

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Mrs. Sandra V. Banky

SAC Chair: Mr. Jonathan Tucker

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Mr. Jonathan Tucker

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Sandra V. Banky	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education/Florida State University Master's of Science in TESOL & Educational Leadership/ Nova Southeastern University, Educational Specialist in Curriculum and Instruction, Nova Southeastern	1	17	2011-2012 – Miami Park Elementary Grade: C Reading Mastery: 32% Math Mastery: 38% Writing Mastery: 77% Science Mastery: 29 % 2010-2011 – Miami Park Elementary Grade: D Reading Mastery: 43% Math Mastery: 57% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 20% 2009-2010 – Miami Park Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 50% Math Mastery: 58% Writing Mastery: 87% Science Mastery: 33%

		University, Certifications: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)-(All Levels), Educational Leadership K-12			2008-2009 – Dr. Henry W. Mack/West Little River Elementary Grade F Reading Mastery: 45% Math Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 56% Science Mastery: 14% 2007-2008 – Lakeview Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 43 % Math Mastery: 60% Writing Mastery: 82% Science Mastery: 16%
Assis Principal	Isabel Castillo	Bachelor of Science in Education/University of Miami, Master's of Science in Education/Nova Southeastern University. Certification: Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Leadership, Principal Leadership K-12.	3	17	2011-2012 – Lakeview Elementary Grade: B Reading Mastery: 45% Math Mastery: 58% Writing Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 45% AMO: Reading- 66, Math -73 2010-2011 – Lakeview Elementary Grade: A Reading Mastery: 63% Math Mastery: 71% Writing Mastery: 91% Science Mastery: 49% AYP: 82%; Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP in reading. Hispanics and English Language Learners did not make AYP in mathematics. 2009-2010 – Charles D. Wyche, Jr. Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 67 % Math Mastery: 67% Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 37% AYP: 74%; Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL subgroups did not make AYP in reading and mathematics. 2008-2009 - Charles D. Wyche, Jr. Elementary Grade B Reading Mastery: 65% Mathematics Mastery: 70% Writing mastery: 93% Science Mastery: 37% 2007-2008- Charles D. Wyche, Jr. Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery 69% Mathematics Mastery: 63 % Writing mastery: 84 % Science Mastery: 33%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
					2011-2012 – Lakeview Elementary Grade: B Reading Mastery: 45% Math Mastery: 58% Writing Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 45% 2010-2011 – Lakeview Elementary Grade: A Reading Mastery: 63% Math Mastery: 71%

Reading Coach	Cecily Wright	<p>Bachelor's degree – Fashion Merchandising from Florida State University; Master's of Science degree from Florida International University;</p> <p>Certifications: Elementary Education, Educational Leadership K-12, Economics 6-12, Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement, Gifted Endorsement</p>	6	6	<p>Writing Mastery: 91% Science Mastery: 49% AYP: 82%; Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners did not make AYP in reading. Hispanics and English Language Learners did not make AYP in mathematics.</p> <p>2009-2010 – Lakeview Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 62% Math Mastery: 67% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 32% AYP: 85%; Black and Hispanic subgroups did not make AYP in reading. Economically Disadvantaged and ELL subgroups did make AYP in reading. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Mathematics. ELL subgroup did make AYP in mathematics.</p> <p>2008-2009 – Lakeview Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 57% Math Mastery: 71% Writing Mastery: 91% Science Mastery: 39% AYP: 77%; Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL subgroups did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL subgroups did not make AYP in Mathematics.</p> <p>2007-2008 – Lakeview Elementary Grade C Reading Mastery: 69 % Math Mastery: 68% Writing Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 43% ELL subgroup did not make AYP in reading.</p>
---------------	---------------	--	---	---	---

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Request interns from local colleges and university to complete their students teaching program at Lakeview.	Principal/ Assistant Principal	June 2013	
2	2. Regular meetings of Professional Learning Communities to help develop strong, collaborative relationships among teachers.	Principal Assistant Principal	June 2013	
3	3. Common Planning time among departments and grade levels.	Principal Assistant Principal	August 2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
32	6.3%(2)	25.0%(8)	40.6%(13)	28.1%(9)	31.3%(10)	71.9%(23)	9.4%(3)	0.0%(0)	84.4%(27)

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
N/A			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided for Lakeview students to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school programs, or summer school). The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to the schools, students, and families. School based, Title I funded Community Involvement Specialists (CIS), serve as bridge between the home and school through home visits, telephone calls, school site and community parenting activities. The CIS schedules meetings and activities, encourage parents to support their child's education, provide materials, and encourage parental participation in the decision making processes at the school site. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Parents participate in the design of their school's Parent Involvement Plan (PIP – which is provided in three languages at all schools), the school improvement process and the life of the school and the annual Title I Annual Parent Meeting at the beginning of the school year. The annual M-DCPS Title I Parent/Family Involvement Survey is intended to be used toward the end of the school year to measure the parent program over the course of the year and to facilitate an evaluation of the parent involvement program to inform planning for the following year. An all out effort is made to inform parents of the importance of this survey via CIS, Title I District and Region meetings, Title I Newsletter for Parents, and Title I Quarterly Parent Bulletins. This survey, available in English, Spanish and Haitian-Creole, will be available online and via hard copy for parents (at schools and at District meetings) to complete. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Lakeview provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities (before-school and/or after-school, and summer school) by the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

Title I, Part D

The District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
- training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school
- focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Lakeview's Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and Recently Arrived Immigrant Children and Youth by providing funds to implement and/or provide:

- tutorial programs (K-12)
- parent outreach activities (K-12) through the Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (The Parent Academy)
- professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
- coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers(K-12)
- reading and supplementary instructional materials(K-12)
- cultural supplementary instructional materials (K-12)
- purchase of supplemental hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, as well as, thematic cultural lessons is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL students and recently arrived immigrant students (K-12, RFP Process)

Title X- Homeless

- Miami-Dade County Public Schools' School Board approved the School Board Policy 5111.01 titled, Homeless Students. The board policy defines the McKinney-Vento Law and ensures homeless students receive all the services they are entitled to.
- The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
- Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
- The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
- Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity, awareness campaign to all the schools - each school is provided a video and curriculum manual, and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization.
- Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.
- The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.
- Each school will identify a school based homeless coordinator to be trained on the McKinney-Vento Law ensuring appropriate services are provided to the homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Lakeview will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, elementary counselors, and/or TRUST Specialists. Training and technical assistance for elementary, middle, and senior high school teachers, administrators, counselors, and/or TRUST Specialists is also a component of this program.

Nutrition Programs

- 1) The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
- 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
- 3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Lakeview Elementary provides a Title I VPK program for the community, as well as a District Pre-K program for students with disabilities.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

- Health Connect in Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based healthcare, which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds.
 - Teams at designated school sites are staffed by a School Social Worker (shared between schools), a Nurse (shared between schools) and a full-time Health Aide.
 - HCiOS services reduces or eliminates barriers to care, connects eligible students with health insurance and a medical home, and provides care for students who are not eligible for other services.
 - HCiOS delivers coordinated social work and mental/behavioral health interventions in a timely manner.
 - HCiOS enhances the health education activities provided by the schools and by the health department.
- HCiOS offers a trained health team that is qualified to perform the assigned duties related to a quality school health care program.

HIV/AIDS Curriculum: AIDS Get the Facts!

- AIDS: GET the Facts!, is an curriculum that provides a series of general objectives, lessons, activities and resources for providing HIV/AIDS instruction in grades K-12.
- HIV/AIDS curriculum is consistent with state legislation, as well as school policy and procedures. These include: Florida Statute 1003.46, Health education; instruction in acquired immune deficiency syndrome, School Board Policy: 2410 – School Health Services Program; School Board Policy 2417 – Human Growth and Development Curriculum; School Board Policy: 8453 – Direct Contact Communicable Diseases; the M-DCPS Worksite HIV/AIDS Handbook, and Control of Communicable Disease in School Guidebook for School Personnel.
- The HIV/AIDS curriculum content is also in alignment with Florida Sunshine State Standards.
- Each school will identify a school-based HIV/AIDS liaison (teacher), to be trained on the curriculum and can participate in yearly professional development about health and wellness related topics.

Miami Lighthouse / Heiken Children's Vision Program

- Heiken Children's Vision Program provides free complete optometric exams conducted at school sites via vision vans and corrective lenses to all failed vision screenings if the parent /guardian cannot afford the exams and or the lenses.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Administration: Principal, Assistant Principal
Instructional Support: Reading Coach, Supplemental Education Services (SES) Facilitator
Instructional/Behavioral Support: Counselor, School Psychologist, School Social Worker
Department/Grade Level Chairpersons: Mathematics Chairperson, Science Chairperson Reading/Language Arts Chairperson, Grades K-1, Reading/Language Arts Chairperson, Grades 2-3, Reading/Language Arts Chairperson, Grades 4-5
Other Stakeholders: EESAC Chairperson Representative, Community Stakeholder

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?

MTSS /RtI is an extension of Lakeview's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting students achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

- Administrators ensure commitment and allocate resources;
- Teachers and Coaches share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
- Team members work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time

Lakeview's MTSS /RtI Leadership Team:

1. Monitors academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:

- What will all students learn? (Curriculum based on standards)
- How will we determine of the students have learned? (common assessments)
- How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)

- How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (Enrichment opportunities).
- 2. Gathers and analyzes data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
- 3. Holds team meetings on a regular basis.
- 4. Maintains communication with staff for input and feedback, and updates them on procedures and progress.
- 5. Supports a process and structure within the school to design, implement and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
- 6. Provides clear indicators of student need and student progress, and assists in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery. Assists with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

1. Lakeview's Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering/analysis.
2. Lakeview's Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. Lakeview's Leadership team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

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

Data is used to guide the instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- Adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- Drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
- Create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

Managed Data will include:

Academic

- FAIR Assessment AP1 September-October 2012 is monitored through PMRN for reading
- 2012 FCAT Scores in Reading, Mathematics, Science, Writing
- District Interim Assessment Scores are monitored through Edusoft for Reading, Math, Science and Writing
- Student grades
- School site specific Assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System (SCAM)
- Detentions
- Suspensions/Expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, administrative context
- Office referrals per day, per month
- Team Climate Surveys
- Attendance
- Referrals to SPED programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff at Lakeview has received training on RtI, as of November 2010.

The administration will provide RtI training to the faculty on October 18, 2012. The School Psychologist will provide additional training on the 3 Tier System on November 15, 2012. During grade level meetings, the school psychologist will conduct data analysis and train teachers in monitoring students through the RtI process.

District professional development and support may include:

1. Additional training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. Providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to discuss the status of students in the RtI system, and will adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the current needs of those students, as well as make adjustments for those students under a behavior management system.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mrs. Sandra V. Banky, Principal; Mrs. Isabel Castillo, Assistant Principal; Mrs. Cecily Wright, Reading Coach; Mrs. Sandra Blemur, Counselor; Ms. Kennetha Jones, Reading/Language Arts Chairperson, Grades K-1; Mrs. Carol Cash, Reading/Language Arts Chairperson, Grades 2-3; Mrs. Shameeka Meredith, Reading/Language Arts Chairperson; Ms. Kathy Gibbons-Adams, Supplemental Education Services (SES) Facilitator/Mathematics Chairperson/Gifted Teacher ; Mrs. Debra Harris, ESE Teacher, Mrs. Christina Gonzalez, ESOL Teacher.

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

- To establish a literacy vision for the school.
- To develop professional development opportunities that match Lakeview's literacy vision and needs.
- To support the administration by providing multiple voices that represents the staff.
- To create structures to assess and develop plans for cohesive curriculum across grades.
- To build a system for handling change, or new state mandates.
- Meet quarterly to discuss progress on initiatives.

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

Continue to apply the rigor of instruction in the New Generation of Sunshine State Standards in reading, introduce Common Core Standards into grades 3-5 and continue to implement the Common Core Standards in grades K-2. The LLT maintains a connection to the school's Response to Intervention process by using the RtI problem solving approach to ensure that a multi-tiered system of reading support is present and effective.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and a half day paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences, in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. Students are assessed utilizing selected components of the Houghton Mifflin Prekindergarten Early Growth Indicators Benchmark Assessment, which are administered to all preschoolers as an initial, mid-year diagnostic and a final assessment. Low performing students are targeted early. Once identified, certified teachers work with low-performing students using the Houghton Mifflin Curriculum and High/Scope strategies. Funding to support the remediation and diagnostic instruments come from a District grant. The staff provides parents with packets of activities, registration materials, and workshops to train parents to assist their children at home. Lakeview Elementary provides strategies to be utilized by the parents at home to prepare their children to make a smooth transition to kindergarten.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/a

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (61)	31% (73)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency for Grade 3 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: students need opportunities to utilize graphic organizers to ensure comprehension of skills during instruction.	Utilize grade-level appropriate texts and graphic organizers that reinforce skill including, but not limited to, explicit ideas and information on main idea, relevant supporting details, cause and effect, themes and topics, text structure, comparison and contrast, chronological order of events, identifiable author's purpose and perspective for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining, story elements and problem/resolution.	MTSS/RtI Team and Literacy Leadership Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
2	The area of deficiency for Grade 4 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis. Barrier: students need opportunities to participate in cross grouping to work with other students on weaknesses.	Students will participate in cross grouping of curriculum groups for analysis of strengths and weaknesses.	MTSS/RtI Team and Literacy Leadership Team.	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
	The area of deficiency for Grade 5 as noted on the 2012 administration	Students will participate in cross grouping of curriculum groups for	MTSS/RtI Team and Literacy Leadership Team.	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the	Formative: District Baseline and Interim

3	of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis. Barrier: students need opportunities to participate in cross grouping to work with other students on weaknesses.	analysis of strengths and weaknesses.		MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
4					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 17% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 19%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17%(39)	19%(45)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Information	Provide a variety of enrichment strategies and informational text resources and activities including computer-assisted instruction such as FCAT Explorer and Reading Plus.	Administration, Reading Coach	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the Reading coach and department chairpersons will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from

1	Text/Research Process. Barrier: Students are not exposed to information text resources.			based on students' instructional needs.	SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Reading Plus, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
---	--	--	--	---	---

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:		The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 72% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
72% (110)		77 % (118)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: Students need to be provided with supplemental interventions.	Provide monthly Reading Clinics for students in grades 3-5	MTSS/RtI Team and Literacy Leadership Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming Reading Clinics based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery

				Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
--	--	--	--	---

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 92% of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup making learning gains by 3 percentage points to 95%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92 (%36)	95 % (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: Students need additional supplemental interventions and remediation.	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming before and after school tutorials based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	Student proficiency in Reading will increase by 4.66% per year thereby reducing the achievement gap by 50% over a six-year period.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	47	52	57	61	66	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 45% of students in the Black subgroup made learning gains. Our goals for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Black subgroup making learning gains by 6 percentage points to 51%. The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 47% of students in the Hispanic subgroup made learning gains. Our goals for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic subgroup making learning gains by 6 percentage points to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: : 45% (81) Hispanic: 47%(25)	Black: 51% (91) Hispanic: 53% (28)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: Students need additional supplemental interventions and remediation.	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming before and after school tutorials based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
2	Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: Students need additional supplemental interventions and remediation.	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming before and after school tutorials based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 37% of students in the ELL subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making learning gains by 9 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (37)	46% (46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency for ELL students as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis. Barrier: Students need additional exposure to grade level appropriate literature during Reading Clinics.	Provide monthly Reading Clinics for ELL students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming Reading Clinics based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 19% of students in the SWD subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (5)	24% (6)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis.	Provide exposure to grade level appropriate text during monthly Reading Clinics for SWD students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs

1	Barrier: SWD students do not have enough exposure to grade level appropriate text.		assessment and make recommendations for upcoming Reading Clinics based on students' instructional needs.	reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
---	--	--	--	--

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 46% of students in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup made learning gains. Our goals for the 2012-2013school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup making learning gains by 6 percentage points to 52%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (104)	52% (118)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Barrier: Students need additional supplemental interventions and remediation.	Provide Before and after school tutorials for economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming before and after school tutorials based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 – Literary Analysis. Barrier: Students need additional exposure to grade level appropriate literature during Reading Clinics.	Provide monthly Reading Clinics for economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations for upcoming Reading Clinics based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lakeview 's Best Practices	Pre-K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-5	August 16, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
SuccessMaker Training	2-5	Technology Facilitator	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, 2-5	October 3, 2012	Analysis of SuccessMaker reports	Administration
FCAT 2.0 Crunch Time Strategies	3-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, 3-5	March 13, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Common Core Exemplars and Rigorous Planning 2-5	2-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, 2-5	October 19, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Common Core Exemplars and Rigorous Planning K-4	K-4	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-4	October 26, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part IV Data Analysis	Pre-K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-5	November 6, 2012	Analysis of results from Baseline and Fall Interim assessments	Administration
Book Study – Reflective Analysis of Student Work	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-5	January 30-April 10, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part V Data Analysis	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, Pre-K-5	February 1, 2013	Analysis of results from Winter interim assessments- impact on Crunch Time instruction	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time(January through April 2013)	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,750.00

Subtotal: \$1,750.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
Subtotal: \$100.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Grand Total: \$2,350.00			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 43% of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking.			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
43% (76)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Barrier: Limited exposure to English prevents students from becoming proficient in listening.	Utilize the Waterford computer program, the Imagine Learning program and ESOL strategies that include but are not limited to Language experience approach (LEA) and modeling to increase listening proficiency.	LEP Committee, MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team and LEP Committee will review data after each assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, Waterford Program Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
2	Barrier: Limited exposure to English prevents students from becoming proficient in speaking.	Utilize the Waterford computer program, the Imagine Learning program, and ESOL strategies that include but are not limited to repetition, role playing and meaningful language practice to increase speaking proficiency.	LEP Committee, MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team and LEP Committee will review data after each assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep,

				Discovery Education, Waterford Program
				Summative: 2013 CELLA Test

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 28% of students were proficient in Reading.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

28% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Barrier: Students have limited exposure to English vocabulary.	Utilize the Waterford computer program, the Imagine Learning program, and ESOL strategies that include but are not limited to, interactive word walls and vocabulary notebooks, to increase reading proficiency.	Administration, LEP Committee, MTSS/RtI Team, Leadership Literacy Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team and LEP Committee will review data after each assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	2.1. Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, Waterford Program Summative: 2013 CELLA Test

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 23% of students were proficient in Writing.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

23% (41)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Barrier: Students have limited exposure to	Utilize the Waterford computer program, the	LEP Committee, MTSS/RtI Team,	Following the Florida Continuous	2.1. Formative: District Baseline

1	English vocabulary when completing writing tasks.	Imagine Learning program, and ESOL strategies that include but are not limited to, illustrating/labeling and reading response journals, to increase writing proficiency.	Leadership Literacy Team	Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team and LEP Committee will review data after each assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	and Interim Assessments, FAIR, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, Waterford Program Summative: 2013 CELLA Test
---	---	--	--------------------------	--	---

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 25% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 7 percentage points to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (69)	36% (85)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to model equivalent representations in real world mathematical situations using strategies to include, but not limited to, interactive word walls and vocabulary maps.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 4 – Category 3 – Number: Geometry and Measurement. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize manipulatives and engage in practice.	Provide students in grades 3-5 contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometry and measurement through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
3	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to learn concepts through discovery or utilize computer assisted programs to demonstrate	Students in grades 3-5 will use manipulatives for hands-on activities to learn concepts through discovery, and utilize computer-assisted programs such as SuccessMaker to demonstrate understanding.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013

understanding.				FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
----------------	--	--	--	------------------------------

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 25% of students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 28%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (59)	28% (66)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide opportunities for students in grades 3-5 to engage in mathematical discourse, participate in enrichment activities, such as frontloading of math activities and/or benchmarks, utilizing computer-assisted programs such as FCAT Explorer and GIZMO, and problem solving events through the use of cooperative student learning teams. Use literature in mathematics to provide the necessary meaning for student to successfully grasp measurement concepts and make connections	Administration, Department chairperson	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) teachers and department chairs will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

		with real world situations.		
--	--	-----------------------------	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 54% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 64%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (83)	64% (98)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide monthly Mathematics Clinics for students in grades 3.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty	Provide monthly Mathematics Clinics for students in grades 4.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments,

2	for Grade 4 was Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.			review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
3	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 was Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide monthly Mathematics Clinics for students in grades 5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 64% of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Lowest 25% subgroup making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%(27)	69%(29)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 3.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
2	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 4 –was Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 4.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
3	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 was Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials for students in grades 5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Student proficiency in Mathematics will increase by 3.83% per year thereby reducing the achievement gap by 50% over a six-year period. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61	64	68	71	75	

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:

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	percentage of students in the Black subgroup making learning gains by 9 percentage points to 64%. The results of the 2012FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 65% of students in the Hispanic subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Hispanic subgroup making learning gains by 66 percentage points to 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 55% (98) Hispanic: 65% (34)	Black: 64%(115) Hispanic: 66%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Black: According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 Black students was Reporting Category 1– Number: Fractions. For Grade 4 Black students – Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems. For Grade 5 Black students - Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for Black students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	Hispanic: According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 Hispanic students was Reporting Category 2 – Fractions. For Grade 4 Hispanic students – Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems. For Grade 5 Hispanic students Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for Hispanic students in grades 3-5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012FCAT Reading Test indicate that 56% of students in the ELL subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making learning gains by 12 percentage points to 68%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (56)	68%(68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 ELL students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for ELL students in grade 3.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
2	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 4 ELL students – Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for ELL students in grade 4.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
3	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 ELL students - Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for ELL students in grade 5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012FCAT Reading Test indicate that 42% of students in the SWD subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making learning gains by 1 percentage point to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

42%(11)					43%(11)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 SWD students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for SWD students in grade 3.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
2	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 4 SWD students – Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for SWD students in grade 4.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
3	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 SWD students - Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for SWD students in grade 5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>

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:

<p>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5E:</p>	<p>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 57% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup making learning gains by 7 percentage points to 64%.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (129)	64% (145)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 3 Economically disadvantaged students was Reporting Category 2 – Number: Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for Economically disadvantaged students in grades 3.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 3rd grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
2	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty-for Grade 4 Economically disadvantaged students – Reporting Category 1 – Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for Economically disadvantaged students in grades 4.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 4th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>
3	<p>According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the area of greatest difficulty for Grade 5 Economically disadvantaged students - Reporting Category 1 - Number: Base Ten and Fractions.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to utilize math skills and make real world connections.</p>	Provide Before and after school tutorials and monthly math clinics for Economically disadvantaged students in grades 5.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on 5th grade students' instructional needs.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, Discovery Education, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test</p>

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

SuccessMaker Training	2-5	Technology Facilitator	Mathematics Teachers, 2-5	October 3, 2012	Analysis of SuccessMaker reports	Administration
Destination Mathematics/ FCAT Explorer	K-5	Department/ Grade Level Chairpersons	Mathematics Teachers, K-5	November 6, 2012	Destination Math reports, FCAT Explorer reports, Analysis of results from Baseline and Fall Interim assessments	Administration
FCAT 2.0 Crunch Time Strategies	3-5	Department/ Grade Level Chairpersons	Mathematics Teachers, 3-5	March 13, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Best Practices	Pre-K-5	Department/ Grade Level Chairpersons	Mathematics Teachers, Pre-K-5	August 16, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
PLC – Learning from Student Work	K-5	Department/ Grade Level Chairpersons	Mathematics Teachers, K-5	January 30-April 10, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part V Data analysis	K-5	Department/ Grade Level Chairpersons	Mathematics Teachers, K-5	February 1, 2013	Analysis of results from Winter interim assessments	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time (January-April 2013).	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,750.00
			Subtotal: \$1,750.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,350.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 36% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3).

Science Goal #1a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(29)	40%(32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Physical Science. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to participate in inquiry-based activities in Physical Science.	Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking and the development of inquiry-based activities in Physical Science.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) the MTSS/RtI Team will review data after each monthly reading assessment and make recommendations based on students' instructional needs.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 5% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency levels 4 and 5 by 7 percentage points to 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

5% (4)			7% (5)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Physical Science. Students need additional exposure to instructional strategies that are linked to increased rigor through inquiry-based learning in Physical Science.</p> <p>Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to increase scientific thinking and participate in enrichment inquiry-based activities.</p>	<p>Provide opportunities that incorporate inquiry-based enrichment learning activities and computer-assisted instruction such as GIZMO, for students to practice and experience the scientific method, and increase participation in the District Elementary Science Fair. During delivery of content use multiple media (oral, graphics, written, technology) to reach a wide range of learning styles and address development of Physical Science Content.</p>	Administrators, Department Chairperson	Review student work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor monthly school based assessments and district interims to ensure adequate progress and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, GIZMO</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test</p>

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

				Target Dates	
--	--	--	--	--------------	--

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)	(e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lakeview 's Best Practices	Pre-K-5	Department/Grade Level Chairpersons	Science Teachers, Pre-K-5	August 16, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part IV Data Analysis	K-5	Department/Grade Level Chairpersons	Science Teachers, K-5	November 6, 2012	Analysis of results from Baseline and Fall Interim assessments	Administration
PLC – Learning from Student Work	Pre-K-5	Department/Grade Level Chairpersons	Science Teachers, K-5	January 30- April 10, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part V Data Analysis	K-5	Department/Grade Level Chairpersons	Science Teachers, K-5	February 1, 2013	Analysis of results from Winter interim assessments	Administration
FCAT 2.0 Crunch Time Strategies	Grade 5	Department/Grade Level Chairpersons	Science Teachers, grade 5	March 13, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time (January-April 2013).	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations.	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,250.00
			Subtotal: \$1,250.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,850.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 72% of scored level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher to 74%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(53)	74%(55)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT2.0 for Level 3 students was vocabulary. Barrier: Students have limited exposure to English vocabulary when completing writing tasks.	Provide opportunities for students to develop vocabulary and an understanding of the writing process through by developing and maintaining a writer's notebook. Conduct Writing Clinics in Narrative and Expository Writing for teachers to implement rigor of instruction on vocabulary skills in which students are not proficient.	MTSS/Rtl Team, Reading Coach	Administer and score monthly narrative and expository writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus of instruction.	Formative: District Baseline data and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test
2	The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT2.0 for students scoring at Level 4 and above were focus, organization, and elaboration in the area of narrative essays that contain at least three paragraphs and include a topic sentence, supporting details, and relevant information. Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to demonstrate understanding of the writing process.	Provide opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding of the writing process through by developing and maintaining a writer's notebook. Conduct Writing Clinics in Narrative and Expository Writing for teachers to implement rigor of instruction on vocabulary skills in which students are not proficient	MTSS/Rtl Team, Reading Coach	Administer and score monthly narrative and expository writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus of instruction.	Formative: District Baseline data and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A			N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Exemplars and Rigorous Planning K-4	K-4	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-4	October 26, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part IV Data Analysis	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-5	November 6, 2012	Analysis of results from Baseline and Fall Interim assessments	Administration
Lakeview's Best Practices	Pre-K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, Pre-K-5	August 16, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Common Core Exemplars and Rigorous Planning 2-5	2-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, 2-5	October 19, 2012	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Book Study – Reflective Analysis of Student Work	K-5	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, K-5	January 30- April 10, 2013	Analysis of results from biweekly assessments, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders	Administration
Lakeview 's Instructional Strategies Part V Data Analysis	4	Reading Coach	Reading/Language Arts Teachers, 4	February 1, 2013	Analysis of results from District midyear writing assessment/createCrunch Time Strategies	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide writing notebooks for 4th grade students.	Office Depot	Title I Funds	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
Grand Total: \$250.00			

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:		Our goal is for 2013 is for 97.14 % of students to have consistent attendance during the 2012-2013 school year, to decrease the number of excessive absences from 102 to 97 and to decrease the number of excessive tardies from 53 to 50.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
96.64(463)		97.14% (465)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
102		97			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
53		50			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to understand the relationship between punctual attendance and achievement. Barrier: Students and parents may be unaware of the attendance policy.	Hold a meeting/parent workshops by grade level to inform parents of the relationship between attendance and achievement and provide students with incentives for perfect attendance. Community Involvement Specialist will identify students with excessive absences and provide support through the Attendance Review	Attendance Review Committee, Administration	Log of ARCS and SCAMS, parent sign-in sheets, grade level logs (teacher's notation)	COGNOS Reports

		Committee.			
2	Students need to understand the relationship between attendance and achievement. Barrier: Students and parents may be unaware of the impact of good attendance on student achievement.	Hold a meeting/parent workshops by grade level to inform parents of the relationship between attendance and achievement and provide students with incentives for perfect attendance. Community Involvement Specialist will identify students with excessive absences and provide support through the Attendance Review Committee.	Attendance Review Committee, Administration	Log of ARCS and SCAMS, parent sign-in sheets, grade level logs (teacher's notation)	COGNOS Reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Policy Workshop	Pre-K through 5	Counselor, Community Involvement Specialist	Pre-K through 5 Parents	November 7, 2012	Log of ARCS and SCAMS, parent sign-in sheets, grade level logs (teacher's notation)	Administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide student incentives for perfect attendance.	Costco	PTA	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$350.00

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	Our goal is that no more than 1 student will be suspended out of school for the 2012-2013 school year.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
0	0				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
0	0				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
13	12				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
10	9				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Barrier: Students and parents do not have an understanding of the student Code of Conduct.	Implement School Wide Discipline Plan, and inform parents and students of the student Code of Conduct via parent workshops. Provide appropriate incentives such as Student of the Month.	Administration, Counselor, Social Worker	Review Student Case Management (SCMS) and COGNOS Reports	Student Case Management (SCMS) and COGNOS Reports, Student of the Month recognition forms.

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

Student Code of Conduct Workshop	Pre-K through 5	Counselor	Pre-K -5 Parents	November 7, 2012	SCM Reports Parent Sign-in Sheets	Administration
----------------------------------	-----------------	-----------	------------------	------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Title 1 School - See FLDOE Parental Involvement Plan			
*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:			
0		0			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase refreshments for parent meetings.	Costco	Title I Funds	\$247.26
			Subtotal: \$247.26
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$247.26

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Our goal is to have students in grades 3-5 develop scientific thinking skills and participate in the district Science Fair.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Barrier: Students do not have opportunities to increase scientific thinking and participate in inquiry-based activities.	Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking and the development of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in The Scientific method.	Administration, Department Chairpersons	Review student work folders for evidence of the use of inquiry based learning activities and monitor monthly school based assessments and district interims to ensure adequate progress and have students in grades 3-5 participate in the District Science Fair.	Formative: District Baseline and Interim Assessments, Computer Assisted Programs reports generated from SuccessMaker, FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, GIZMO Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
---	--	---	---	---	--

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Preparing Your Students for the Science Fair	K-5 Science	Department Chairpersons	K-5 Science Teachers	February 1, 2012	Analysis of science boards, classroom walkthroughs, student work folders in preparation for Science Fair	Administration

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase Science boards for selected students.	Office Depot	Title I Funds	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$250.00

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time (January through April 2013)	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
Mathematics	Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time (January-April 2013).	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
Science	Utilize supplemental materials during Crunch Time (January-April 2013).	Triumph Learning	EESAC Funds	\$500.00
Attendance	Provide student incentives for perfect attendance.	Costco	PTA	\$350.00
STEM	Purchase Science boards for selected students.	Office Depot	Title I Funds	\$250.00
				Subtotal: \$2,100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,750.00
Mathematics	To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,750.00
Science	To purchase technology hardware for classroom stations.	UDT Technology	Title I Funds	\$1,250.00
				Subtotal: \$4,750.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
Mathematics	Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
Science	Provide teacher incentives during professional development.	Office Depot	PTA	\$100.00
Parent Involvement	Purchase refreshments for parent meetings.	Costco	Title I Funds	\$247.26
				Subtotal: \$547.26
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	Provide writing notebooks for 4th grade students.	Office Depot	Title I Funds	\$250.00
				Subtotal: \$250.00
				Grand Total: \$7,647.26

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA
-------------	----------	------------	-------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
2012-2013 EESAC funds will be utilized for student incentives, academic awards, field trips and supplemental materials.	\$500.00

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

The EESAC will meet in September to review and update the EESAC roster.
October the EESAC will review the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan.
In January, the EESAC will review midyear data and update the School Improvement Plan.
EESAC will approve and monitor the implementation of the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan throughout the school year.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	71%	91%	49%	274	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	70%			136	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	69% (YES)	74% (YES)			143	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District LAKEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	62%	67%	90%	32%	251	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	68%	53%			121	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	51% (YES)			115	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					487	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested