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

School Name: COCONUT CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Katherine Good

SAC Chair: Martha Houck

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Katherine Good | BA-Elementary Education, Florida Atlantic University<br>MA-Educational Leadership, Florida Atlantic University<br>2009-2010 Certifications: Educational | 3 | 7 | 2011-2012<br>Principal<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 67%<br>Math Mastery: 65%<br>Science Mastery: 46%<br>Writing Mastery: 85%<br>Reading Gains: 70%<br>Math Gains: 73%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Reading: 65%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Math:77%<br><br>2010-2011<br>Principal<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 81%<br>Math Mastery: 83%<br>Science Mastery: 54%<br>Writing Mastery: 93%<br>AYP: No<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make mastery in Reading and Math. Black |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Leadership (all levels), ESOL, Elementary Education (1-6) | | | subgroup did not make AYP in Reading and Math. Hispanic subgroup did not make it in Math.<br><br>2009-2010<br>Assistant Principal<br>Coral Park Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 86%<br>Math Mastery: 89%<br>Science Mastery: 67%<br>Writing Mastery: 90%<br>AYP: No<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make mastery in Reading and Math. Black subgroup did not make AYP in Reading and Math. |
| Assis Principal | Deborah L. Brown | Doctor of Education-Ed.Leadership, MS-Elementary Education,BA-Jornalism, Certifications: Educational Leadership (all levels), ESOL, Elementary Education (1-6) | 5.5 | 5.5 | Assistant Principal<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 67%<br>Math Mastery: 65%<br>Science Mastery: 46%<br>Writing Mastery: 85%<br>Reading Gains: 70%<br>Math Gains: 73%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Reading: 65%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Math:77%<br><br>2010-2011<br>Assistant Principal<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 81%<br>Math Mastery: 83%<br>Science Mastery: 54%<br>Writing Mastery: 93%<br>AYP: No<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make mastery in Reading and Math. Black subgroup did not make AYP in Reading and Math. Hispanic subgroup did not make it in Math.<br><br>2009-2010:<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 85%<br>Math Mastery: 84%<br>Science Mastery: 58%<br>Writing Mastery: 90%<br>AYP:No-lowest 25% reading 51%, lowest 25% in math 60%, students with disabilities did not meet AYP. |

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2011-2012<br>Reading Resource Specialist<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 67%<br>Math Mastery: 65%<br>Science Mastery: 46%<br>Writing Mastery: 85%<br>Reading Gains: 70%<br>Math Gains: 73%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Reading: 65%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Math:77%<br><br>2010-2011 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Resource Specialist | Janice Buck | Master of Art in elementary Education Certification: Reading, ESOL Elementary Education and Early Childhood | 27 | 23 | Grade: A<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Reading Mastery: 81%<br>Math Mastery: 83%<br>Science Mastery: 54%<br>Writing Mastery: 93%<br>AYP: No<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make mastery in Reading and Math. Black subgroup did not make AYP in Reading and Math. Hispanic subgroup did not make it in Math.<br><br>2009-2010:<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 85%<br>Math Mastery: 84%<br>Science Mastery: 58%<br>Writing Mastery: 90%<br>AYP:No-lowest 25% reading 51%, lowest 25% in math 60%, students with disabilities did not meet AYP. |
| Autism Coach | Barbara Hennessey | Bachelor of Science in Education/ Certification: Elementary Education K-6 and ESE | 9 | 7 | 2011-2012<br>Autism Coach<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 67%<br>Math Mastery: 65%<br>Science Mastery: 46%<br>Writing Mastery: 85%<br>Reading Gains: 70%<br>Math Gains: 73%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Reading: 65%<br>Lowest 25% Learning gains Math:77%<br><br>2010-2011<br>Coconut Creek Elementary<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 81%<br>Math Mastery: 83%<br>Science Mastery: 54%<br>Writing Mastery: 93%<br>AYP: No<br>Economically Disadvantaged did not make mastery in Reading and Math. Black subgroup did not make AYP in Reading and Math. Hispanic subgroup did not make it in Math.<br><br>2009-2010:<br>Grade: A<br>Reading Mastery: 85%<br>Math Mastery: 84%<br>Science Mastery: 58%<br>Writing Mastery: 90%<br>AYP:No-lowest 25% reading 51%, lowest 25% in math 60%, students with disabilities did not meet AYP. |

## 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. Communicate information to staff about extra certifications | Katherine Good (Principal) | June 7, 2013 | |
| 2 | 2. Utilize Professional Development Committee funds to offset costs for teachers to add areas to their certificate | Katherine Good (Principal) | June 7, 2013 | |
| 3 | 3. Professional Staff Development | Maria Salomatoff (PDST Chair)/Administration | June 7, 2013 | |
| 4 | 4.Professional Learning Community-Strategies for success in diverse and inclusive classrooms | Katherine Good (Principal)/Deborah Brown (Asst. Principal) | June 7, 2013 | |
| 5 | 4. Team Planning and Weekly Collaboration Meetings: Staff | Katherine Good, Principal | 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 |
|---|---|
| 100% of our staff is teaching in field. There are no teachers at this time that are teaching out of field. | |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | 0.0%(0) | 10.4%(5) | 33.3%(16) | 56.3%(27) | 43.8%(21) | 100.0%(48) | 16.7%(8) | 16.7%(8) | 100.0%(48) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| LaDonna Weaver | Melissa Martin | Change of Grade/Team Leader | Weekly grade level meetings/classroom visits and support |
| Linda Westmoreland | Instructional Personnel | Transition of team leader/Team Member | Social Studies Update |
| Darlene Hazen | Instructional Personnel | National Boards | Professional Development Committee |
| Marcia Fay | Michele Rothacker | Lead teacher | Project-based, Technology |
| Mary Beskin | Brian Kenney | New to Grade Level | Weekly team meetings |
| Marcia Robbe | Instructional Personnel | National Boards | Learning Community |
| Maria Salomatoff | Gordon Groff | Lead Teacher | Weekly Meetings |
| Marci Maher | Instructional Personnel | National Boards | Team planning and classroom support/SIP Reading Committee Chair |
| Esta Siegel | Merilee Fazio | Core Subject Review | Monthly Meetings/Learning Community |
| Ladonna Weaver | Thomas Anderson | Team Leader/New to grade level | Weekly team meetings |

# 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

As a Title I school we will utilize Title I funds to help with Parent Resource centers at school. We utilize funds for professional development with teachers and staff. We will also utilize Title I funds to provide training for parents on current curriculum standards.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

MA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used for support materials for selected students in our targeted sub-groups.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school and the Coconut Creek Police Department work together in an effort to curb violence and bullying by implementing the CARE Program.

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

## 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 RtI Leadership Team.
Our leadership team consist of:

Katherine Good (Principal)-oversees all processes, procedures and monitors implementation of the RtI process with fidelity.
Dr. Deborah Brown (Assistant Principal)- assists in overseeing all processes, implementing procedures and monitoring implementation of the RtI process with fidelity.
Denise Collins (ESE Specialist)-oversees the ESE Program and works with all teachers on interventions for academics and behavior.
Janice Buck (Reading Resource Specialist)-oversees all curriculum and assists teachers with interventions.
Denise Balais (Guidance Counselor)-works with teachers to develop behavior and emotional interventions.
Dr. Aratha Dixon (School Psychologist)-assists with evaluating whether a child should go on for further testing and makes suggestions for interventions.
Rochelle Abramowitz (School Social Worker): works with teachers and parents to ensure proper social, emotional and economic interventions are taking place
Barbara Hennessey (Autistic Coach)-Assists with interventions for general education, ESE and Autistic behavioral and academic interventions.

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 team will use a school wide approach to core curriculum focusing on adherence to the instructional focus calendar and school wide needs. The school will implement the school wide "Paws"itive behavior plan. Students who are at risk of not meeting targeted goals will be tracked by teachers through virtual counselor and the new BASIS system. 1. The team will meet twice a month. Tier 1 data will be routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science and behavior. Data is used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. This same data is used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions; all such students are referred to the CPS team for consideration of how best to proceed.
Case management of Tier 2 and Tier 3 will be done through a grade level team member as well as a CPS Team Member will also be grade level case manager. Data will be stored and reviewed on the district's BASIS system and will be reviewed by the School Psychologist. Our team will continue to follow the four-step problem-solving model.
2. We will use data chats to identify struggling learners that are not meeting grade level benchmarks within the standards in both Reading and Math. We will utilize data chats to identify struggling students who are in need of additional support both academically and behaviorally. The data will be collected to represent which students are in the lowest quartile. These students will be identified as students who need to have a Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 intervention. If necessary those students will be referred to CPS Team.
3. At Tier 2, our team will develop targeted interventions from Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions. The Struggling Math Chart will be used for math interventions. Behavior strategies will be recommended in the Problem Behavior Guide. Our Team will use the district Intervention Records with the required progress monitoring graphs to monitor student progress, make good data based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.
4. At Tier 3, our team will develop targeted interventions with from Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions. The Struggling Math Chart will be used for math interventions. Behavior strategies will be recommended in the Problem Behavior Guide. Our Team will use the district Intervention Records with the required progress monitoring graphs to monitor student progress, make good data based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.

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 team will meet twice a month. Case management of Tier 2 and Tier 3 will be done through a grade level team member as well as a CPS Team Member will also be grade level case manager. Targeted data will be recovered from the district's BASIS system and reviewed by the School Psychologist. Our team will continue to follow the four-step problem-solving model.
2. We will use data chats to identify struggling learners that are not meeting grade level benchmarks within the standards in both Reading and Math. We will utilize data chats to identify struggling students who are in need of additional support both academically and behaviorally. The data will be collected to represent which students are in the lowest quartile. These students will be identified as students who need to have a Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 intervention. If necessary those students will be referred to CPS Team.
3. At Tier 2, our team will develop targeted interventions from Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions. The Struggling Math Chart will be used for math interventions. Behavior strategies will be recommended in the Problem Behavior Guide. Our Team will use the district Intervention Records with the required progress monitoring graphs to monitor student progress, make good data based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.
4. At Tier 3, our team will develop targeted interventions with from Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions. The Struggling Math Chart will be used for math interventions. Behavior strategies will be recommended in the Problem Behavior Guide. Our Team will use the district Intervention Records with the required progress monitoring graphs to monitor student progress, make good data based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.

## MTSS Implementation

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

science, writing, and behavior.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will provide information for students on whom data was collected for the purpose of determining areas for academic or behavioral improvement and suggested strategies that have proven successful. All Tier I data is routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science and behavior. Data is used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. The same data is also used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions. All such students are referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) for consideration of how best to proceed to meet the needs of individual students.

Administration conducts Classroom Walkthroughs, Data Chats, and meets with teams as need to discuss targeted sub groups and the accommodated instruction these students are receiving in reading, mathematics, science, writing and behavior. The following Tier I data is routinely inspected: 10reading: 1) district benchmark, FAIR, Running Records, treasures and Triumphs assessments, 2) writing: district benchmark prompts, 3) mathematics: district benchmark assessments, chapter tests, Go Math Assessments, 4) science: district benchmark assessments, BEEP assessments, and 5) behavior: discipline management system reports on referrals and classroom data and graphs.

For Tier 2 and Tier 3, the data sources are the intervention records for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students. These graphs include scatter plots, line graphs and bar graphs. The plan will be monitored by completing the CPS/RtI Benchmark Checklist at two additional intervals to the end of the year evaluation (at the end of November, and at the end of February). This will allow for monitoring of progress on those essential elements of CPS/RtI your team has identified as needing improvement. The end of the year evaluation will be completed in May/June 2013.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

1. All members of the CPST Team will attend a district sponsored training which includes documentation of all interventions in the BASIS system.
2. Once the CPST team is adequately trained, members of the team will disseminate needed information to your staff.
3. The last Wednesday of the month the CPS/RtI PLC will meet to do ongoing and systematic training on MTSS/RtI concerns.
Note: Many of our training materials can be accessed on the Psychological Services website at: www.broward.k12.fl.us/STUDENTSUPPORT/psychologicalservices/html/CPS_RTI.htm

RtI training will be discussed during the first week of teacher planning. The way in which this information affects reading and development and mathematics instruction will be woven into he staff development plan for reading and mathematics for the 2012-2013 school year. Specific training includes the following. District and school-based training in the core and intervention programs included in the Go Math, Treasures and Fusion series. Additional training in differentiated instruction will be included. All teachers will be trained in Destination Reading and Destination Math to differentiate instruction for RtI. Additionally, all teachers K-2 and one third grade teacher will be trained in guided reading using Fountas and Pinnell leveled-books. District personnel from psychological services will train team leaders during the initial team leader release day, 9/25/12. The content of the training will include the role of the CPST, progress monitoring and instructional decision making of the RtI process through Tier 1 data, and intervention records for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

School-based personnel will attend BASIS training in September 2012 to ensure that we are in compliance with district and state mandates by tracking student data on targeted students. The district personnel, who are assigned to the school, will also be trained in BASIS at a separate training, which is tailored to the implementation of student services. The team meets every two weeks to discuss students and personnel in need of additional support. Each CPS team member is assigned to a grade level to ensure MTSS school wide.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Katherine Good-Principal
Dr. Deborah Brown-AP
Janice Buck-Reading Resource Specialist
Denise Balais-Guidance Counselor-ESOL coordinator
Denise Collins-ESE Specialist
Barbara Hennessey-Autism Coach

K-5 Team Leaders
Maria Salomatoff-Media Specialist
Katheen Connick-(3rd grade teacher)Reading Committee Chair
Brian Kenney-(K teacher) Technology Committee Chair
Writing Committee Chair

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

The principal and the reading coach together guide the the Literacy Leadership Team. The LLT will meet on a monthly basis. The function of the team will be to provide information for students on whom data was collected for the purpose of determining areas or academic improvement and/or enrichment. The LLT ensures that the District's K-12 Reading plan is being implemented with fidelity. The Principal and the Reading Resource Specialist will guide the team through this process.

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

The goals and initiatives of the LLT will be based on student and teacher data and be aligned with the Reading SIP goals. 1) Following the FCIM, the initiative will focus on using data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesigning interventions/instruction to meet the needs of individual students. 2) How to provide tier 1 and tier 2 interventions using Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs, scientifically based instruction and strategies with fidelity. 3) Identifying data indicators to utilize for struggling students receiving tier 2 or tier 3 interventions. 4) Implementation of the Accelerated Reader Program school wide, 5) Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan, 6) Unwrapping the benchmarks and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, and the alignment with FCAT 2.0, and 7) Implementation of the Struggling Reader's Chart and the Decision Tree, 8) leading and supporting PLC's and Study Groups, and 9) creating and sharing school-wide initiatives and activities that promote literacy and 10) the implementation of Common Core Standards K-5.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Our School will provide two Kindergarten Round Ups to children and families that will be attending Coconut Creek Elementary in the upcoming school year. These events will help pre-schoolers and parents with the transition to Kindergarten. We also have speech programs for pre-school students that help with the transition to Kindergarten.

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

NA

## *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?

NA

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?

NA

## 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

NA

# 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 trend data indicates that our reading proficiency scores declined in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28.6% (105/367) scored at a level 3 in Reading on the 2012 FCAT. | 34% (125/367)will score at a level 3 in Reading on the 2013 FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will be trained in the implementation of the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during Pre-Planning to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. An ongoing PLC for Reading and Mathematics will meet once a month for the entire school year. | PLC Leaders<br>Administration<br>Reading Specialist<br>Summer Leadership Team | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests<br>I-Observation |
| 2 | 1. Teachers may not understand how to interpret data | Provide extended training to interpret test scores<br>Analysis of formative data from district and or teacher developed tests, informal observation, etc. | 1.Principal<br>2.Asst. Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP Committee Chair | 1. Significant trends and patterns emerge from i-Observation Data<br><br>Analyze FCAT Scores. Utilize the FCIM process to look at and interpret data. | 1. Administrative formal evaluation<br><br>Data chat with teachers discuss students formal and informal evaluations |
| 3 | 1.2.<br>Meeting the needs of individual students | 2.2 A model teacher/NBCT will assist with building capacity across the curriculum areas.<br><br>Word of the Day infused K-5 in content areas incorporated into daily instruction.<br><br>Differentiated Computer Instruction using programs such as Brainchild and FCAT Explorer | 1.Principal<br>2.Asst. Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP Committee Chair | Review of data benchmarks in leadership team as compared to the school, team and individual student goals<br>Review of goals during quarterly data chat meetings with teachers.<br>Lesson study and review of lesson plans | 1.2<br>Assessments will be charted to monitor progress<br>Internal student database<br>Treasures Reading Assessments<br>ORF Assessments<br>DAR<br>BAT |
| 4 | 1.3.<br>Understanding and adhering to the RTI process with fidelity. | 1.3 Formulate PLC to assist teachers with monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of supplemental material, including Accelerated Reader | 1.Principal<br>2.Asst. Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP Committee Chair<br>5. CPST | 1.3 District and state recommended criteria | District Benchmark Test |
| | 1.4 Teachers may not be using effective teaching | Train teachers with professional development | 1.Principal<br>2.Asst. Principal | 1.4 i-Observation data will show trends in | Administrative formal evaluation |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | strategies in the classroom | with facilitators from Core Curriculum.<br><br>Train teachers to use CRISS strategies. | 3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP Committee Chair | reading<br><br>Teachers will coplan, model and share best practices | |

| 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 reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | The number of students scoring at levels 4,5, and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment Test will increase in 2013. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18.2% (2/11) scored at levels 4,5 and 6 in reading. | 36% (4/11) are expected to score a level 4, 5 or 6. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | The trend data indicates that our reading proficiency scores declined in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38% (141/367) of students achieved above proficiency | 43% (161/367)students will achieve above proficiency |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during an early release day to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. | Administration<br>Reading Specialist | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests |
| 2 | Students lack of exposure to higher materials and thinking skills | Grouping students based on reading FCAT levels to ensure that advanced performing students are grouped together in a gifted/high achieving classroom and/or reading groups. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP committee chair<br>5. Classroom Teachers | Significant trends and patterns emerge from CWT Data<br><br>Data chats on targeted students | Results of data chats<br>Treasures Reading Assessments<br>BAT Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Utilization of higher level thinking skills. Teachers will attend training on higher level thinking skills and Webb's Depth of Knowledge | | | |
| 3 | 2.Lack of differentiated instruction-assuming students are proficient in all areas of reading | 2.2.<br>Schedule and conduct student/teacher data chats<br><br>A model teacher/NBCT will assist with building capacity across the curriculum areas face-to-face or through videotape.<br><br>PLC to share best practices and lesson study | 2.2.<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Quarterly meetings with administration and Reading Coach<br><br>Demonstration Model will be studied within the framework of a lesson study. | 2.2.<br>Review of log of consultation with classroom teacher |
| 4 | 2.3<br>Failing to have extensive reading on student's independent level | 2.3<br>Utilization of Accelerated Program along with a school-wide Accelerated Reader Incentive Program | 2.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher<br>5. Media Specialist | 2.3<br>Review of AR progress during data chats | 2.3<br>AR Data<br>Treasures Reading Benchmark Assessments<br>BAT Assessments<br>chapter test<br>independent projects correlating to student's reading level. |

| 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 reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | The 2013 FAA will show a positive trend in students scoring at or above a level 7 in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 54.5% (6/11) scored at or above a level 7 in reading. | 72% (8/11) will score at or above a level 7 in reading on the 2013 FAA. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning | |

| | |
|---|---|
| gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | The trend data indicates that our learning gains scores increased in the 11-12. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72% (177/246) made learning gains. | 75% (184/246) of students are expected to make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Grade level material is difficult for some students and they need additional skills and strategy instruction in phonics or fluency instruction. | Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Readers Chart for students who are demonstrating difficulty. | Administration<br>Curriculum Specialist | Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative programs. | IRI, DAR, Fluency Probes, BAT, Mini-benchmarks, STAR, DRA, Rigby. |
| 2 | 3.1.<br><br>Meeting the needs of all students and understanding how to interpret data and align instruction | 3.1.<br>Analyze FCAT scores and identify a model teacher to present a master lesson, which will be observed by other teachers on his/her grade level<br><br>Modeling of a balanced, uninterrupted 120 minute reading block. | 3.1.<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. SIP committee chair | 3.1.<br>Study group will discuss, dissect and have professional conversations to develop research-based lesson plans.<br><br>I-Observation through for instructional strategies | 3.1.<br>Dissaggregate information from CWT for data chats. |
| 3 | 3.2<br>Students have not met benchmark for fluency in reading | 3.2.<br>Continuous monitoring of students via the Fluency Builders in the Treasures reading series, Quick Reads, Great Leaps, and Voyager.<br>Differentiated Instruction | 3.2<br>• Classroom Teacher<br>• Reading Specialist<br>• Collaborative Problem Solving Team | 3.2<br>Progress Monitoring Fluency Assessments in Treasures reading series (Pre, Mid, and Post)<br>Voyager Fluency Benchmark | 3.2<br>Pre, Mid and Post Fluency Tests from Treasures Reading Series/ Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT)<br><br>FAIR- fluency progress monitoring |
| 4 | 3.3<br>Teacher may need training in effective Vocabulary instruction needed for student proficiency | 3.3<br>Daily small group reading instruction using:<br>Trophies assessments<br>• Voyager<br>• Treasures Reading series vocabulary lessons and activities<br>• Differentiated instuction<br><br>Word of the Day infused K-5 in content areas incorporated into daily instruction. | 3.3<br><br>• Classroom Teacher<br>• Reading Specialist<br>• Collaborative Problem Solving Team | 3.3<br>formative and summative data analyzed through the following: Unit Assessment Tests<br>Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests (Mini BATS)<br>Voyager Adventure Check Point<br><br>identify school wide implementation trends through classroom walk through | 3.3<br>Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) |
| 5 | 3.4<br>Teachers will need training in monitoring Comprehension through the RTI process | 3.4<br>Daily small group reading instruction:<br>• Double Dosing students daily<br>• Using STARS, SUPER QAR, Level Readers, and Voyager<br>• Differentiated Instruction | 3.4<br>• Classroom Teacher<br>• Reading Specialist<br>• Collaborative Problem Solving Team | 3.4<br>Treasures Placement Test<br>Benchmark Assessment Tests<br>Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests (Mini BATS)<br>Diagnostic Assessments of Reading (DAR) | 3.4<br>Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Accelerated Reader | | Florida Assessment Voyager Adventure Checkpoint | |

| 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: | The number of students making learning gains on the FAA will increase in 2013. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 42.9% (3/7) students made learning gains in reading. | 57% (4/7) will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FAA. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach<br>Administration | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | The trend data indicates that our learning gains scores for the lowest 25% increased in the 11-12. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (44/65) students in the lowest 25% made a learning gain. | 71% (46/65) students in the lowest 25%, will make a learning gain |

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 | 63% of students made met proficiency.<br><br>Meeting the needs of all students | Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Reading Chart for students who are not demonstrating proficiency. | Team Leaders<br>Curriculum Specialist<br><br>Administration | Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative program(s). | IRI, DAR, Fluency Probes, BAT, mini benchmarks, STAR, DRA, Rigby. |
| 2 | 4.1<br>Meeting the needs of all students in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency | 4.1.<br><br>Teachers will differentiate instruction for all struggling students through the utilization of research-based programs and strategies as follows: | 1. Classroom Teacher<br>2. Reading Specialist<br>3. CPST<br>4. FCAT Coordinator | Progress monitoring of leveled students | DAR, Triumphs assessments,mini benchmarks |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ALL strategies, Great Leaps, Triumphs/treasures, intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons | | | |
| 3 | 4.2<br>Time on task and remediation in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension | 4.2<br><br>Through learning communities and study groups, teachers will use BEEP lessons and IFC's to promote collaborative learning, rigorous instruction, building motivation and confidence. | 4.2<br>1. Classroom Teacher<br>2. Reading Specialist<br>3. CPST<br>4. FCAT Coordinator<br>5. Assistant Principal<br>6. Principal Coordinator | 4.2<br>Analyze data results from Treasures Placement Tests, Mini benchmark Tests, and Treasures Unit Tests | 4.2<br>Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) |
| 4 | 4.3<br>Teachers may not understand the process of monitoring comprehension through the RTI process | 4.3<br>Through learning communities and study groups, teachers will use BEEP lessons and IFC's to promote collaborative learning, rigorous instruction, building motivation and confidence | 4.3<br><br>Reading Specialist<br>Collaborative Problem Solving Team<br>FCAT Coordinator<br>Principal<br>Assistant rincipal<br>Group facilitator | 4.3<br>Analyze data results from Treasures Placement Test<br>Benchmark Assessment Tests<br>Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests (Mini BATS) | Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT)<br><br>Unit and Chapter Tests<br><br>SAT-10<br><br>Standford Diagnostic<br><br>Rigby Benchmark |
| 5 | 4.4<br>Students may not respond to interventions | Teachers will differentiate instruction for all struggling students through the utilization of research-based programs and strategies. Through progress monitoring teachers will assess the effectiveness of the interventions. Students who are not progressing will be referred to CPST.<br><br>Review of consultation log with classroom teacher | 1. Classroom Teacher<br>2. Reading Specialist<br>3. CPST<br>4. FCAT Coordinator<br>5. Assistant Principal<br>6. Principal | Intermittent assessments to monitor goal.<br><br>Consultation meetings with reading coach and administration<br><br>I-Observation for instructional practices<br><br>Teachers will share best practices at PLCs discussing different strategies for student achievement | 4.4.<br><br>Reading chapter tests-selected questions.<br><br>BATs<br>Mini-BATs |

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>5A : In 2016-2017, the percentage of our students demonstrating non-proficiency will be reduced by 50%. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 67 | 70 | 73 | 76 | 79 | |

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 achievement gap in reading proficiency scores for our black population continued to widen on the 11-12 FCAT Reading Assessment. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| The current level of students not making satisfactory progress by subgroup in reading:<br>White:28% (37/134)<br>Black: 46% (54/118)<br>Hispanic: 26% (20/78)<br>Asian: 15% (2/13)<br>American Indian: 50% (2/4) | The expected target Annual Measurable Objective for 2013 in reading by subgroup:<br><br>White:76% (102/134)<br>Black: 56% (66/118)<br>Hispanic: 73% (57/78)<br>Asian:83% (11/13)<br>American Indian: 75% (3/4) |

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 | Meeting the needs of all learners-Black population and total did not meet standards | Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum and intertwine subject areas to increase reading time on task. | Teachers<br>Administration<br>Reading Coach | Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative program(s). | IRI, DAR, Fluency Probes, BAT, mini benchmarks, STAR, DRA, Rigby. |
| 2 | White:82%(126)<br>Black: 67%(70)<br>Hispanic:81% (89)<br>Asian:88% (12)<br>American Indian: 82%(4)<br>Meeting the needs of all students<br>Meeting the needs of diverse subgroups | On a quarterly basis, teachers, administration and support staff will meet to review benchmark data and goal attainment with particular attention to the subgroup progress. Instructional plans and methods will be revised and developed.<br><br>Reading Coach and teacher will meet to set goals and discuss progress.<br><br>Students demonstrating significant deficiencies and failure to respond to interventions implemented in the classroom will be referred to t he Collaborative Problem Solving team. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Quarterly data chats on targeted students | Results of data chats<br>Treasures Reading Assessments, DAR, Rigby Running Records, FAIR progress monitoring ORF passages |
| 3 | Accurately diagnosing reading deficiencies in students who may be 1-2 years below grade level | All level one and two students will be assessed using the Diagnostic Assessment in Reading (DAR). We will ensure that students receive additional instruction in areas of weakness. Students will be assessed intermittently. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Data chats on targeted students<br>Quarterly meetings by administration with reading coach<br>Intermittent assessments to measure progress towards goal. | 5A.2.<br>Results of data chats<br><br>Review of log of consultation with classroom teacher<br><br>Reading chapter test-selected questions, BAT Test ORF assessments. |
| 4 | 5A.3.<br>After the initial reading block scheduling time for intensive instruction | 5A.3.<br>Utilization of the Accelerated Reader Program, Destination Reading and Fountas and Pinnell intervention. | 5A.3.<br>Reading Coach<br>Media Specialist<br>Administration | 5A.3.<br>Quarterly review of AR Reports<br><br>Incentive Plan for school-wide implementation, requiring students to read for 20 minutes each night. | 5A.3.<br>AR reports<br>Destination Reading Tools<br>Fountas and Pinnell running records |

| 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: | We will bridge the achievement gap for our ELL students through a reduction of the number of students non-proficient on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67% (6/9) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress. | 52% (4/9) of ELL students will meet the target Annual Measurable Objective for 2013 as provided by the FL DOE. |

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 | Meeting the needs of all learners-ELL population met proficiency. | Encourage wide reading in nonfictional and fictional text | teacher | Accelerated Reader Assessments | STAR and AR Reports |
| 2 | 5B.1.<br><br>Meeting the needs of all students-students may not be proficient in oral language development/fluency<br><br>cy | 5B.1.<br><br>Identify students in this group through IPT, CELLA and/or Parent registration.<br><br>Readers Theater resources for classroom teachers. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Quarterly Data chats on targeted students | Results of data chats |
| 3 | Students will have difficulty understanding and using the English language. | Ensure they receive additional instruction | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Review of teacher lesson plans including ESOL Strategies | Rigby Assessments |
| 4 | 5B.3.<br>Students not reading widely | 5B.3.<br>Utilization of the Accelerated Reader Program and the Incentive Plan for school-wide implementation, requiring students to read for 20 minutes each night.<br><br>English in my pocket reading books. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Student work portfolio<br><br>Ar Reading reports | AR 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 reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | Data shows are SWD population is far below the proficiency targets of students in other sub groups. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 64% (36/56) students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | By June 2013, 51% (29/56) of the SWD population will meet the target Annual Measurable Objective provided by the FL DOE. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Additional staff may be needed to be included in | Identify the students in this group | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant | Data chats with targeted teachers and students | Results of data chats |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | the classroom to assist SWD students as per their IEP's-additional training in differentiated instruction may be needed for all staff | Use of graphic organizers in lesson instruction | Principal<br>3. ESE Specialist<br>4. Teacher | | |
| 2 | Teachers may need additional training in Phonics,<br>Phonemic Awareness and Fluency strategies for SWD students to achieve AMO's | ALL strategies for Phonics<br>Great Leaps<br>Triumphs<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Treasures Series<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Voyager<br>Brainchild | Classroom Teacher<br>Reading Specialist<br>Collaborative Problem Solving Team<br>FCAT Coordinator | Classroom Walkthrough | DAR, Great leaps, Triumphs assessments<br>FCAT Assessment Test<br><br>Rigby |
| 3 | Students will not be proficient in vocabulary instruction | Utilizing CRISS Strategies and Visual cluing to enhance instruction<br>Elements of Vocabulary<br>Triumphs<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Treasures Series<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Voyager<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>FCAT Camp | Classroom Teacher<br>Reading Specialist<br>Collaborative Problem Solving Team<br>FCAT Coordinator | Focused literacy centers with manipulatives for hands on experience | Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT)<br>Student portfolio<br><br>Elements of Vocabulary |
| 4 | Understanding and the implementation of the RTI process to monitor comprehension | Double Dose daily in small groups<br>STARS<br>Triumphs<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Treasures Series<br>Intervention/Below Level Activities and Lessons<br>Great Leaps<br>Voyager<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>FCAT Camp<br>Wilson Reading | Classroom Teacher<br>Reading Specialist<br>Collaborative Problem Solving Team<br>FCAT Coordinator | Treasures Placement Test<br>Benchmark Assessment Tests<br>Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests (Mini BATS) | Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT) |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | The trend data indicates that our reading proficiency scores declined in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 41% (78/189) of Economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. | By June 2013, 61% (115/189) of the Economically disadvantaged student population will meet the target Annual Measurable Objective provided by the FL DOE. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Meeting the needs of all students-FRL students did not meet standards in reading and math. | Teachers in all grades will be collaborate with team members to ensure that the Common Core Standards are integrated into the curriculum. | Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Reading and Math Charts for students who | Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative programs. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | Grade level material is difficult for some students and they need additional skills and strategy instruction in reading, math and writing fluency instruction. | are not demonstrating proficiency. | | |
| 2 | Meeting the needs of all students-students may not be proficient in fluency. | Differentiated fluency instruction will be implemented in each K-5 classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children in all subgroups. Students will be serviced using the push-in and pullout models.<br><br>Identify students in this group and administer the beginning of the year oral reading passage | 5D.1.<br>Administration<br>Reading Coach<br>Teacher | 5D.1.<br>weekly fluency passages to students not making sufficient progress | Results of basal series and FAIR evaluation tool |
| 3 | Students may not have basic skills needed for proficiency in vocabulary | Teachers attend learning communities focusing on the six areas of reading instruction with emphasis on vocabulary development and strategies. | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Teacher | Quarterly meetings by administration with Reading Coach to review assessments using chapter review from basal | Review of log of consultation with classroom teacher. Graphing of individual student scores to note progress. |
| 4 | Teachers may have limited familiarity with specific reading instruction | Modeling, coaching, conferencing with reading coach and attending staff development for CRISS, Treasures, Literacy Centers K-2,3-5 and Critical Thinking-essential questioning | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Reading Coach<br>4. Team Leader<br>5. National Board Certified Teachers | Classroom Walkthroughs and student progress monitoring. | Classroom Walkthrough data for instructional strategies<br><br>All basal assessments<br>mini BATS<br>BATS |

---

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core Standards Implementation | All Grades/Literacy | Facilitators/Kathy Good and Deborah Brown | Summer Leadership Team | June 11, 2012-June 14, 2012<br>and August 8, 2012 | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot Data;Agenda and Minutes | Administration |
| Common Core Implementation | All Grades/Reading and Math | PLC-Biting into the Common Core: Facilitators Kathleen Connick and Michele Rothacker | All grade levels represented | Initial session on 9/6/12;Weekly Team Meeting Review ofDistrcit Common Core Website, including video clips and focus skills<br><br>Twice a month PLC meetings on the first and third Thursday of each month. | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot Data;Agenda and Minutes; Quarterly Data Chats | Administration<br>Reading Coach<br>PLC Facilitators |
| | | | | | Marzano Formal, | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core Leadership | All grades and core subject areas | Kathy Good and Deborah Brown | Team Leaders | Pathways to the Common Core | Informal and Snapshot Data, Agenda and minutes, book review chats | Administration |
| Marzano presented by BTU | All grades and subjects | Martha Houck | School Wide | 9/18/12 | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot Data, Agenda and Minutes | BTU |
| Increasing Comprehension and Writing from Informational Text | All grades/Reading | David Shelley | School Wide | 9/27/12 | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot Data, Agenda and Minutes | Administration Reading Coach |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Incorporate Reading Comprehension skills through Accelerated Reading | School Improvement Funds | School Improvement Funds | $3,100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $3,100.00 |
| **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: $3,100.00 |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | 52% (26/51) of students will score at the proficient level on the listening/speaking 2013 CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 49% (25/51%) of students scored proficient on the listening/speaking 2012 CELLA. | |
| 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 | Limited Student Vocabulary | Teachers in grades 3-5 will implement Elements of Vocabulary in small groups and build content area vocabulary. | Reading Coach Administration ESOL Coordinator | Monitor student growth through Running Records and data chats | Running Records, BAT 1 and2 data, CELLA 2013 |

| 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: | 35% (17/51) of students will score at the proficient level on the 2013 CELLA in Reading. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 29% (15/51) scored proficient on the 2012 CELLA in Reading. | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of Fluency in the English Language | Teachers will utilize Reader's Theater and Leap Frog in centers and in group activities | Reading Coach Administration | Fluency tests on a weekly basis | FAIR Fluency assessments |

| 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: | 22% (11/51) of students will score proficient on the 2013 writing CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 17% (9/51)students scored proficient on the 2012 writing CELLA. | |

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 | Student knowledge of the basic conventions and structure of the written English Language. | Teachers will differentiate instruction through planned oral language experiences and through the use of the English in My Pocket program. | Reading Coach Administration ESOL Coordinator | Review/Analyze writing samples monthly to determine progress and discuss at data chats. | writing samples |

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 trend data indicates that our mathematics proficiency scores declined in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (119/367) scored a level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics assessment. | 40% (146/367)students are expected to attain proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will be trained in the implementation of the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during Pre-Planning to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. An ongoing PLC for Reading and Mathematics will meet once a month for the entire school year. | PLC Leaders<br>Administration<br>Reading Specialist<br>Summer Leadership Team | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests<br>I-Observation |
| 2 | Teachers limited familiarity with how to accurately interpret data, then use it to drive instruction. | Utilizing Go Math resources to differentiate the instruction of small and whole groups of students. | Math Committee<br><br>FCAT Coordinator<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Teachers will compare pre - post test data to determine if students have shown improvement.<br><br>Teachers will analyze individual student data on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress.<br><br>Quarterly data chats with teachers<br><br>Lesson study to support teachers through implementation | FCAT<br>BAT Mini-BAT<br>Go Math Chapter Test<br>FCAT<br><br>Results of data chats |
| 3 | Lack of knowledge about how to implement differentiated computer lessons. | Differentiated Computer Instruction<br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction using programs such as Destination Math.<br><br>PLC and co-planning to ensure implementation of Destination Math resources. | Math Committee<br><br>FCAT Coordinator<br><br>Assistant Principal | Teachers will compare pre - post test data to determine if students have shown improvement.<br><br>Teachers will analyze individual student data on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress.<br>Teachers will attend training in Destination Math in order to assign differentiated lessons to | FCAT<br>BAT Mini-BAT<br>Go Math Chapter Test<br>FCAT<br><br>Destination Math Reports |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | students. | |
| 4 | Lack of differentiated instruction in the Big Ideasfor Level 3 students who may become Tier 2 and Tier 3 students | Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction.<br>teacher directed instruction<br>in FCAT after school camp<br><br>Computer assisted instruction targeting big ideas: Florida Achieves and Destination Math | Math Committee<br><br>FCAT Coordinator<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Teachers will compare pre -<br>post test data to determine<br>if students have shown improvement.<br><br>Teachers will analyze individual student data on<br>an ongoing basis to monitor<br>student progress.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to monitor implementation<br><br>Professional learning communities will acclimate teachers to NGSSS and newly adopted Go Math series | FCAT<br>BAT Mini-BAT<br>Go Math Chapter Test<br><br>Classroom walkthrough data |
| 5 | Understanding of the implementation of the RTI process to monitor Big Ideas for level 3 students who may fall behind | CPST meets to discuss effective strategies and needs during the baseline, intervention and RTI phases. | Math Committee<br><br>FCAT Coordinator<br><br>CPST | Teachers will compare pre -<br>post test data to determine<br>if students<br><br>Collaboration between ESE and General education teachers through study groups and learning communities | FCAT<br>BAT Mini-BAT<br>Go Math Chapter Test<br>RTI data |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | The number of students scoring level 4,5 and 6 on the FAA will increase in 2013. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 63.6% (7/11) of students scored levels 4,5, and 6 on the 2012 Florida Assessment in Mathematics. | 72% (8/11) of students will score level 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA in mathematics 2013. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach<br>Administration | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. | The trend data indicates that our mathematics proficiency scores declined in the 11-12 school year as a result of the |

| Mathematics Goal #2a: | cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012 32% (118/367) students achieved above proficiency on the FCAT Mathematics Assessment | 40% (146/367)students are expected to achieve above proficiency on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during an early release day to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. | Administration<br>Reading Specialist | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests |
| 2 | Creation of student math centers using big ideas for students above grade level | ESE Specialist will assist teachers in creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | Gifted Certified Teachers<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Math Committee Chair<br><br>Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Distance Learning<br><br>Accelerated Math Camp | BAT Tests<br>GO Math Assessments<br>FCAT<br>Classroom Walk through data-instructional practices |
| 3 | Implementation and understanding of strategies to increase achievement of above level students | Differentiated Instruction | Gifted Certified Teachers<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Math Committee Chair<br><br>Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | Team Leaders will assist the implementation of the GO Math above level material, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | BAT Tests<br>GO Math Assessments<br>FCAT<br>Classroom Walk through data-small group instruction |
| 4 | Teachers understanding and training in new computer programs to differentiate lessons in the big ideas for above level students | Team Leaders will assist the implementation of the GO Math above leveled material, and administration will ensure activities are implemented<br>Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Distance Learning<br><br>Accelerated Math Camp | Gifted Certified Teachers<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Math Committee Chair<br><br>Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | I-Observation snap shots, informal and formal data will be collected on a weekly basis.<br><br>Teams will discuss data from classroom walk-throughs for effectiveness of instruction. | BAT Tests<br>GO Math Assessments<br>FCAT<br>Classroom Walk through data-instructional practices |

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: | The number of students scoring at or above Achievement level 7 in mathematics will improve. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18.2% (2/11) students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. | 36% (4/11) of students scoring at or above a level 7 in mathematics on the FAA. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach<br>Administration | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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:

| | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | The trend data indicates that our mathematics learning gains scores increased in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3 – 5, 74% (182/246) students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math Test.. | 77% (189/246) are expected to make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |

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 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions in the area of Number Sense and Operations | Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>FCAT Camp<br><br>Brainchild and Destination Math differentiated computer lessons | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Curriculum Specialist | Teachers will compare pre - post test data to determine if students have shown improvement.<br><br>Teachers will analyze individual student data on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress.<br><br>Administrators will conduct snapshot, informal and formal observation through I-Observation | FCAT<br><br>BAT<br>Mini-BAT<br><br>Go Math Chapter Test<br><br>I-Observation data-instructional practices<br><br>Reports from computer programs |
| | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions in the big | Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | Teachers will compare pre - post test data to determine | FCAT<br><br>BAT<br>Mini-BAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | ideas. | Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>FCAT Camp<br><br>Brainchild and Destination Math differentiated computer lessons | Curriculum Specialist | if students have shown improvement.<br><br>Teachers will analyze individual student data on an ongoing basis to monitor student progress.<br><br>Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs | Go Math Chapter Test<br><br>I-Observation data-instructional practices<br><br>Reports from computer programs |

| 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: | The number of students making learning gains in math on the FAA will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71% (5/7) | 85% (6/7) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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: | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | The trend data indicates that our mathematics proficiency scores of the lowest 25% increased in the 11-12 school year as a result of the cut-score changes to FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 80% (51/63) of student in the lowest 25% made learning gains.. | 85% (54/63)3-5 grade students in the lowest 25 percent are expected to make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the big ideas and NGSSS. | Go Math<br><br>Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction | CPST<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Strategies and effectiveness will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs-teams will analyze data | BAT data<br>Go Math Assessments<br><br>Classroom |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>FCAT Camp<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math differentiated computer lessons | Math Committee Chair | and formulate a plan of action to address instructional needs. | Walkthrough Data-instructional practices<br><br>Mini Benchmarks |
| 2 | Students lack understanding of understanding of basic concepts in Big Ideas 1, 2, and 3 | Go Math<br><br>Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>FCAT Camp<br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math differentiated computer lessons<br><br>Math Pullout groups | CPST<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal<br><br>Math Committee Chair | Strategies and effectiveness will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs-student engagement | BAT data<br>Go Math Assessments<br><br>Classroom Walkthrough Data-instructional practices<br><br>Mini Benchmarks |
| 3 | Students are not making adequate progress with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions | Go Math<br><br>Math Manipulatives<br><br>Differentiated Instruction and Small Group Instruction<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>FCAT Camp<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math differentiated computer lessons<br><br>Math Pullout groups<br><br>Distance Learning | CPST<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal<br><br>Math Committee Chair | . Monthly data reports will be assessed by curriculum specialist. | BAT data<br>Go Math Assessments<br><br>Classroom Walkthrough Data<br><br>Mini Benchmarks |

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A : In 2016-2017, the percentage of our students demonstrating non-proficiency will be reduced by 50%.

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 65% | 71% | 74% | 77% | 80% | |

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: | By June 2013, the following student populations are expected to increase their levels of performance. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| The current level of students not making satisfactory progress by subgroup:<br>White: 26% (35/134)<br>Black: 53% (63/118)<br>Hispanic:32% (25/78)<br>Asian:100%<br>Am.Indian:25% (1/4) | The expected target Annual Measurable Objective for 2013 provided by the FL DOE:<br>White:76% (102/134)<br>Black:58% (68/118)<br>Hispanic: 72% (56/78)<br>Asian:88%<br>Am.Indian:79% (3/4) |

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 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the big ideas and NGSSS. | Go Math intervention program<br><br>Math manipulatives<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination math below level computer programs<br><br>Pullout math using BEEP math lessons | CPST<br><br>Team leader<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Collaborative Problem Solving Team will monitor response to intervention | BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>I-Observation data-instructional strategies. |
| 2 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the big ideas. | Go Math intervention program<br><br>Math manipulatives<br><br>Calendar Math<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination math below level computer programs<br><br>Pullout math using BEEP math lessons | CPST<br><br>Team leader<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Team Leaders and CPST Leader will assist teachers in creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented. | BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>I-Observation data-instructional strategies. |
| 3 | Teacher implementation and understanding of the RTI process to improve adequate progress of the black student population | CPST will meet to analyze data and target individual students in the subgroup | Curriculum Specialist<br><br>Teacher<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Monitor implementation of RTI through classroom walkthroughs and data chats with teachers and students | Classroom walkthrough data-instructional strategies<br><br>Qualitative data from data chats<br><br>RTI progress monitoring graphs |

| 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: | In grades 3-5, the school will decrease the achievement gap of the ELL student population by meeting the expected level of performance on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33% (3/9) of the English Language Learner student population not making satisfactory progress. | By June 2013, 65%(6/9)of the English Language Learners student population will meet the target Annual Measurable Objective provided by the FL DOE. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students will have difficulty understanding and using the English language. | Identify students in this group | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Teacher | Data chats on targeted students | Results of data chats |
| 2 | Students will have difficulty understanding and using the English language. | Target Weak Areas | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Teacher | Quarterly Meetings with administration and teachers | Review of log of consultation with classroom teacher |
| 3 | Students will have difficulty understanding and using the English language. | Remediate weak areas | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Teacher | Intermittent assessment to measure progress towards goal | Math chapter tests |

| 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: | In grades 3-5, of SWD student population will met the expected level of performance on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 59% (33/56) of the SWD student population not making satisfactory progress. | 57% (32/56)of the SWD population will meet the targeted Annual Measurable Objective in 2013. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the big ideas | Utilizing Go Math resources to differentiate the instruction of small and whole groups of students.<br><br>Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math leveled computer instruction<br><br>Utilizing Touch Math resources to differentiate instruction<br><br>Utilizing Moving with Math for target groups | ESE Resource Teacher<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal | ESE Specialist and Autism Coach will assist teachers in creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented. | Key Math III<br><br>BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>RTI Data |
| 2 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the area of Geometry and Spacial Sense and Algebraic Thinking | Utilize Go Math below level lessons<br><br>Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math leveled computer instruction<br><br>Utilizing Touch Math resources for small group instruction<br><br>Utilizing Moving with Math for target groups | ESE Resource Teacher<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal | Strategies and effectiveness will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs. | Key Math III<br><br>BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br>I-Observation data<br><br>RTI Data |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Teacher understanding of effective strategies to make adequate progress of the SWD student population in the area of data analysis and probability | Utilizing Go Math below level lessons<br><br>Use of manipulatives and hands on through Go Math<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Math leveled computer instruction<br><br>Utilizing Touch Math resources for small group instruction<br><br>Collaboration and accommodations between general education and ESE teachers | ESE Resource Teacher<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal | Monthly data reports will be assessed by the ESE specialist and the Autism Coach<br><br>Teacher meetings with general ed. and ESE teachers to discuss accommodations, grades and lesson planning. | Key Math III<br><br>BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>RTI Data<br><br>Review I-Observation data and lesson plans during data chats |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | In grades 3-5, the achievement gap for the Economically Disadvantaged student population will continue to decrease on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% (87/189) of the economically disadvantaged student population not making satisfactory progress mathematics. | By June 2013, 61% (115/189) of the Economically Disadvantaged student population will meet the target Annual Measurable Objective provided by the FL DOE. |

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 | Meeting the needs of all students-FRL students did not meet standards in reading and math. | Teachers in all grades will be collaborate with team members to ensure that the Common Core Standards are integrated into the curriculum.<br><br>Grade level material is difficult for some students and they need additional skills and strategy instruction in reading, math and writing fluency instruction. | Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Reading and Math Charts for students who are not demonstrating proficiency. | Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative programs. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests |
| 2 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the area of Number Sense and Operations and Measurement | Go Math below level interventions<br><br>Math manipulative centers<br><br>BEEP math lessons<br><br>Florid Achieves and Destination Reading leveled computer instruction<br><br>Math pullout groups | Curriculum Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal | Curriculum Specialist will assist teachers in creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented. | BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>Go Math assessments<br><br>FCAT |
| | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier | Go Math below level interventions | Classroom teacher<br><br>Curriculum | Strategies and effectiveness will be monitored through | BAT<br><br>Mini BAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 interventions in the area of Geometry and Spatial Sense and Algebraic Thinking | Math manipulative centers<br><br>BEEP math lessons<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Reading leveled computer instruction<br><br>Math pullout groups | Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal | classroom walkthroughs. | Go Math assessments<br><br>FCAT<br><br>I-Observation Data |
| 4 | Teacher understanding and the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in the area of Data Analysis and Probability | Go Math below level interventions<br><br>Math manipulative centers<br><br>BEEP math lessons<br><br>Florida Achieves and Destination Reading leveled computer instruction<br><br>Math pullout groups | Classroom teacher<br><br>Curriculum Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | . Record of student success on mini benchmarks and Benchmark Assessments will be monitored and maintained by support teachers.<br><br>Quarterly teacher data chats will be conducted | BAT<br><br>Mini BAT<br><br>Go Math assessments<br><br>FCAT<br><br>I-Observation Data<br><br>Qualitative data from teacher data chats |
| 5 | Teacher understanding of student poverty and the effects of poverty on student achievement | Staff training in Ruby Payne's understanding poverty | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Guidance Counselor<br><br>District Staff | Monitor through data chats with teachers and students<br><br>Guidance Counselor conferences and small groups | Qualitative and Quantitative data from teacher and student conferences.<br><br>Monitor Guidance Plan |

*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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Understanding the Math Common Core Standards and linking them to instructional practices | All Grades | Team Leaders Administration ESE Specialist | All teachers | Weekly Team Meetings utilizing video links from the Common core district website | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot; Agenda and Minutes | Team Leaders Administration |
| Common Core Implementation | All Grades | Administration Summer Leadership Team | School Wide | 8/14/12 | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshots; Agenda and Minutes, Quarterly Data Chats; Pre and Post Conferences | Administration |
| Common Core Implementation | All Grades | PLC:Biting into the Common Core-Math Gayle Pritchard | All grade levels represented | Initial Session 9/13/12; meets twice a month on the second and fourth Thursday of each month | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snapshot, Agenda and Minutes; Quarterly Data Chats | PLC Facilitaor Administration |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Determine baseline proficiency of Math Skills through STAR Math program to build differentiated math planning in the classrooms | STAR Math program to test knowledge of math skills. | School Improvement funds | $3,100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $3,100.00 |
| **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: $3,100.00 |

*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: | Students in grades 5, students will achieve a level 3 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33% (43/129) students achieved a level 3 | 40% (51/129)students will achieve a level 3 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will be trained in the implementation of the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during Pre-Planning to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. An ongoing PLC for Reading and Mathematics will meet once a month for the entire school year. | PLC Leaders<br>Administration<br>Reading Specialist<br>Summer Leadership Team | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests<br>I-Observation |
| | 1.1<br>Teachers need to analyze data in order | 1.2<br>Review Webb's DOK levels | 1.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant | 1.4<br>Conduct Data chats with administration | 1.5<br>BEEP Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | to plan and teach students' critical thinking skills | Use the 5 E Model of Instruction<br><br>Instructional Focus Calendars, BEEP lessons, Hands-on science kits, Florida Science Fusion, and science journals. | Principal<br>4. Teacher | to review data from formative and summative evaluations Significant trends and patterns emerge through CWT<br><br>Lesson Study<br>Lesson plan checklists | District Benchmark Test results |
| 3 | 2.1<br>Students lack prior learning in specific science content areas. | 2.2<br>Analyze deficiencies in science through lack of exposure to lab explorations<br>Florida Science Fusion diagnostic assessments (Think Central) to see possible deficiencies of current students | 2.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Media Specialist<br>4. Teacher | 2.4<br>Strand weakness remediation in classroom and media included in teacher lesson plans<br><br>Weekly classroom walk-throughs-teams will analyze data and provide feedback<br><br>Review of science journal rubrics, monthly giving student feedback | 2.5<br>Science Journals and rubrics<br><br>Fusion science assessments<br><br>Mini BAT |
| 4 | 3.1<br>Students will not be proficient in essential vocabulary needed to be successful in science. | 3.2<br>Enrich curriculum with in-house field trips, National Geographic for kids-Science Weeklies, Bookflix<br><br>Incorporate a science word of the day | 3.3<br>1.Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Computer Tech.<br>4. Teacher | 3.4<br>Scienceaurus used to enhance vocabulary<br><br>Include word of the day in lesson plans | 3.5<br><br>Lesson plan checklists<br><br>Review of teacher lesson plans during quarterly data chats. |
| 5 | Students lacking foundational knowledge in the Big Ideas | Enrich curriculum with in-house field trips, National Geographic for kids, Science Weeklies and Bookflix | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Computer Tech.<br>Teacher | Bookflix used in the computer lab<br><br>Fusion online virtual experiment<br><br>Quarterly data chats | Online Big Idea Tests<br><br>Mini-BATS |

| 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: | The number of students scoring at levels 4, 5 and 6 in science on the FAA will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% (1/2) | 100% (2/2) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and assessments. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 on FAA. | | | | |

| 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: | In grades 5, of students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 12% (16/129) achieved a level 4 or 5 | 20% (25/129) students will achieve a level 4 or 5 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards. | Teachers in all grades will be trained during an early release day to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. | Administration<br>Reading Specialist | Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. | Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests |
| 2 | 2.1<br>Using science to identify text complexity in Physical and Chemical Sciences | Review FCAT scores | 1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Media Specialist | Quarterly data chats with administration<br><br>Significant trends and patterns emerge through I-Observation<br><br>Lesson Study | 1.5.<br>Chapter Tests |
| 3 | 2.1<br>Using science to identify text complexity in Life and Environmental Sciences | 2.2<br><br>Target weak area | 2.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Media Specialist | 2.4<br>Strand weakness remediation in classroom and media | 2.5<br>Science Journals<br>Science mini-bats |
| 4 | 3.1<br>Scientific Thinking | 3.2<br>Remediate weak areas | 3.3<br>1.Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal<br>3. Computer Tech. | Science enrichment through science alive and hands of experiments | Science journals and rubrics |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | The number of students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0/2) students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in science on the FAA. | 50% (1/2) students scoring at or above achievement level 7 in science on the FAA. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collaborative Team Planning | All Levels/Science | Curriculum Specialist Administration | All Teachers | Quarterly 9/28/12 1/18/13 3/22/13 5/24/13 | Marzano Formal, Informal and Snap Shots | Administration |
| Data Chats/Data Disaggregation Strategies | fourth and fifth grade science | Administration | All Fourth and Fifth grade teachers | October 10, 2013 | Data chats with learning gains and goals | Administration |
| Instructional strategies to comprehend informational text using hands-on experiments and science journals | All levels | Team Leaders Reading Specialist | All teachers | September 2012-June 2013 | Modeling of lessons for follow up; teacher lesson plans | Administration Reading Coach Team Leaders |

Science Budget:

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

## 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: | By June 2013, students will achieve a level 3.0 or high on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 85% (101/119) students achieved a level 3 or above | 88% (104/119)students achieved a level 3 or above |

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>Students do not have basic writing skills for proficiency | 1.2<br>Analyze student writing ability<br><br>Follow IFC for writing<br><br>Students will use cooperative learning and peer editing | 1.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal | 1.4<br><br>Teachers will evaluate based on the six traits of writing rubric | 1.5<br>The six traits of writing rubric |
| 2 | 2.1<br>Students do not have adequate progress in basic writing skills needed for proficiency in sentence structure | 2.2<br>Target weak areas<br>• Writing Superstars<br>• BEEP lessons to teach writing lessons. | 2.3<br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal | 2.4<br>Data chats with classroom teachers will be used to discuss students strengths and weaknesses.<br><br>Student-Teacher conferences | 2.5<br>The six traits of writing rubric. |
| 3 | 3.1<br>Students may be in need of additional assistance outside of the classroom | 3.2<br>Through teacher modeling use of document camera and modeling.<br><br>FCAT Writing Camp | 3.3<br><br>1. Principal<br>2. Assistant Principal | 3.4<br>Student writing samples in after school writing camp folders. | 3.5<br>The six traits of writing rubric |

| 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: | The number of students scoring at 4 or higher in writing on the FAA will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 80% (4/5) scored at 4 or higher in writing on the FAA. | 100% (5/5) will score a level 4 or higher in writing on the FAA. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students specific learning disability and the unique manifestation in each child as it applies to learning reading may be a barrier for achieving level 4,5, or 6 on FAA. | Staff will use PLC time to investigate research based strategies and programs to address individual student needs. | ASD Coach, Administration ESE Specialist | Teachers will maintain data books with IEP and assessment data collected throughout the year. | Quarterly data chats to analyze data and discuss instructional strategies, programs and 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching revision and editing strategies | K-5 | Curriculum Specialist | K-5 Classrooms | Monthly Team Meetings | Monitor students writing portfolios, notebooks, or journals. The students will make revisions and edit so their self correcting behavior can be easily monitored | Administration Reading Specialist Team Leaders |
| Expository and Narrative writing | 2-4 | Writing Committee Chair | 2-4 Classroom Teachers | September 2012-June 2013 | Monthly learning communities in writing with a focus on strategies for writing expository and narrative papers. | Administration<br><br>Curriculum Specialist Writing Committee chair |
| PLC/Six Traits of Writing | 4th grade teachers | Team Leader | 4th grade Teachers | September 2012-June 2013 | graded writing prompts | 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: | By June 2013, attendance rate for the school will be at |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 96% (131121/136641) current attendance rate | 98% (133908/136641) expected attendance rate |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 3% (25/761) | 2% (20/761)expected number of student absences |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 118/761 (15%) students have excessive tardies | 10% (76/761)students will have excessive tardies |

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 | Elementary students must rely on parents to bring them to school | Parent incentives to bring their students to school on time<br><br>Parent Link callouts | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>Social Worker<br>IMT | Monitor attendance of targeted students and make home contact with parents<br>BTIP Process | DWH records |
| 2 | Parents not understanding the importance of adhering to the attendance policy | Communication of district attendance policy in open house meetings, conferences, school newsletter, and website.<br><br>Utilize parent link system to inform parents of absences<br><br>Meetings with parents of students with a pattern of non-attendance.<br><br>Social Worker involvement | Administration | Review of daily, monthly and quarterly attendance | Attendance Reports |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Framework for Understanding Poverty | All Teachers | Administration | Leadership Team Members | Monthly Leadership Team | Review Leadership Agenda and Minutes | Administration |
| Student Achievement | K-5 Attendance | Social Worker | K-5 Teachers | August 2012-June 2013 | Pinnacle data | IMT |

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | By June 2013, student suspension rates will decrease to 20 (2%) -internal suspension and 14 external suspensions. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 29/761 (3%) internal suspensions | 20/761 (2%) internal suspensions |

| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
|---|---|
| 15/761 (1%) total number of students suspended in-school | (0.5%) 7/761 expected number of students suspended in-school. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 7 (NA%) | 3 (NA%) |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 5 (NA%) | 3 (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 | Understanding and implementation of the RTI process may not be understood | staff development in effective behavior interventions | CORE team<br><br>School Psychologist<br><br>ESE Specialist<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Principal | Review RTI data | RTI Graphs |
| 2 | Students not familiar with school wide expectations | Students will be oriented to the CCES School wide discipline plan | Administration Teachers | I-Observation data | student referrals |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Classroom Management | K-5 | Team Leader | PLC | team level meetings | Team Meeting minutes | Principal<br>Assistant Principal |

Suspension Budget:

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

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>**Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | June 2013, parent involvement in school activities and events will increase to 60%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| About 55% of our parents participate in school activities and events. | 60% of parents are expected to be involved in school activities and events. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The economy has forced many families to go back to work. | Combine events with student work or performances. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Specialist. | Survey to be completed at the end of the year. | Annual District and School Customer Survey. |
| 2 | Parents busy and unable to attend events due to work demands and/or failure to recognize the importance | Schedule Family nights to encourage parents to participate in hands on activities with students. | Administration | Review of Sign-In sheets documenting attendance | Attendance sheets |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A Framework For Understanding Poverty | All Teachers | Principal | Leadership Team | Leadership team agendas | Leadership team meeting agenda | Principal |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Inform parents of current curriculum topics such as common core. | Common Core informational packets | title I | $1,800.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,800.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $1,800.00 |

*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: | 33% (43/129) students achieved a level 3, 12% (16/129) achieved a level 4 or 5, and overall<br>47% scored at a level 3 or higher . In order to effectively master the Common Core Standards, students will head to utilize technology, inquiry and integration of disciplines |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of working computers | FCAT Explorer, Science Alive and Use of research on laptop carts for intermediate level | Micro. Computer Technology Specialist<br><br>Administration | Research logs and projects<br><br>Electronic portfolios through Microsoft Word, Powerpoint and Key Note. | Teacher lesson plans<br>Graded Assignments |
| | Teacher knowledge regarding instruction | Weekly science-based lessons aligned with | Teachers | Science fair projects for academic nights | Rubrics |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | through inquiry | instructional framework | Administration<br><br>School Science Representative | | |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

### Technology Goal:

| 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: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Technology Goal<br><br>Technology Goal #1: | 75% of instructional teachers will use digital tools to engage students in exploring real world issues in the areas of reading, math, and writing. |
| 2012 Current level: | 2013 Expected level: |
| 65% of instructional teachers will use digital tools to engage students in exploring real world issues in the areas of reading, math, and writing. | 75% of instructional teachers will use digital tools to engage students in exploring real world issues in the areas of reading, math, and writing. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Meeting the needs of all teachers-differing level of technological abilities | Provide training through team meetings and committee meetings. | Administration | Marzano formal, informal and snapshot data | I Observation |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I-Pod Touch Training | K-5 | Zach Barbarosh | School-K-5 Teachers | Monthly | PLC Followup Assignments | Administration<br>ESE Specialist<br>Team Leaders |
| I-Pad Training | K-5 | Zach Barbarosh | Maria Salomatoff-Media<br>Michelle Rothacher-2nd<br>Marcia Fay-3<br>ESE Resource Teacher<br>ESE Specialist Autism<br>ClusterTeachers<br>Autism Coach | Monthly | PLC Follow up Activities | Administration<br>ESE Specialist<br>Autism Coach |

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 Technology Goal(s)*

## FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Incorporate Reading Comprehension skills through Accelerated Reading | School Improvement Funds | School Improvement Funds | $3,100.00 |
| Mathematics | Determine baseline proficiency of Math Skills through STAR Math program to build differentiated math planning in the classrooms | STAR Math program to test knowledge of math skills. | School Improvement funds | $3,100.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Inform parents of current curriculum topics such as common core. | Common Core informational packets | title I | $1,800.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $8,000.00 |
| **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 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $8,000.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

( ) Priority ( ) Focus ( ) Prevent ( ) NA

Are you a reward school: (•) Yes ( ) No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

## 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 |
| --- | --- |
| SAC will utilize funds to purchase ILS programs to help with student achievement. | $5,200.00 |

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

SAC will monitor and review the School Improvement Plan on a monthly basis. SAC will review school data on a monthly basis and make decisions for school improvement based on needs of school. SAC will make decisions that will comply with the school improvement plan. SAC will review and discuss ways to make the school better academically.

# AYP DATA

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

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Broward School District<br>COCONUT CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL<br>2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 81% | 83% | 93% | 54% | 311 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 68% | 68% | | | 136 | 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? | 63% (YES) | 65% (YES) | | | 128 | 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 | | | | | 575 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Broward School District<br>COCONUT CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 83% | 84% | 90% | 58% | 315 | 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 | 67% | 67% | | | 134 | 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? | 51% (YES) | 60% (YES) | | | 111 | 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 | | | | | 560 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |