# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PALM LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Alina Q. Iglesias

SAC Chair: Sophia Sanchez

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

# PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principal | Alina Q. Iglesias | Early Childhood Ed. Elementary Ed. School Principal | 12 | 18 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade B A A A A<br>AYP NA N N Y Y<br>High Standards Rdg.61 82 79 80 78<br>High Standards Math59 81 75 76 78<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 73 73 69 66<br>Lrng Gains-Math 64 62 54 62 76<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 61 60 61 65 59<br>Gains-Math-25% 55 64 56 69 81 |
| Assis Principal | Jordana C. Schneider | Elementary Ed. Educational Leadership | 9 | 12 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade B A A A A<br>AYP NA N N Y Y<br>High Standards Rdg.61 82 79 80 78<br>High Standards Math59 81 75 76 78<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 73 73 69 66<br>Lrng Gains-Math 64 62 54 62 76<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 61 60 61 65 59<br>Gains-Math-25% 55 64 56 69 81 |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math Coach | Sophia J. Sanchez | Elementary Ed. Primary Ed. Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsed | 18 | 6 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A A A A AYP NA N N Y Y High Standards Rdg.61 82 79 80 78 High Standards Math59 81 75 76 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 73 73 69 66 Lrng Gains-Math 64 62 54 62 76 Gains-Rdg-25% 61 60 61 65 59 Gains-Math-25% 55 64 56 69 81 |
| Reading Coach | Ivette Garcia | Elementary Ed. Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed | 23 | 14 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A A A A AYP NA N N Y Y High Standards Rdg.61 82 79 80 78 High Standards Math59 81 75 76 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 68 73 73 69 66 Lrng Gains-Math 64 62 54 62 76 Gains-Rdg-25% 61 60 61 65 59 Gains-Math-25% 55 64 56 69 81 |

## 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. Host interns from local universities.<br><br>2. Offer professional development opportunities on site. | Alina Q. Iglesias<br><br>Sophia J. Sanchez (PLC) | June 7, 2013<br><br>June 7, 2013 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 11- Out of Field<br><br>1- Less than effective | Teachers will be encouraged to take the subject area certification test.<br><br>Support is being provided to assist with areas needing improvement. |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63 | 0.0%(0) | 15.9%(10) | 47.6%(30) | 36.5%(23) | 28.6%(18) | 82.5%(52) | 3.2%(2) | 3.2%(2) | 79.4%(50) |

## 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 | N/A | N/A | 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

Palm Lakes Elementary provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Curriculum coaches at Palm Lakes Elementary lead and evaluate school core content standards/program; 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. Other components that are integrated into the school wide program include an extensive parental program; Supplemental Educational Services (SES), and special support services to special needs population as Homeless, Migrant and Neglected or Delinquent students (as needed).

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The school 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

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, and ELL.
• Training and substitute release time for Profession Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Communities (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

• tutorial programs (K-12)
• parent outreach activities (K-12)
• professional development on best practices for ELL and content area teachers
• coaching and mentoring for ELL and content area teachers(K-12)
• reading and supplementary instructional materials(K-12)
• purchase of supplemental hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL students (K-12, RFP Process)

Title X- Homeless

• The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by

collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
• All schools are eligible to receive services and will do so upon identification and classification of a student as homeless.
• Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students.
• 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.
• Project Upstart will be proposing a 2011 summer academic enrichment camp for students in several homeless shelters in the community, pending funding.
• 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)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

Palm Lakes will participate in the district's research based bullying program.

Nutrition Programs

1. Palm Lakes adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District's Wellness Policy. We offer free breakfast to all interested students. Lunch is available for all students and is served by the food and nutrition staff at the school site. Many students benefit from free or reduced lunch.
2. The physical education department and classroom teachers teach nutrition education as per state statute. Additionally, school wide events are held to promote good nutrition throughout the year.
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. Cafeteria staff prepare snacks for the YWCA, which provide the after school program.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

Palm Lakes works in conjunction with Hialeah High school to offer ELL and citizenship classes for adults at our school site.

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

Parental Involvement Program Description
Involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and other referral services.
Increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with ongoing parental input) our Title I School- Parent Compact (for each student); our school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House); and other documents/ activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.
Conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc. with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.
Complete Title I Administration Parental Involvement Monthly School Reports (FM 6914 revised 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activities Report (FM-6913 03-07), and submit to Title I Administration by the 5th of each month as documentation of compliance with the NCLB Section 1118. Confidential "as needed services" will be provided to any students in the school in "homeless situations" as applicable.

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

## School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team.
• Principal-Alina Q. Iglesias
• Assistant Principal-Jordana Schneider
• Primary Teacher-Ellen Gonzalez
• Intermediate Teacher-Esther Overton
• SPED Teacher-Isabel Soto
• ELL Teacher-Magda Perez
• Gifted Teacher-Vladimir Santana
• Reading Coach-Ivette Garcia
• Math/ Science Coach-Sophia Sanchez
• Counselor-Sandra McGlynn

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The Leadership Team will:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data through data talks and grade level meetings.
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold monthly team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress

1. MTSS/RtI leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:
Administrator(s) will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
• Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.
2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
• Special education personnel
• School guidance counselor
• School psychologist
• School social worker
• Member of advisory group
• Community stakeholders

3. MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.
• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
• The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.
There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The 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.

1. Data will be used to guide 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
2. Managed data will include:
Academic
• FAIR assessment-Reading/ Language Arts
• Edusoft/ Interim Assessments- Reading, Mathematics and Science
• FCAT- Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science
• CELLA- Language/ ELL
• School site specific assessments- All subject areas.
Behavior
• Student Case Management System
• Detentions
• Suspensions/expulsions
• Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
• Office referrals per day per month
• Team climate surveys
• Attendance
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:
1. Common planning time for instructional personnel as well as early release data meetings and training.
2. Training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
3. Providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and
4. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RtI organized through feeder pattern.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration will provide MTSS/RtI support to staff during faculty meetings and grade level meetings.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal- Alina Q. Iglesias
Assistant Principal- Jordana Schneider
Reading Coach- Ivette Garcia
EESAC Chairperson- Sophia Sanchez
Media Specialist- Dianna Rose
SPED Teacher- Isabel Soto
ELL Teacher- Magda Perez
Primary Teacher Representative- Ellen Gonzalez

Intermediate Teacher Representative- Esther Overton
Gifted Program Representative- Vladimir Santana

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets formally on a monthly basis during or after school hours. At the Literacy meetings the team discusses reading data and trends. The team will review the concerns during grade level meetings.
The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school.
The principal selects team members for the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represents highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum. The Reading Coach is a member of the Reading Leadership Team. The team will meet monthly throughout the school year.
The principal will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active participant in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. During school site visits, the District team will review the minutes from RLT meetings and have a dialogue with the principal regarding the meetings.
The principal will provide necessary resources to the LLT. The reading coach will serve as a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coach will share her expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coach will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP. The reading coach will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development.

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team for the 2012 – 2013 school year will be to maintain the fidelity of the Reading Program, intervention groups, continue to promote the Reading Plus and Ticket to Read programs for use at home. Additionally, the use of the SuccessMaker Program will be promoted and monitored to provide Differentiated Instruction and data-driven lessons within the reading classes.

The Core Reading Program, Houghton Mifflin, Reading provides the basis for instruction and connects meaningfully to supplemental materials. The core reading program correlates to all Reading and Language Arts Sunshine State Standards and addresses the six areas of reading: oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. The core reading program provides a coherent design that includes explicit instructional strategies, coordinated instructional sequences, and ample practice opportunities. Utilizing the core reading program is a portion of the allocated, protected, uninterrupted 90 minute block of time for literacy instruction. Accommodations in both pace and level may be required to meet the instructional need of advanced, gifted, or struggling readers.

Supplemental Intervention Reading Programs are intended for flexible use as part of differentiated instruction, or in more intensive interventions to meet student learning needs in specific areas (oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension). SIRPs are used to support initial instruction provided by Houghton Mifflin. Teachers will place students in supplemental intervention programs based on data. Placement will be fluid and reevaluated after each progress monitoring assessment. Supplemental materials for advanced and gifted students include materials that accelerate and enrich with a higher degree of complexity and abstraction.

Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs are intended for use in addition to the 90-minute reading block to provide immediate intensive intervention to students who are reading one or more years below grade level, and who are struggling with a broad range of reading skills. CIRPs include instructional content based on the six essential components of reading instruction (oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension). CIRPs are used to accelerate growth in reading with the goal of returning students to grade level proficiency. Teachers will place students in intervention programs based on data. CIRPs provide more frequent assessments of student progress. Therefore, in order to ensure membership and proper pacing of instruction and mastery of all instructional components, placement will be fluid and reevaluated after each progress monitoring assessment.

## 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 Palm Lakes 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 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. Pre-Kindergarten students are administered the HMH Houghton-Mifflin Harcourt three times per year which assesses Pre-Reading skills.

At Palm Lakes Elementary School, all incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to determine their ELL level and to ascertain the individual and group needs. These assessments will allow for the development of the instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print Letter Knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Specifically, the FLKRS and FAIR assessments will be used to assess basic academic skill development and academic school readiness of incoming students. ECHOES is a readiness behavioral observation checklist which is administered to Kindergarten students at the beginning of the school year. The OLPS-R will be used to assess the English language ability of the incoming students. Screening data is utilized to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Screening tools will be administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine student learning gains. This will help determine the need for changes to the instruction/intervention programs.

Local pre-school students are invited annually to visit the Kindergarten classes at Palm Lakes. This provides them with an opportunity to become familiar with the school and staff. These meetings are arranged through the Pre K department at the district office. Also, the school holds an orientation meeting for all incoming kindergarten students and their parents prior to the opening of school. Students and parents meet the instructional staff and are provided with a tour of the school. School tours are conducted by the administration for any parents who request it prior to enrolling their children.

## *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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 28% (130) of students achieved level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 5 percentage points to 33% (152). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28%<br>(130) | 33%<br>(152) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 3 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 63% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts. | 1a.1.<br>Align instruction to provide grade-level appropriate texts to incorporate with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. | 1a.1.<br>Literacy Leadership Team<br>Administration | 1a.1.<br>Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to identify text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. | 1a.1.<br>Formative: Mini-assessments<br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 4 was reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis with only 64% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to interpret the text to determine differences in fiction and non-fiction in the information presented. | 1a.2.<br>Align instruction to provide grade-level appropriate material suggested by district "Making the Grade with the Next Generation SSS" using graphic organizers monthly as instructional tools. | 1a.2.<br>Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | 1a.2.<br>Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to identify elements of story structure, types of language and text features. | 1a.2.<br>Formative: Mini-assessments<br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments |
| 3 | 1a.3.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 5 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 59% average correct in this | 1a.3.<br>Align instruction to provide grade-level appropriate texts to incorporate with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order | 1a.3.<br>Literacy Leadership Team<br>Administration | 1a.3.<br>Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to identify text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. | 1a.3.<br>Formative: Mini-assessments<br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts. | | | | |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | NA |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30% (137) of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage points to 32% (148). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30%<br>(137) | 32%<br>(148) |

| 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 |
| | 2a.1.<br>The areas which demonstrated negative growth when comparing the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test and would require students to improve performance on are Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary for grade 3 with a score which went from 83% to 75% mastery.<br>Grade 5 had negative | 2a.1.<br><br>In grade 3, pre-reading activities to utilize concept maps and word walls strategies to help build their knowledge of word meanings and relationships will be implemented. Implement "Wild About Words" program to address deficiencies in vocabulary knowledge. | 2a.1.<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | Ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of word meaning and relationships | Formative: Mini-assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0Assessment Interim Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | growth in Categories 2, 3, and 4 of 68% to 59%, 71% to 67%, and 67%-63% respectively.

The students in grade 3 are in need of additional support to interpret the meanings of words, phrases, and expressions. Students need to use sentence and word context to determine meaning. The students in grade 5 demonstrated the highest deficiency in Reading Application. Students lack the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies. | In grade 5, activities to support category 2 include implementing reciprocal teaching. For category 3, implementation of applicable CRISS strategies. For category 4, implementation of sample lessons of "Time For Kids" articles modeled by Reading Coach. | | | |

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: | NA |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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 68% (198) of students made learning gains.
Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 73% (212). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (198) | 73% (212) |

| 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 |
| | 3a.1.

As noted on the 2012 | 3a.1.

Expand tutoring before | 3a.1.

MTSS/RtI | Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and | Formative: Mini-assessments, Successmaker, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test the percent of students making learning gains maintained the same as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 3 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 63% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 4 was reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis with only 64% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to interpret the text to determine differences in fiction and non-fiction in the information presented.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 5 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 59% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts.<br><br>Students had limited tutoring options and lacked fidelity with utilizing the Successmaker program. Students require a structured tutoring tool implemented with fidelity. | and after school, utilizing learning centers within the 90-minute block, SuccessMaker program, and small group/differentiated instruction in a computer lab setting outside of the required reading block.<br><br>Provide incentives for students. | Leadership Team Administration | adjust intervention as needed. | FAIR Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | NA | |
|---|---|---|

| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | | NA | | |

| | 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 61% (46) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 66% (50). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 61%<br>(46) | 66%<br>(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 |
| | 4a.1.<br><br>As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the percent of students making learning gains demonstrated negative growth from 61% to 60% when compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 3 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 63% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 4 was reporting Category 3 Literary | 4a.1.<br><br>Expand tutoring before and after school, utilizing learning centers within the 90-minute block, SuccessMaker program, and small group/differentiated instruction in a computer lab setting outside of the required reading block. | 4a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Administration | Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | Formative: Mini-assessments, Successmaker, FAIR<br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |

| 1 | Analysis with only 64% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to interpret the text to determine differences in fiction and non-fiction in the information presented.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for Grade 5 was reporting Category 2 Reading Application with only 59% average correct in this category. The students are in need of additional support to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to formulate comparisons within and across texts.<br><br>Students had limited tutoring options and lacked fidelity utilizing the Successmaker program.<br><br>Students require a structured tutoring tool implemented with fidelity. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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 #<br><br>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 58% (267) of students achieved level 3 or higher proficiency.<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 64 | 68 | 71 | 74 | 77 |  |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 61% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 67%. The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 42% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 14 percentage points to 56%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Hispanic- 61% (266)<br>White- 42% (5) | Hispanic- 67% (292)<br>White- 56% (7) |

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

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Hispanic:<br><br>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the Hispanic subgroup needs support in language proficiency and Reading Category 1, appropriate grade level vocabulary. Students need support to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | 5B.1.<br><br>Utilize data to identify tier 2 and 3 students. Place in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus. Monitor student progress monthly. | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Administration | Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments (Voyager and Reading Plus). | Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |
| 2 | White:<br><br>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the White subgroup needs support in language proficiency and Reading Category 1, appropriate grade level vocabulary. Students need support to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | White:<br><br>Utilize data to identify tier 2 and 3 students. Place in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus. Monitor student progress monthly. | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Administration | Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments (Voyager and Reading Plus). | Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 52% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 61%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 52%<br>(74) | 61%<br>(87) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5C.1.<br><br>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the ELL subgroup needs support in language proficiency and Reading Category 1, appropriate grade level vocabulary. Students needs support to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | 5C.1.<br><br>Utilize data to identify tier 2 and 3 students. Place students in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus. Monitor student progress monthly. | 5C.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Administration | 5C.1.<br><br>Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. | 5C.1.<br><br>Formative: FAIR, District, and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessments Interim Assessments |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading test indicate that 22% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 31%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22% (11) | 31% (16) |

| 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 | As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the SWD subgroup needs support in language proficiency and Reading Category 1, appropriate grade level vocabulary. Students needs support to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | Utilize data to identify tier 2 and 3 students. Place students in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus. Monitor student progress monthly. | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team Administration | Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. | Formative: FAIR, District, and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessments |
| 2 | 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 subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading test indicate that 60% (246) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 66%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% (246) | 66% (271) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5E.1. The data indicates that the Economically Disadvantaged groups appropriate grade level vocabulary, Reading Category 1. Students need support to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | 5E.1. Utilizing data identify tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus and monitor student progress monthly. | 5E.1. Literacy Leadership Team Administration | 5E.1. Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. | 5E.1. Formative: FAIR, District, and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |
| | 5.E.1. | 5.E.1. | 5.E.1. | 5.E.1. | 5.E.1. |

| 2 | The data indicates that the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup needs support in appropriate grade level vocabulary. Students need opportunities to increase a limited knowledge of vocabulary. | Utilizing data identify tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions, such as Voyager and Reading Plus and monitor student progress monthly. | Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | Meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments. | Formative: FAIR, District, and School-site assessment data, Voyager and Reading Plus assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment Interim Assessments |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Review of Reading data from interim assessments and Successmaker | K-5 | Ivette Garcia | School-wide | February 2013 | Review of Interim Assessments | Administrative Team |
| Common Core | K-2 | Ivette Garcia | K-2 Teachers | September 2012-May 2013 | Lesson implementation | Administrative Team |
| Review of Reading data from baseline assessments and Successmaker | K-5 | Ivette Garcia | School-wide | September 2012 | Review of Baseline Assessments | Administrative Team |
| Review of Reading data from interim assessments and Successmaker. | K-5 | Ivette Garcia | School-wide | November 2012 | Review of Interim Assessments | Administrative Team |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading Interventions | Part Time Paraprofessionals | Title I | $40,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $40,000.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Incentives for technology programs | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $40,500.00 |

## 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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 45 % (183) of students were proficient in Oral Skills (listening and speaking).<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in the area on Listening/Speaking on the CELLA assessment. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 45%<br>(183) | |

| 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.<br><br>ELL learners need additional support in vocabulary development.<br><br>Students have difficulties decoding unfamiliar words. This impedes their reading and comprehension. | 1.1.<br><br>Provide daily English Language Learner (ELL) instruction for levels 1 and 2 students in grades 3-5.<br>Use with fidelity materials from the Houghton-Mifflin reading program that support ELL students. Utilize graphic organizers, word jars and vocabulary notebooks to increase vocabulary. | 1.1.<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | 1.1.<br><br>Monitor fluency of targeted students using Monthly FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring | 1.1.<br><br>2013 CELLA Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 ASSESSMENT |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 30 % (121) of students were proficient in Reading.<br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students<br>scoring proficient Reading on the CELLA assessment. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 30%<br>(121) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 2.1.<br><br>ELL learners need additional support in Vocabulary Development. Students have difficulties decoding unfamiliar words. This impedes their reading and comprehension. | 2.1.<br><br>Provide daily English Language Learner (ELL) instruction for levels 1 and 2 students in grades 3-5.<br>Use materials from the Houghton –Mifflin reading program that support ELL students with fidelity.<br>Develop a systematic plan to address the phonemic needs of second and third graders to increase their vocabulary of targeted students. Students will begins stories with picture walks to gain an understanding of the story and to illicit story related language. | Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | Monitor fluency of targeted students using monthly FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring passages. | 2013 CELLA Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 ASSESSMENT |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 30 % (123) of students were proficient in Writing.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students writing in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students on the CELLA assessment. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 30%<br>(123) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 3.1.<br><br>Students have difficulty with written expression due to poor vocabulary and difficulty organizing their thoughts. | 3.1.<br><br>Provide students opportunities to use Dialogue Journals and Graphic Organizers. The Dialogue journals will provide students the write on topics of their choice.<br>The use of Graphic Organizers will provide students with format to organize related ideas. | 3.1.<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | 3.1.<br><br>Monitor fluency of targeted students using monthly FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring passages. | 3.1.<br><br>2013 CELLA Assessment 2013 FCAT 2.0 ASSESSMENT |

CELLA Budget:

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% (137) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 38% (176). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30%<br>(137) | 38%<br>(176) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1a.1.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test in grade 3 was the Number and Operations-Fractions.<br><br>This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities. | 1a.1.<br><br>Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional shapes/objects. | 1a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team Administration | 1a.1.<br><br>Review ongoing classroom assignment and assessments that target application of the skills taught. | 1a.1.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test in grade 4 was the Geometry and Measurement content cluster.<br><br>This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities. | 1a.2.<br><br>Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional /objects. | 1a.2.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team Administration | 1a.2.<br><br>Review ongoing classroom assignment and assessments that target application of the skills taught. | 1a.2.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments |
| | 1a.3.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test in grade 5 was the Geometry and | 1a.3.<br><br>Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, | 1a.3.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team Administration | 1a.3.<br><br>Review ongoing classroom assignment and assessments that target application of the skills taught. | 1a.3.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments<br><br>Summative: |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Measurement content cluster.<br><br>This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities. | comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional /objects. | | | Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments |

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
</table>

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 Mathematics test indicate that 26% (122) of students achieved proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 30% (139). |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 26%<br>(122) | 30%<br>(139) |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2a.1.<br><br>The level 4 and 5 students in grade 3 showed a deficiency in the area of fractions as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.<br><br>The level 4 and 5 students in grade 4</td><td>2a.1.<br><br>Provide 3rd grade students with activities and manipulatives in order to transition from a concrete example of fractions to an abstract understanding.<br><br>Provide 4th grade students with additional support using the SuccessMaker program to</td><td>2a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team<br><br>Administration</td><td>2a.1.<br><br>Review ongoing classroom assignment and assessments that target application of the skills taught.</td><td>2a.1.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | | Assessments<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | showed a deficiency in the area of operations and problems as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. There is a deficiency in grades 4 and 5 in Geometry and Measurement.<br><br>The level 4 and 5 students in grade 5 showed an area of deficiency in Geometry and Measurement as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.<br><br>This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities. | reinforce operations and problem solving skills. In order to address the other area of deficiency in grade 4, which is Geometry and Measurement, faculty will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.<br><br>Provide 5th grade students with activities that promote the knowledge of three-dimensional shapes and how to analyze their properties, including volume and surface area. Students will identify and plot ordered pairs on the first quadrant; compare, contrast, and convert units of measures within the same dimension to solve problems. Students will solve problems requiring attention to approximations, selections of appropriate tools, and precision in measurement; and derive and apply formulas for area. | | | |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

| 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. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 64% (186) of students demonstrated learning gains. |

| | Mathematics Goal #3a: | Our goal for the 2012 -2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test is to increase students showing learning gains by 5 percentage points to 69% (201). |
|---|---|---|
| | 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | 64%<br>(186) | 69%<br>(201) |

| 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 | 3a.1.<br><br>The level 4 and 5 students in grade 3 showed a deficiency in the area of fractions as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.<br><br>As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the percent of students making learning gains increased from 54% to 62% as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.<br><br>There is a deficiency in grades 4 and 5 in Geometry and Measurement.<br>Our goal of 64% was not met but did increase. Limited tutoring options and lack of fidelity with the implementation of the Successmaker program impeded the ability to meet the goal. | 3a.1.<br><br>Provide 3rd grade students with activities and manipulatives in order to transition from a concrete example of fractions to an abstract understanding.<br><br>In order to address the noted deficiencies in Geometry and Measurement, faculty will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.<br><br>Expand tutoring before and after school, utilizing learning centers within the 60-minute block, SuccessMaker program, and small group/differentiated instruction in a computer lab setting. | 3a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team<br><br>Administration | 3a.1.<br><br>Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | 3a.1.<br><br>Formative:<br>Student authentic work; Monthly assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports |

| 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:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 55% (41) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test is to increase students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 65% (49). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 55%<br>(41) | 65%<br>(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 | 4a.1.<br><br>The lowest 25th percentile students in grade 3 showed a deficiency in the area of fractions as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.<br><br>As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the percent of students making learning gains increased from 54% to 62% as compared to the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. There is a deficiency in grades 4 and 5in Geometry and Measurement.<br>Our goal of 64% was not met but did increase. Limited tutoring options and lack of fidelity with the implementation of the Successmaker program impeded the ability to meet the goal. | 4a.1.<br><br>Provide 3rd grade students with activities and manipulatives in order to transition from a concrete example of fractions to an abstract understanding.<br><br>In order to address the noted deficiencies in Geometry and Measurement, faculty will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.<br><br>Expand tutoring before and after school, utilizing learning centers within the 60-minute block, SuccessMaker program, and small group/differentiated instruction in a computer lab setting. | 4a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team<br><br>Administration | 4a.1.<br><br>Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | 4a.1.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments, Successmaker reports<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports |

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 #<br><br>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 56% (259) of students achieved level 3 or higher proficiency.<br><br>5A : |

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 65 | 68 | 72 | 75 | 78 | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 59% of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 68%.<br>The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 42% of students in the White subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 19 percentage points to 61%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Hispanic- 59% (257)<br>White- 42% (5) | Hispanic- 68% (296)<br>White- 61% (8) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5B.1.<br>Hispanic:<br>As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics from the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test administration increased from 71% to 74%.Although we met our goal for the year, the Hispanic subgroup made AYP through safe harbor.<br><br>Students had limited opportunities to participate in hands-on activities through small group instruction. | 5B.1.<br>Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction and implementation of the SuccessMaker program during the mathematics 60-minute instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on mini-assessments and hands-on practice. Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional shapes/objects. | 5B.1.<br>MTSS/RtI Team<br><br>Administration | 5B.1.<br>Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | 5B.1.<br>Formative:<br>Student authentic work; Monthly assessments, Successmaker reports<br><br>Summative:<br>Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test indicate that 53% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 12 percentage points to 65%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 53%<br>(76) | | 65%<br>(93) | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5C.1.<br><br>As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics from the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test administration increased from 71% to 74%. Although we met our goal for the year, the Hispanic subgroup made AYP through safe harbor.<br><br>Students had limited opportunities to participate in hands-on activities through small group instruction. | 5C.1.<br><br>Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction and implementation of the SuccessMaker program during the mathematics 60-minute instructional block and provide tailored instruction based on mini-assessments and hands-on practice. Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the composing and decomposing of; describing, analyzing, comparing, and classifying; and building, drawing, and analyzing models that develop measurement concepts and skills through experiences in analyzing attributes and properties of two-and three-dimensional shapes/objects. | 5C.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team<br><br>Administration | 5C.1.<br><br>Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | 5C.1.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments, Successmaker reports<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>SuccessMaker Reports |

| 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test indicate that 20% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 15 percentage points to 35%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20%<br>(10) | 35%<br>(18) |

| 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 subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test indicate that 57% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged |

| | Mathematics Goal #5E: | | subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 67%. |
|---|---|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 57%<br>(234) | 67%<br>(275) |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5E.1.<br><br>As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup made 73% learning gains in mathematics. Although we exceeded our goal of 72% for the year, this subgroup made AYP through safe harbor. There was limited time for hands-on activities during small group instruction. | 5E.1.<br><br>Implement a rotation schedule for small group instruction and implementation of the SuccessMaker program. Provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice.<br>Provide time for hands-on activities during small group instruction. | 5E.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI LeadershipTeam<br><br>Administration | 5E.1.<br><br>Review reports to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust intervention as needed. | 5E.1.<br><br>Formative: Student authentic work; Monthly assessments, Successmaker reports<br><br>Summative: Results of 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

*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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Review of Mathematics data from baseline assessments and Successmaker | K-5 | Sophia Sanchez | School-wide | September 2012 | Review of Baseline Assessments | Administrative Team |
| Review of Mathematics data from interim assessments and Successmaker | K-5 | Sophia Sanchez | School-wide | November 2012 | Review of Interim Assessments | Administrative Team |
| Review of Mathematics data from interim assessments and Successmaker | K-5 | Sophia Sanchez | School-wide | February 2013 | Review of Interim Assessments | Administrative Team |
| Common Core Workshop | K-2 | Sophia Sanchez | K-2 Mathematics Teachers | September 2012-May 2013 | Implement Lessons | Administrative Team |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Incentives for Mathematics programs | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $500.00 |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| 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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 40% (57) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT 2.0 Level 3).<br>The expected level of performance for 2012 is 43% (62) achieving proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40%<br>(57) | 43%<br>(62) |

| 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 |
| | 1a.1.<br><br>The area of deficiency according to the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0 identifies Earth/ Space as the cluster in most need of improvement. Enrichment activities were limited to support | 1a.1.<br><br>Provide students opportunities on a weekly basis to conduct a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate | 1a.1.<br><br>MTSS/RtI<br><br>Administration | 1a.1.<br><br>Review Data from school site and District assessments. Analyze for effectiveness of strategies. | 1a.1.<br><br>Formative: Science Baseline, Mini benchmark assessments, Science Projects<br><br>Summative: 2013 Science FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | and develop independent projects. | conclusions and apply key instructional concepts. Students will maintain logs and notations of their lessons.<br>Provide activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Earth and Space Science. | | | |

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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | NA |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 13% (18) of students scored above proficiency (FCAT 2.0 Level 4 and 5).<br>The expected level of performance for 2013 is 14% (20) above proficiency. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 13%<br>(18) | 14%<br>(20) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. | 2a.1. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency according to the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, and three years of trend data identifies the Earth/Space as the cluster in most need of improvement. Enrichment activities were limited to support and develop independent projects. | Provide enrichment activities for students to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Earth and Space Science. | MTSS/RtI<br><br>Administration | Review projects periodically using a rubric to determine if students are making progress and ensure that adjustments are being made as necessary. Review inquiry-based activities and provide feedback. | Formative: Science Baseline, Mini benchmark assessments, Science Projects<br><br>Summative: 2013 Science FCAT |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scientific Process & Hands On Science | K-5 | Sophia Sanchez | School-wide | November 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Science Coach Administrative Team |

Science Budget:

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

| 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 |
| Incentives for Science Program | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $500.00 |

## Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | On the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Writing Test, 70% of students achieved a proficiency score of 3 or higher.<br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students by 3 percentage points achieving at or above a level 3 proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 70%<br>(118) | 73%<br>(123) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1a.1.<br><br>The area of deficiency for students on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment which focused on narrative writing was elaboration.<br><br>Students need improvement in applying appropriate tools or strategies to evaluate and refine the draft to include more support and details during the writing process. | 1a.1.<br><br>Utilize the Grade Four Narrative Prompt Anchor set and incorporate the use of graphic organizers that will remind and encourage students to elaborate, support and provide details that will strengthen their writing and writing expression. Additionally, teacher conferencing will be used to strengthen the revision process.<br><br>Provide small group instruction to students | Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | 1a.1.<br><br>Administer Baseline District Exam to all fourth grade students. Identify needs of each student and monitor their progress through monthly writing prompts. Adjust instruction to address skills needed. | 1a.1.<br><br>Formative: District Baseline, monthly writing prompts<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | needing similar skills. | | |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br><br>Students need additional support with elaboration during the expository writing process.<br>Students need improvement in applying appropriate tools or strategies to evaluate and refine the draft to include more support and details during the writing process. | 1a.2.<br><br>Utilize the Grade Four Expository Calibration Guide to focus on elaboration and guide lessons. Incorporate the use of graphic organizers that will remind and encourage students to elaborate, support and provide details that will strengthen their writing and writing expression. Additionally, teacher conferencing will be used to strengthen the revision process. | 1a.2.<br><br>Literacy Leadership Team<br><br>Administration | 1a.2.<br><br>Administer Baseline District Exam to all fourth grade students. Identify needs of each student and monitor their progress through monthly writing prompts. Adjust instruction to address skills needed. | 1a.2.<br><br>Formative: District Baseline, monthly writing prompts<br><br>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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | NA |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scoring/Utilizing Rubrics & Anchor Sets/Calibration | K-5 | Reading Coach | K-5 Reading/Language Arts teachers | October 2012-May 2013 | Evidence of writing strategies in lesson plans. | Administration |
| Writing Instructional Practices: Adding quality details and word choice | K-5 | Reading Coach | School-wide | August 2012-January 2013 | Evidence of Writing Strategies in Lesson Plans | 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 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*End of Writing Goals*

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 96.3% (936) from 96.8% (941) in 2011-2012 by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy and to decrease the number of unexcused absences.<br><br>In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5% |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 96.3%<br>(936) | 96.8%<br>(941) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 261 | 248 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 219 | 208 |
| 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.<br><br>Spread of common illnesses from one student to the other because of poor hygiene and/or lack of knowledge.<br><br>Students need to follow proper hygiene procedures to avoid common illnesses. | 1.1.<br><br>Provide health counseling to students on topics that may impact their daily health and impact their attendance.<br><br>Identify and refer students who are developing a pattern of non-attendance to the Attendance Review Committee (ARC) and refer to the student services team for interventions and attendance incentives. | 1.1.<br><br>Assistant Principal and/or designee | 1.1.<br><br>Weekly updates to the administration by the ARC and to entire faculty during faculty meetings. | 1.1.<br><br>ARC logs and attendance rosters. |
| 2 | 1.2<br><br>Parents have difficulty getting children to school on time due to work schedules and a lack of support from family members. | 1.2<br><br>Provide morning supervision beginning at 7:30 am for working parents to get children to school on time. Additionally, students are provided free breakfast starting at 7:30 am on a daily basis. | 1.2<br><br>Administration<br><br>Cafeteria Manager | 1.2<br><br>Monitor breakfast participation and utilize Connect Ed system to remind parents of morning supervision and breakfast program. | 1.2<br><br>Daily Attendance rosters. |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

| Professional Development | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Incentives for improved attendance | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $750.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $750.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $750.00 |

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to reduce the total number of in & out of school suspensions from 20 to 18. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 6 | 5 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 6 | 5 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 14 | 13 |
| 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.<br><br>Additional opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior are needed. | 1.1.<br><br>Utilize the Student Code of Conduct and provide incentives for students to recognize good citizenship. | 1.1.<br><br>Administrative team | 1.1.<br><br>Monitor COGNOS Report on student indoor/outdoor suspension rate. | 1.1.<br><br>COGNOS Report |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

# Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement  Parent Involvement Goal #1:  *\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | See Parent Involvement Plan (PIP) |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |

| See PIP | See PIP |
|---|---|

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test, there is a need for improvement in student's knowledge of the scientific process. |

| 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.<br><br>Data from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science test indicate that Report Category I: Nature of Science needs improvement.<br><br>Students require additional opportunities for inquiry based and independent investigations. | 1.1.<br><br>Students in first through fifth grade will participate in quarterly "Science Boot Camps". This activity will allow for students to be engaged in hands on experiments targeting specific benchmarks. | 1.1.<br><br>Science Coach Administration | 1.1.<br><br>Science Logs/Activity Sheets Classroom Walkthroughs Data analysis of interim assessments. | 1.1.<br><br>Formative: School based assessments and district interim assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessments |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inquiry Projects for Science Boot Camps | 1-5 | Sophia Sanchez | 1st-5th Teachers | Quarterly | Review of agenda and minutes<br><br>Classroom Walkthroughs | Administration |

STEM Budget:

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

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

## FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Reading Interventions | Part Time Paraprofessionals | Title I | $40,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $40,000.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Incentives for technology programs | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| Mathematics | Incentives for Mathematics programs | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| Science | Incentives for Science Program | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $500.00 |
| Attendance | Incentives for improved attendance | Miscellaneous Items | EESAC | $750.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $2,250.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $42,250.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| ꞽn Priority | ꞽn Focus | ꞽn Prevent | ꞽn NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school:  ꞽn Yes  ꞽn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

## 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 |
|---|---|
| Attendance Goal- Student Incentives ($750.00) Reading Goal- Student Incentives ($500.00) Mathematics Goal- Student Incentives ($500.00) Science Goal- Student Incentives ($500.00) | $2,250.00 |

Develop and monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Assist in developing strategies/programs to support student instruction. Assist in monitoring student achievement and making recommendations to strengthen the instructional program. Make recommendations to ensure the safety of students, staff and stakeholders. Develop strategies to promote the instructional programs and the school to the surrounding community.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Dade School District**
**PALM LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2010-2011**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 82% | 81% | 82% | 68% | 313 | 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 | 73% | 62% | | | 135 | 3 ways to make gains: <br>• Improve FCAT Levels <br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 60% (YES) | 64% (YES) | | | 124 | 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 | | | | | 572 | |
| 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**
**PALM LAKES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2009-2010**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 79% | 75% | 88% | 53% | 295 | 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 | 73% | 54% | | | 127 | 3 ways to make gains: <br>• Improve FCAT Levels <br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 <br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 61% (YES) | 56% (YES) | | | 117 | 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 | | | | | 539 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |