Asst. Principal, Schultz Center/District Level Content Area Coach	May, 2013
4. DIG – Differentiated Instruction Groups	Principal, Asst. Principal	May, 2013
5. PLCs – Professional Learning Communities	Principal, Leadership Team	June, 2013
6. Vertical Planning	Principal	June, 2013
7. Focus Walks	Principal, Asst. Principal	June, 2013
8. Team interviews of applicants	Principal, Asst. Principal, Leadership Team	June, 2013

9. Team Teaching	Principal	June, 2013
10. Modeling of Lessons	Leadership Team	June, 2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and 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 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
59	6.78% (4)	18.64% (11)	45.76% (27)	28.81% (17)	28.81% (17)	79.66% (47)	6.78% (4)	1.69% (1)	42.37% (25)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

Jennifer Correa	Brandi McKinsey	• Kindergarten Teachers on the same team • Shared Common Core expectations • CET Trained • Ranch Leader • Classroom Proximity	• Classroom visits • Weekly meeting (Ranch & Grade Level) • Professional Development Opportunities for both • On-Going Communication & Support • Pairing will provide Ms. McKinsey with support to our "Mustang Style."
Teri Hargett-George	Courtney Prewitt	• Pre-K ESE Teachers • Shared expectations • Ranch Leader • CET Trained	• Classroom Visits • Weekly Meetings • Professional Development opportunities, for both • On-Going Communication
Darla Shiell	Darcy Lavis	• First Grade teachers on the same team • Shared Common Core expectations • CET Trained • Previous Ranch Leader • Classroom Proximity	• Classroom visits • Weekly meeting (Ranch & Grade Level) • Professional Development Opportunities for both • On-Going Communication & Support
Kathryn Henson	Melissa Parker	• First Grade teachers on the same team • Shared Common Core expectations • CET Trained • Classroom Proximity • Similar professional backgrounds	• Classroom visits • Weekly meeting (Ranch & Grade Level) • Professional Development Opportunities for both • On-Going Communication & Support
Courtney Mizell	Janet Heartsill	• Cross grade level teachers • ESE Inclusion experience to share • CET Trained • Previous Ranch Leader	• Classroom visits • Weekly meeting (Ranch & Grade Level) • Professional Development Opportunities for both • On-Going Communication & Support

Melissa Henderson	Lindsey Rice	• Second Grade Teachers on the same grade level • Shared Common Core expectations • CET Trained • Ranch Leader • Classroom Proximity	• Classroom visits • Weekly meeting (Ranch & Grade Level) • Professional Development Opportunities for both • On-Going Communication & Support

Additional Requirements

*Coordination and Integration-**Title I Schools Only*

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

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. • Jennifer T. Gray (Principal) - Administrator • Cynthia Bartley (Assistant Principal) - Administrator • Erin Anthony (ESE Liaison) – ESE Resource • Jennifer Correa (Kindergarten Teacher) – Classroom/Inclusion Resource • Kayla Bowes (First Grade Teacher) – Classroom Resource • Janet Heartsill (Second Grade Teacher) – Classroom/Inclusion Resource • Linda Gordon (Second Grade Teacher) – Classroom/Inclusion Resource • Faleeta Acoff (School Psychologist) – District School Psychologist • Kathy McQueen (Guidance Counselor) – Guidance Counselor
Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? 1. Serve as a resource to faculty and staff regarding the RtI process, best practices, and data disaggregation. 2. Attend all district training opportunities and bring pertinent information back to the school community to better meet the individual needs of our students. 3. Meet on a monthly, consistent basis to review and disaggregate data. Take information gained from these meetings back to the staff and provide assistance in addressing the needs identified through this process. 4. Monitor and assist in the implementation of the three-tiered RtI model within our school community.
Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The members of the RtI Leadership Team will continue to work as an integral part of our school community. By meeting on a regular basis and reviewing data, these individuals will discuss trends and apparent gaps. Through professional discussions, these individuals will work to provide assistance to the school community to address trends and any possible gaps in achievement, so that we are continuing to meet the individual needs of our students. This work will be constant, in that as we identify areas of need, we implement strategies and assess the affect through data disaggregation. The members of the RtI Leadership Team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and Principal to help monitor implementation of the SIP. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2 and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; will establish clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationships); facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining and Summarizing); and align processed and procedures.

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. A universal screening system is in place for assessment of all students. There is differentiated support within the Tier 1 program with process monitoring of students within the core program. Tier 2 supplemental interventions are implemented for students performing one grade level below and those not meeting grade level expectations. There is progress monitoring within the supplemental intervention. Tier 3 intensive interventions are provided for students who are two or more grade levels below expectations. There is also progress monitoring within the intensive intervention. The following assessments are used to determine student needs and monitor progress in addition to Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) and teacher checkpoints: Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Math enVisions and Investigations assessments, District Benchmark Assessments. Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2), Math Benchmark Assessments End of Year: FAIR, DRA2, Math Benchmark Assessments, enVisions/Investigations Summative/End of Year Assessments
Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. Professional development will be provided through professional learning communities with small sessions that will occur throughout the year. Two PD sessions entitled, "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will took place last fall. The RtI facilitator will work closely with Administration. The RtI facilitator will train the faculty and staff during early dismissal professional development training. The RtI facilitator will keep the RtI Leadership Team informed of the district implementation process as it unfolds throughout the year.
Describe the plan to support MTSS. As included within the professional development plan for our team members, the team will continue to be supported through a variety of ways. During monthly meetings, conversations regarding data and trends throughout the school will provide the team members with vital information regarding the needs of our students and our staff. As we continue to train the members on appropriate interventions to provide support for our students throughout the tiers, opportunities to identify areas for continued training and support will be provided. In each instance, discussions will occur regarding where we are in the process and to ensure the learning/the growth has occurred. Through this reflection, additional support may be provided to meet the individual needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Jennifer Gray (Principal)
- Cynthia Bartley (Assistant Principal)
- Ashley Hines (Kindergarten Teacher)
- Jennifer Correa (Kindergarten Teacher)
- Kathryn Burghardt (First Grade Teacher)
- Kayla Bowes (First Grade Teacher)
- Lindsey Rice (Second Grade Teacher)
- Teri Bowen (Second Grade Teacher)
- Erin Anthony (ESE Liaison)
- Teri Hargett-George (Pre-K/ESE Liaison)

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet on a monthly basis to monitor and assess our growth, trends, and any gaps identified through the disaggregation of data. Through on-going communication with our RtI Leadership Team, we will work to identify best practices and provide assistance to our school community to better meet the individual needs of our students. We will work with our staff to ensure successful implementation of our core curriculum and provide assistance, as needed, to guide instruction and curricular decisions. Our focus will be on rigor and providing resources to ensure student achievement.

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

Based upon our FCAT data, our primary goals for the 2012-2013 school year will focus upon addressing the achievement gains of our identified subgroups. Through tailoring instructional strategies within our SIP, we will strive to address achievement gaps, provide rigorous instruction and focus on continued achievement in identified areas. This will be done through continued monitoring and disaggregation of data within all professional learning communities, and professional development opportunities, as determined by needs assessments.

In addition, the LLT will work with key staff members to guide the unpacking of the Common Core State Standards. In doing so with a focus on the literacy components, the team will also work with staff to assist in providing additional professional development opportunities to ensure individual needs are being mete. District level PLCs will be used to share key best practices (i.e. text complexity, text dependent questions) and members of the LLT will assist in multiplying the learning to ensure these best practices are shared across the campus.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
  Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S
For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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]).

Reading Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. | 1A.1. Prior Knowledge | 1A.1. Utilize guided reading groups Facilitate student-teacher independent conferences Provide student access to leveled texts Utilize core curriculum Implement RtI Process for students in need | 1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Teacher | 1A.1. DRA2 Reading Assessments FAIR Assessment Reading log Conferences with colleagues (assessment results) Analyze clas, school-wide and individual DRA2 or running record data each quarter Teacher created assessment | 1A.1. Observations by administration Focus Walks of readers' workshop Guided reading observations Teacher-self assessment Guided reading lesson plans Data notebook Conference logs | | |

Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
In 2013, 25% (125) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in reading.						
	In 2012, 27% (82) of students scored Achievement Level 3 in reading.	*In 2013, 25% (125) of students will score Achievement Level 3 in reading.*				
		1A.2. Low Parent Involvement	1A.2. • Continue literacy night and literacy week • Continue Ready to Learn nights • Weekly take home reading books and home reading logs • Continue "Million Word Campaign" • Increase parent volunteers in the classroom	1A.2. • Principal • Assistant Principal Literacy Committee Members • PTA • SAC	1A.2. • Parent Attendance at educational nights with a meal • Classroom volunteering logs • Home reading logs •	1A.2. • Parent sign in sheets and feedback forms from educational nights • Million Words progress chart
		1A.3. Excessive absences/tardies	1A.3. • Quarterly perfect attendance achievement incentive • Implement Attendance Committee to educate parents on the importance of attendance	1A.3. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Teacher • Attendance Committee	1A.3. • Individual and school-wide attendance records	1A.3. • Individual and school-wide attendance records
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	

Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.	2A.1. Low Parent Involvement	2A.1. • Continue Literacy Night and Literacy Week • Ready to Learn nights once a month • Increase parent volunteers in the classroom	2A.1. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Literacy Committee • Ready to Learn Committee	2A.1. • Parent attendance at educational events • Classroom volunteering logs	2A.1. • Parent sign in sheets and feedback forms from educational nights • Million Words progress chart		

Reading Goal #2A: *In 2013, 43% (215) of students will score at or above achievement levels 4 in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 41% (122) of students will score at or above achievement levels 4 in reading.	*In 2013, 43% (215) of students will score at or above achievement levels 4 in reading.*					
		2A.2. Excessive absences/tardies	2A.2. ● Attendance Team ● Quarterly Perfect Attendance achievement incentive	2A.2. ● Principal ● Assistant Principal ● Teachers ● Attendance Committee	2A.2. ● Individual and school-wide attendance records	2A.2. ● Individual and school-wide attendance records	
		2A.3. Need for individualized instruction	2A.3. ● Utilize guided reading groups ● Facilitate student-teacher independent conferences ● Provide student access to leveled texts ● Utilize core curriculum ● Implement and utilize differentiated learning centers	2A.3. ● Principal ● Assistant Principal ● Teachers	2A.3. ● DRA2 ● Reading Assessments ● FAIR Assessment ● Teacher-created assessments ● Conferences with colleagues (assessment results) ● Analyze class, school-wide individual DRA2 and running record data each quarter. ● Parent surveys ● Observations of readers' workshop	2A.3. ● Observations by administration ● Focus Walks on readers' workshop ● Guided Reading observations ● Teacher-self assessment ● Guided reading lesson plans ● Data notebook and conference logs	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Reading Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	3A.1. Prior Knowledge	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
		• Utilize guided reading groups • Facilitate student-teacher independent conferences • Provide student access to leveled texts • Utilize core curriculum • Implement RtI Process for students in need	• Principal • Assistant Principal • Teachers	• DRA2 • Reading Assessments • FAIR Assessment • Teacher-created assessments • Conferences with colleagues (assessment results) • Analyze class, school-wide individual DRA2 and running record data each quarter. • Parent surveys • Observations of readers' workshop	• Observations by administration • Focus Walks on readers' workshop • Guided Reading observations • Teacher-self assessment • Guided reading lesson plans • Data notebook and conference logs		

Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
In 2013, 75% (375) of students will make learning gains in reading.						
	In 2012, 72% (349) of students made learning gains in reading.	*In 2013, 75% (375) of students will make learning gains in reading.*				
		3A.2. Low Parent Involvement	3A.2. - Promote literacy and educate families during annual literacy week and literacy night - Continue Ready to Learn nights - Weekly take home books and logs	3A.2. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Literacy Committee - Ready to Learn Committee	3A.2. - Parent Attendance logs at educational nights - Classroom volunteering logs - Home reading logs	3A.2. - Attendance Logs - Reading Logs
		3A.3. Excessive Absences/Tardies	3A.3. Quarterly perfect attendance achievement incentive	3A.3. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Teachers	3A.3. Individual and school-wide attendance reports.	3A.3. Individual and school-wide attendance records
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Reading Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

4. FCAT 2.0: **Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.**	4A.1. Prior Knowledge	4A.1. - Guided Reading groups - Student-Teacher independent conferences - Student access to leveled text of varying genres – text complexity - Use of core curriculum - Teacher modeling of skills / strategies	4A.1. - Teachers - Principal - Assistant Principal	4A.1. - DRA2 - Reading Assessments - FAIR Assessment - Teacher-created assessments - Conferences with colleagues (assessment results) - Analyze class, school-wide individual DRA2 and running record data each quarter. - Parent surveys - Observations of readers' workshop - Utilizations of adaptations of lesson plans - Team meetings to share knowledge from professional development.	4A.1. - Observations by administration - Focus Walks on readers' workshop - Guided Reading observations - Teacher-self assessment - Guided reading lesson plans - Data notebook and conference logs - Team Meeting notes - Lesson plan checks - Teacher Evaluations	

		at Critical Points of Interventions on DRA Assessments and continuum. ● Refine reading instruction through professional development.				
Reading Goal #4: *In 2013, 77 % (96) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	In 2012, 74% (90) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	*In 2013, 77% (96) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.*				

		4A.2. Low Parent Involvement	4A.2. ● Promote literacy and educate families during annual literacy week and literacy night.	4A.2. ● Principal ● Assistant Principal ● Literacy Team Committee	4A.2. ● Parent Attendance and Participation	4A.2. ● Attendance Logs ● Parent Surveys	
		4A.3. Excessive Absences/ Tardies	4A.3. ● Quarterly perfect attendance achievement incentive ● Weekly take home books and reading logs	4A.3. ● Principal ● Assistant Principal ● Literacy Team Committee ● Ready to Learn Commitee	4A.3. ● Individual and school-wide attendance records	4A.3. ● Individual and school-wide attendance records	
		4A.4. Lack of Resources at Home	4A.4. ● Book in the Bag program ● Consistent phonics program implemented throughout grade level	4A.4. ● Teachers	4A.4. ● Schedule of rotating books for home use ● Utilization of phonics program within Readers' Workshop	4A.4 ● Focus Walks ● Lesson plan checks ● Teacher Evaluation	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**	72%	74%	77%	79%	82%	85%
Reading Goal #5A: In six years, the achievement gap will be reduced by 50% and 85% of students will meet their reading performance target.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.**	5B.1. Clarity to identify subgroups.	5B.1. Teachers will identify and monitor progress of white and black students in his/her class.	5B.1. - Principal - Leadership Team	5B.1. Principal, RTI team, and teachers will review target students at data meetings to determine growth or continued areas of weakness.	5B.1. Student data. Student performance, on informal and formal assessments, FCAT results		

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
In 2013, white students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 17% (15) and black students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 38% (31).						
	In 2012, 19% (17) of white students and 40% (33) of black students did not make satisfactory progress in reading. White: 19% (17) Black: 40% (33) Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	*In 2013, 17% (15) of white students and 38% (31) of black students will not make satisfactory progress in reading.* White: 17% (15) Black: 38% (31) Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a				
		5B.2. Unaware of effective strategies to utilize to address subgroup	5B.2. • Develop a plan of action for students in the black subgroup who are not proficient.	5B.2. • Principal • Leadership team	5B.2. • Literacy Leadership Team and teachers will review progress of students in these subgroups.	5B.2. • Literacy Leadership team documentation, student learning plans FCAT results

		5B.3. Text Complexity	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
			• Teachers will integrate complex texts into read alouds and provide support/scaffolding for students.	• Principal • Assistant Principal • Leadership Team	• Lesson Plans • Focus walks looking for the use of complex texts and the support that they are providing.	• Lesson Plans • Focus Walk Rubrics	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Reading Goal #5C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5D.1. ESE students need additional interventions	5D.1. • RtI Block to address the individual needs • Morning skills block and additional interventions as needed.	5D.1. • Leadership team • ESE teachers	5D.1. Leadership team will monitor and track student achievement data for students within this subgroup.	5D.1. Attendance and RtI documentation		
Reading Goal #5D: *In 2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 30% (10).*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 34% (12) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	*In 2013, 30% (10) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will not make satisfactory progress in reading.*					

		5D.2. Some students in the Students in the Disabilities subgroup are falling behind in reading.	5D.2. ● Weekly collaboration with inclusion classrooms ● ESE teachers will push in during instruction and pull out students for remediation as needed.	5D.2. ● ESE Teacher ● Inclusion teacher	5D.2. At quarterly data meetings, teachers, instructional coach, and principal will review SWD student data and student performance on both informal and formal assessments.	5D.2. ● Student data from informal and formal assessments ● FCAT results	
		5D.3. ESE teachers are not always a part of the planning process	5D.3. ● Weekly collaborative Planning ● Apply for grant from the inclusion network to provide collaboration opportunities	5D.3. ● Classroom Teacher ● ESE Teacher	5D.3. ● Lesson Plans ● Collaborative Meeting Notes ● Focus Walks ● Teacher Evaluations	5D.3. ● Class monitoring sheets ● Lesson Plans ● Collaborative Planning team notes ● FCAT results	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5E.1. Student mobility	5E.1. • Identify subgroup • Review data in comparison to other subgroups	5E.1. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Teacher • MTSS Team	5E.1. • Principal • MTSS team • Teachers will review targeted students at data meetings to determine growth or continued areas of weakness.	5E.1. • Student data • Student performance on informal and formal assessments • FCAT results		
Reading Goal #5E: *In 2013, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 34% (20).*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 37% (23) of economically disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	*In 2013, 34% (20) of economically disadvantaged students will not make progress in reading.*					

		5E.2. Some students are not successful with tier one interventions (core instruction).	5E.2. ● Tier II and/or III interventions with students in the subgroup not reaching proficiency.	5E.2. ● Teachers ● ESE Teachers	5E.2. ● CPST and RtI Leadership Team Meetings ● MTSS Meetings	5E.2. ● FCAT Results ● RtI assessments	
		5E.3 Low vocabulary	5E.3. ● Daily word works	5E.3. ● Teachers	5E.3. ● Walk-Throughs	5E.3. ● Focus Walk Rubrics ● Lesson Plans ● Formal and Informal Assessment Data	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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
ABCs of Common Core	K-2	Bartley	School-wide	Initial discussion at Early Dismissal Meeting in September, on-going discussions, unpacking of standards during grade level meetings each week.	Focus Walks, Team Meeting discussions, Observations (formal and informal), Lesson Plan checks	Bartley/Gray
Ranch Level Book Studies	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Monthly PLC meetings	Monthly PLC Meetings, Focus Walks	Bartley/Gray

Thinking Thursdays	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Once each semester	Focus Walks, Team Meeting discussions, Observations, Reflection sheets	Bartley/Gray
Additional training and education with regard to RtI	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Monthly on Tuesdays/ Bi-weekly Early Dismissal meetings	Focus Walks, Team Meeting discussions, Target/MRT process	Bartley/Gray
Additional behavior strategies teachers can use for disruptive students.	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Monthly on Tuesdays/ Bi-weekly Early Dismissal meetings	CHAMPs refreshers, Team Meeting discussions, Leadership Team discussions, Teacher Evaluation process	Bartley/Gray
Alternative resources to help students who are below level	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Monthly on Tuesdays	Team Meeting discussions, Teacher evaluations of training, Focus Walks	Bartley/Gray
Further education for teachers with regard to differentiated instruction.	K-2	Bartley/Gray	School-wide	Bi-weekly Early Dismissal Meetings	Focus Walks, Analysis of Student work during team meetings, teacher evaluations of training, self-assessments of implementation, lesson plan checks and monitoring	Bartley/Gray

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/ materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Monthly PLCs – Book Studies	Professional Books for each ranch	Professional Development	$1000.00
Subtotal:$1000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:$1000.00			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.				
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.

CELLA Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
CELLA Goal #3: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Prior Knowledge	1A.1. ● Utilize District Math benchmark data to identify students needing intervention and enrichment with RtI and small groups. ● Increase the use of manipulatives and hands on materials to reinforce	1A.1. ● Teacher ● Principal ● Parent	1A.1. ● Team Planning ● Data analysis ● Lesson Plan checks ● Focus Walks ● PLC ● RtI/CPST	1A.1. ● Assessments ● Conference notes ● Checklists ● Focus Walks ● Teacher Evaluation ● Student Work ● Performance Tasks		

		math concepts. • Utilize team meetings to discuss implementation of benchmarks and data disaggregation to ensure curriculum alignment.				
Mathematics Goal #1A: *In 2013, 26% (130) students will score at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	In 2012, 31% (93) of students score at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	*In 2013, 26% (130) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.*				

		1A.2. Budget/ Lack of appropriate materials	1A.2. • School level math professional development opportunities • Ability to purchase additional supplies for hands on learning.	1A.2. • Principal • Assistant Principal	1A.2. • Focus Walks • Lesson Plans	1A.2. • Student work	
		1A.3. Parent Support	1A.3. • Provide parents with strategies and activities for home support.	1A.3. • Principal • Classroom Teacher • Grade level committees	1A.3. • Parent attendance at Family Math Night event. • Homework	1A.3. • Parent/Teacher conferences • Parent survey for math night	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1. Lack of challenging/ enrichment activities	2A.1. • Provide students enrichment opportunities and integrate other subject content areas. • Utilize data to identify students needing enrichment. • Utilize Sunshine Math as a supplemental program provided	2A.1. Classroom Teacher	2A.1. Differentiated Lesson Plans	2A.1. Student Work		

		for enric hme nt pract ice in the area of Math .				
Mathematics Goal #2A: *In 2013, 47% (235) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	In 2012, 45% (218) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	*In 2013, 47% (235) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.*				
		2A.2. Effective use of higher level questioning.	2A.2. Continue use of higher order folder to assist in planning intentional higher level questions.	2A.2. ● Principal ● Teacher	2A.2. ● Lesson Plans ● Focus Walks ● Teacher Observations	2A.2. ● Student work and dialogue ● Teacher evaluations
		2A.2. Lack of time to work with high students	2A.2. Students will serve as peer tutors for other students allowing them the opportunity to practice reciprocal teaching to further their learning.	2A.2. Teacher	2A.2. ● Observations ● Focus Walks	2A.2. ● Focus Walk Rubrics Observation Notes
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	

Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1. Lack of remedial support	3A.1. - Small group instruction using RtI lessons - Targeted interventions, provided in addition to core.	3A.1. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Teacher	3A.1. - Intervention Logs - Student participation - Focus Walks - Classroom observations - Volunteer Log	3A.1. - District Benchmark Assessments - Assessments from core - Student work - Performance Tasks		
<u>Mathematics Goal #3A:</u> *In 2013, 74% (370) of students will make learning gains in mathematics.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					

	In 2012, 71% (344) of students made learning gains in mathematics.	*In 2013, 74% (370) of students will make learning gains in mathematics.*				
		3A.2. Parental Support	3A.2. • Provide parents with strategies and activities for home support (Math Night)	3A.2. • Teacher • Grade Level Committees	3A.2. • Parent attendance for Family Math Night event.	3A.2. • Conferences • Parent survey results from Math Night	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.**	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1. Parental Support	4A.1. • Provide parents with strategies and activities • Provide community resources and information for parents.	4A.1. • Principal • Teacher • Grade Level Committees • School Counselor	4A.1. Parent attendance for Family Math Night event.	4A.1. • Conference • Parent survey from math night		
Mathematics Goal #4: *In 2013, 65% (81) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

		In 2012, 61% (74) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.	*In 2013, 65% (81) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.*				
		4A.2. Prior Knowledge	4A.2. - Utilize data to identify students needing intervention - Increase the use of manipulatives and hands on materials to reinforce math concepts. - Utilize tam meetings to discuss implementation of differentiated instruction and data disaggregation to ensure curriculum alignment. - Use white boards during mini-lessons to assure active participation.	4A.2. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Teacher	4A.2. - Team Meeting notes - Data analysis - Lesson Plan checks - Focus Walks	4A.2. - Assessments - Conference Notes - Checklists - Focus Walks - Teacher Evaluation - Performance Tasks	
		4A.3. Student behavior	4A.3. - School level teacher training in CHAMPs and Foundations. - Positive reinforcement.	4A.3. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Teacher	4A.3. Review of disciplinary data	4A.3. - Disciplinary Data Disaggregation - Teacher Evaluation	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011** 68%	71%	73%	76%	79%	81%	84%
<u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> <u>In six years, the achievement gap will be reduced by 50% and 84% of students will meet their math performance target.</u>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. Clarity to identify subgroups.	5B.1. • Teachers will identify and monitor progress of students in particular subgroups in his/her class.	5B.1. • Principal • Leadership Team	5B.1. • Principal, RTI team, and teachers will review target students at data meetings to determine growth or continued areas of weakness.	5B.1. • Student data. • Student performance, on informal and formal assessments • FCAT results		

Mathematics Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In 2013, white students not making satisfactory progress in math will decrease to 15% (13) and black students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease to 22% (20).							
	In 2012, 17% (15) of white students and 22% (22) of black students did not make satisfactory progress in math. White: 17% (15) Black: 22% (22) Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a	*In 2013, 15% (13) of white students and 22% (20) of black students will not make satisfactory progress in math.* White: 15% (13) Black: 22% (20) Hispanic: n/a Asian: n/a American Indian: n/a					
		5B.2. Unaware of effective strategies to utilize to address subgroup	5B.2. ● Develop a plan of action for students in the black subgroup who are not proficient.	5B.2. ● Principal ● Leadership team	5B.2. ● Literacy Leadership Team and teachers will review progress of students in these subgroups.	5B.2. ● Literacy Leadership team documentation, student learning plans FCAT results	

		5B.3. Text Complexity	5B.3. ● Teachers will integrate complex texts into read alouds and provide support/scaffolding for students.	5B.3. ● Principal ● Assistant Principal Leadership Team	5B.3. ● Lesson Plans ● Focus walks looking for the use of complex texts and the support that they are providing.	5B.3. ● Lesson Plans ● Focus Walk Rubrics

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1. Students are performing below grade level standards.	5D.1. • ESE teachers will implement strategies to help alleviate the gap and assist general education teacher during Math Workshop.	5D.1. • ESE Teacher • Math Teachers	5D.1. • Data from interventions will be looked at to determine progress of students in group.	5D.1. • Math assessment data		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *In 2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease to 17% (8).*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

	In 2012, 19% (10) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	*In 2013, 17% (8) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.*				
		5D.2. Some students in the SWD subgroup are falling behind in math or are below grade level.	5D.2. • ESE teachers will collaborate weekly with classroom teachers for planning purposes. • ESE teachers will push in and pull out as needed to support students.	5D.2. • ESE teachers • Teachers	5D.2. • Classroom and ESE teachers will review data on a regular basis to ensure that students are progressing. • Principal will conduct focus walks on a regular basis to monitor ESE instruction.	5D.2. • Focus walk rubrics • ESE student data • FCAT results	
		5D.3. ESE teachers are unaware of the content/ activities in math classrooms.	5D.3. • General education and special education teachers will participate in collaborative planning on a regular basis.	5D.3. • Teacher • ESE Teacher • Principal	5D.3. • Lesson Plans • Collaboration Notes • Data Disaggregation	5D.3. • Lesson Plans • Collaborative Planning team Notes • Assessment Data	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1. Prior Knowledge	5E.1. - Differentiated Instruction - Small group instruction, targeted instruction - Continued use of manipulatives, hands on activities.	5E.1. - Principal - Assistant Principal - Teachers	5E.1. - Progress Monitoring - PMAs/Benchmark assessments - Teacher-created assessments - Conferences with colleagues (assessment results) - Data disaggregation, including subgroup data analysis	5E.1. - Observations by administration - Focus Walks during math workshop - Teacher-self assessment - Data notebook and conference logs		

Mathematics Goal #5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
In 2013, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease to 25% (30).							
	In 2012, 27% (32) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	*In 2013, 25% (30) of Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.*					
		5E.2. Low socio-economic status	5E.2. • Math Night – cross curricular night providing parents with tools/skills necessary to support their child.	5E.2. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Math Night Committee	5E.2. • Parent Attendance and Participation	5E.2. • Attendance Logs • Parent Surveys	
		5E.3. Impaired leaning capacity and/or medical conditions	5E.3. • Incorporate individual student needs as needed • Collaborative support	5E.3. • Principal • Assistant Principal • Teachers	5E.3. • Progress Monitoring	5E.3. • Teacher Evaluation • Charted Growth over time	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

ddle School Mathema	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

1B. **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #4: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Mathematics Goal #5A: *N/A*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		

Mathematics Goal #5B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5D: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

gh School Mathemat	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

Algebra 1 EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Algebra 1 Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Algebra Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2010-2011**						
Algebra 1 Goal #3A: *N/A*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

Geometry EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Geometry Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Geometry Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	**Baseline data 2011-2012**						
Geometry Goal #3A: *N/A*							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.**	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		

Geometry Goal #3D: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Geometry Goal #3E: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning						

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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
RtI	K-2	Teacher Leaders	All Grade Levels	Early Dismissals and PLC meetings throughout the school year.	Focus Walks, Team Meetings, Leadership Team Meetings, Analysis of Student Work, Data Disaggregation	Principal, Assistant Principal, Leadership Team
Compass Odyssey	K-2	Teacher Leaders	All Grade Levels	Early Dismissals and Grade Level meetings throughout the school year.	Focus Walks, Team Meetings, Leadership Team Meetings	Teacher Leaders
Differentiated Instruction	K-2	District, Principal	All Grade Levels	Based upon staff needs assessment	Focus Walks, Team Meetings, Teacher Evaluations	Principal, Assistant Principals

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Additional materials to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students/instruction	Go Math!	Supplies	$500.00
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$500.00			
Total:$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]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Lack of student prior knowledge including vocabulary and scientific process; lack of materials	1A.1. Third and fourth grade teachers will utilize the district learning schedule as a guide for implementing engaging hands-on science exploration using the 5E instruction model. Teachers will also use strategies such as graphic organizers and word banks to increase vocabulary. Primary students at Merrill Road will support these goals.	1A.1. 3rd and 4th grade science teachers	1A.1. Teachers will analyze data from common assessments to monitor progress toward benchmark proficiency (70% on common assessments).	1A.1. Assessments aligned with NGSSS, FCAT test specifications and content limits; FCAT and district benchmark results		

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

Science Goal #1A: *In 2013, 35% (51) or students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 in science.* ****Specific to our feeder school, Don Brewer Elementary School.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	In 2012, 31% (50) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in science.	*In 2013, 35% (51) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 in science.*				
		1A.2. Gaps in science instruction from kindergarten through fourth grade	1A.2. Fifth grade teachers will utilize the P-SELL science research project with students.	1A.2. District Science coaches, 5th grade science teachers	1A.2. Students will take a pre and post test to determine the effectiveness of the PSELL research project.	1A.2. PSELL pre and post assessment results, benchmark results, FCAT results
		1A.3. Interruption in instructional time	1A.3. Teachers will provide consistent science instruction prioritizing the "Essential Exploration" identified by the learning schedule.	1A.3. Principal, Science teachers	1A.3. Principal will conduct classroom focus walks, review lesson plans, and monitor daily schedules.	1A.3. Assessments, lesson plans, focus walk rubrics, and FCAT results
		1.A.4. Literacy is not being integrated among other subject areas.	1.A.4. Teachers will allow students time to write in science through the use of science journals.	1A.4. Science teachers	1A.4. Teachers will review student journals to determine their understanding of science skills.	1A.4. Science Journal responses
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	

Science Goal #1B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Computer access for the entire class, lack of materials for actual science lab	2A.1. Teachers will utilize district resources such as Gizmos, to enhance learning.	2A.1. Science teachers	2A.1. Principal will observe Gizmo lessons in classrooms and track the progress of students who receive instruction using Gizmos.	2A.1. Assessment aligned with NGSSS, FCAT test specifications, and content limits.		
Science Goal #2A: *In 2013, 15% (22) of students will score at above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.* ****Specific to our sister school, Don Brewer Elementary School.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	In 2012, 11% (18) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	*In 2013, 15% (22) of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.*					
		2A.2. Students are not making connections between observations from hands-on explorations and concepts being taught.	2A.2. Teachers will implement higher order questioning techniques and provide students with opportunities to explain their thinking by writing and sharing ideas with classmates.	2A.2. Science teachers	2A.2. Students will provide written responses to essential questions provided by the learning schedule.	2A.2. Performance task rubric provided in the learning schedule	

		2A.3. Lack of materials and time at home to complete a project	2A.3. Teachers and students will work toward the completion of a Science Fair/Invention Convention project to improve their scientific inquiry and discovery.	2A.3. Science teachers, Science committee	2A.3. Teachers at each grade level will create a common assessment tool to evaluate the student created projects.	2A.3. Science Fair/Invention Convention project rubrics	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.**	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Science Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: **Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.**	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Science Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

Biology 1 EOC Goals	**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem**					

	ent						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Biology 1 Goal #1: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology 1 Goal #2: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

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

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Prior Learning	1A.1. • Students will write daily using the writing process; all writing will be dated and recorded in journals, notebooks, and work portfolios to show growth over time. • Students will build expe	1A.1. • Principal • Teachers	1A.1. • Focus walks (artifacts) • Classroom observations • Analyzing work • Observation of student work and performance during the workshop • Collaborative planning which identifies effective literature.	1A.1. • Writing portfolios/ pieces • Classroom observations • Lesson plans • Data notebooks, conference notebooks • Teaching / Learning rubrics • Genre specific rubrics • Pre and post baseline pieces • Genre class profile sheets		

		rience by writing across content areas. • Include high quality non-fiction texts in writing instruction. • Administer (revised) District writing prompts • Monthly discussion to analyze student writing • Ass					

		ign writing homework for additional practice.				
<u>Writing Goal #1A:</u> *In 2013, 60% (90) of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.*	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	In 2012, 56% (84) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or higher in writing.	*In 2013, 60% (90) of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.*				
		1A.2. Teachers professional ability, comfort with content	1A.2. ● Provide in-school professional development for best practices in writing instruction ● Observations and modeling by master teacher	1A.2. ● Teachers ● Principal	1A.2. ● Allow for teaching feedback and documentation of growth over time.	1A.2. ● Focus Walks ● Teacher Evaluations
		1A.3. New rubric for narrative writing based on common core expectations	1A.3. ● Utilize experts within this staff to review the common core rubric ● Develop a primary specific rubric to assist our primary staff in meeting the needs of our students	1A.3. ● Teacher Leaders	1A.3. Writing prompts and disaggregation	1A.3. Data from prompts

1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Writing Goal #1B: *N/A*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

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

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Civics Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

U.S. History EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
U.S. History Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.*					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

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

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| 1. Attendance | 1.1. Parent Accountability | 1.1.
• Utilize Attendance Intervention Team to identify chronic situations and provide resources/strategies/education to families regarding the importance of attendance.
• Run monthly attendance reports to | 1.1.
• AIT Committee
• Attendance Committee
• Teachers
• Principals | 1.1. Monthly Attendance Reports | 1.1.
• AIT notes
• Attendance committee notes
• Monthly attendance reports | | |

		assist in the identification process				
Attendance Goal #1: *In 2013, 6% (39) of our students will have 20 or more absences, 25% (163) of our students will have excessive absences (10 or more), while reducing the number of students with excessive tardies/early outs by 25% as well.*	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				
	In 2012, 11% (69) of students had 20 or more absences.	*In 2013, 6% (39) of students will have 20 or more absences.*				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
	In 2012, 34% (219) of students had 10 or more absences.	*In 2013, 25% (163) of students will have 10 or more absences.*				
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
	In 2012, 30% (195) of students had 10 or more tardies.	*In 2013, 25% (163) of students will have 10 or more tardies.*				

| | | 1.2. Education regarding its importance | 1.2.
● Include attendance facts in monthly newsletters
● Add attendance/ tardiness/early out as a topic at parent conferences, SAC meetings, PTA meetings, and any other venue.
● Implement a "Perfect/ Perfect" Attendance Recognition assembly for students who are at school daily and do not have tardies or early outs. | 1.2.
● Principal
● Guidance Counselor
● Attendance Committees | 1.2.
● AIT Meetings
● Monthly attendance reports | 1.2.
● AIT Meeting notes
● Monthly attendance reports | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Attendance Professional Development

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

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance incentive awards	His/her bicycles	SAC	$300.00
Subtotal:$300.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$300.00			
Total:$300.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Suspension	1.1. Disciplinary Choices	1.1. • Utilize CHAMPs in every classroom and implement with fidelity. • Utilize the foundations team and SCOPE expectations throughout the building and common areas.	1.1. • Assistant Principal • Principal • Teachers	1.1. • Disciplinary reports • Focus Walks • SAC Monthly Safety Reports	1.1. • Discipline reports • SAC Minutes		

Suspension Goal #1: *In 2013, our school will continue to have < 1% (7) of our students suspended out of school.*	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 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
	In 2012, <1% (6) students were suspended out of school.	*In 2013, <1% (6) students will be suspended out of school.*				
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School				
	In 2012, <1% (6) students were suspended out of school.	*In 2013, <1% (6) students will be suspended out of school.*				

| | | 1.2. Developmental Age | 1.2.
• Begin book study entitled "Conscious Discipline" with our Kindergarten Ranch for monthly PLCs.
• Conduct focus walks to review the implementation of this process.
• Utilize team meetings to discuss trends and modifications. | 1.2.
• Teachers
• Ranch Leaders
• Principal
• Assistant Principal | 1.2.
• Meeting notes
• Focus Walk reflections
• Monthly disciplinary reports | 1.2.
• Trend data regarding disciplinary actions | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

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
Conscious Discipline	Kindergarten	Ranch Leader	All Kindergarten Teachers	Monthly Meetings	Focus walks with observation notes, review of trend data regarding disciplinary actions	Ranch Leaders, Principal, Assistant Principal

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Books for PLC	Conscious Discipline book	Professional Development	$600.00
Subtotal:$600.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:$600.00			
Total:$600.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: *N/A* **Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.*	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.*				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
	Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	*Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.*				

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement						
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1. Parent Involvement	1.1. Parent Notification	1.1.	1.1	1.1	1.1.		
		• Utilize marquee to highlight upcoming events. • Utilize "School Messenger" to notify parents of upcoming events. • Utilize twitter, website, teacher blogs, and any available electronic connection to ensure the information is	• Principal • Assistant Principal • Teachers	• Website visits • Parent participation • Parent feedback	• Website visits • Parent climate surveys		

		shared in a timely fashion.					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: *In 2013, 85% (828) of parents will participate in at least one school sponsored activity offered at Merrill Road Elementary School throughout the 2012-2013 school year.* **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					
	In 2012, 80% (780) of parents participated in at least one school sponsored activity.	*In 2013, 85% (828) of parents will participate in at least one school sponsored activity.*					
		1.2. Updated contact information	1.2. Run reports from School Messenger after every call out to clean up the data.	1.2. ● Principal ● CRT	1.2. ● School Messenger Reports	1.2. ● School Messenger Reports	
		1.3. Unsure how/when to assist	1.3. Conduct a "Volunteer Training" to inform parents of opportunities to volunteer and expectations involved.	1.3. Volunteer Liaison	1.3. Five Start School Award	1.3. Five Star School Award	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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 Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a					

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

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

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.*	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

1. Additional Goal - TECHNOLOGY	1.1. Funding	1.1. • Host a talent show that enables funds to be raised to purchase new and additional equipment. • STCs will provide trainings monthly, or as needed, to ensure proper use of technology throughout the building. • Team Meetings will incorporate best practi	1.1 • STCs • Principals • Talent Show Committee	1.1. Expansion of technology resources	1.1. Inventory of equipment		

		ces and strategies utilizing technology in the primary classroom.				
<u>Additional Goal #1:</u> *In 2013, 50% (24) of classroom teachers will have access to interactive white boards, while 75% (36) of classroom teachers will have document cameras to provide, enhance, and implement technologically sound instructional best practices to better meet the individual needs of our students.*	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>				
	In 2012, 38% (18) of classroom teachers have access to interactive white boards and 38% (18) have document cameras.	*In 2013, 50% (24) of classroom teachers will have access to interactive white boards and 75% (36) will have document cameras.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase				

Additional Goal(s)

	Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

| 2. Additional Goal - SAFETY | 1.1. Prior knowledge | 1.1.
• Utilize grade level representatives to continue district training, as necessary.
• Grade level representatives will continue to train and act as a resource to staff regarding the implementation of this initiative.
• Monitor the implementation of this initiative | 1.1.
• Principal
• Assistant Principal | 1.1.
• Focus Walks
• Team Meetings | 1.1.
Teacher evaluations | | |

		and identify on-going needs.				
Additional Goal #2: *In 2013, 100% (65) of staff members will implement the district required Second Step curriculum with fidelity.*	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*				
	In 2012, 100% (65) of staff members implemented the Second Step curriculum with fidelity.	*In 2013, 100% (65) of staff members will continue to implement the Second Step curriculum with fidelity.*				
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

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

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.
Reading Budget
Total:
CELLA Budget
Total:
Mathematics Budget
Total:
Science Budget
Total:
Writing Budget
Total:
Civics Budget
Total:
U.S. History Budget
Total:
Attendance Budget
Total:
Suspension Budget
Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget
Total:
Parent Involvement Budget
Total:
STEM Budget
Total:
CTE Budget
Total:
Additional Goals
Total:

	Grand Total:

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance
Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2.When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK,* this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
▢Priority	▢Focus	▢Prevent

Are you reward school? ▢Yes   ▢No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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   ▢ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.
Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
The School Advisory Council will continue to monitor student growth and progress as we also continue to monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. We understand that as an advisory council, it is our primary responsibility to assist in the continued growth of our students. We must devote extra effort and attention to monitor the disaggregation of our data and monitoring the growth of our subgroups. We, as an advisory council, will also continue to seek out business partners and ways to reach out to our community.

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
To support and encourage regular school attendance	$500.00
To increase technology resources	$900.00