FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GRAND RIDGE SCHOOL

District Name: Jackson

Principal: Randy G. Ward

SAC Chair: Kristy Edwards

Superintendent: Lee W. Miller

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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)
					2011-2012 Principal, Grand Ridge School, Grade A, Reading Mastery for level 3 and above 58%, Math mastery for level 3 and above in elementary 64% and middle school 67%, Writing Mastery 79% 2010-2011 Principal Grand Ridge School, Grade A, Reading Mastery 71%, Math Mastery 76%, Writing Mastery 86%, Science Mastery 49%, AYP 87%, Total Population, White, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not meet reading proficiency, Black subgroup did not meet math proficiency. 2009-2010 Principal Grand Ridge School, Grade B, Reading Mastery 72%, Math Mastery 65%, Writing Mastery 78%, Science Mastery 51%, AYP 95%, Economically Disadvantaged did not meet math proficiency 2008-2009 Principal Marianna High School,Grade D, Reading mastery 50%,

Principal	Randy G. Ward	BS: University of West Florida; M.Ed. University of West Florida	2	10	Math mastery 81%;Writing mastery 90%, Science mastery 39%, AYP 82%; Whites, Blacks and Economicay Disdvantaged did not meet reading proficiencies. Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged did not meet math proficiencies 2007-2008: Principal Marianna High School, Grade C, Reading mastery 51%; Math mastery 81%, Writing mastery 92%, Science mastery 38%, AYP 85%. Blacks and Economically disadvantaged did not meet reading or math proficiencies. 2006-2007: Principal Marianna High School, Grade D, Reading mastery 41%, Math mastery 76%, Wriging mastery 84%, Science mastery 44%, AYP 74%. Whites, Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged and students with Disabilities did not meet the reading proficiencies. Blacks, Economically Disadvangaged, and Students with Disabilities did not meet reading or math proficiencies. 2005-06: MMS A No 2004-05: MMS A No 2003-04: MMS A No 2002-03: Riverside A No 2001-02: Riverside A No
Assis Principal	Ken Granger	BS: University of West Florida;	6		2011-2012 Teacher/Athletic Director, Grand Ridge School, Grade A, Reading Mastery for level 3 and above 58%, Math mastery for level 3 and above in elementary 64% and middle school 67%, Writing Mastery 79% 2010-2011 Teacher/Athletic Director, Grand Ridge School, Grade A, Reading Mastery 71%, Math Mastery 76%, Writing Mastery 86%, Science Mastery 49%, AYP 87%, Total Population, White, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not meet reading proficiency, Black subgroup did not meet math proficiency. 2009-2010 Teacher/Athletic Director, Grand Ridge School, Grade B, Reading Mastery 72%, Math Mastery 65%, Writing Mastery 78%, Science Mastery 51%, AYP 95%, Economically Disadvantaged did not meet math proficiency

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)
Curriculum/Reading	Vicki Taylor	Miami Christian College, Miami, FL --BS in Elementary Education Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT- Master of Arts in Teaching	1	1	2011-2012 Grand Ridge School, Grade A, Reading Mastery for level 3 and above 58%, Math mastery for level 3 and above in elementary 64% and middle school 67%, Writing Mastery 79% Three years of data from her previous school, Riverside Elementary, where she worked as a teacher is listed. 2010-2011: School Grade A, AYP 85%, Reading Mastery 73%, Math Mastery 77%, Total Population, Black subgroup and Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not meet reading proficiency or math proficiency. 2009-2010: School Grade A, AYP 85%, Reading mastery 73%, Math mastery 78%, Writing Mastery 91%; Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet reading

					or math proficiency. 2008-2009: School Grade A, AYP 95%, Reading Mastery 75%, Math Mastery 79%, Writing Mastery 94%, Economically Disadvantaged, Black, and Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet reading mastery; Black and Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet math mastery.

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. Recruit- Jackson County works with Chipola College to recruit newly graduated teachers. Jackson County is also a partner with the Panhandle Area Education Consortium that advertises job openings for the district that is accessible on the World Wide Web.	Deputy Superintendent- Larry Moore; Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-	August 2012- June 2013	
2	2. Retain- Newly hired teachers are provided a mentor and district support through the beginning teacher program.	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal-	July 2012-June 2013	
3	3. Retain- Professional development opportunities through the coordination of local, state, and federal funds sources to increase teacher effectiveness and retain qualified teachers by providing a conducive environment for improving professional knowledge	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
4	4. Retain- provide resources (tutoring for subject area exams, reimbursement for reading endorsement, reimbursement for college courses, etc.) for teachers to obtain their professional teaching certificate; become highly-qualified in subject areas taught; and renewal of professional certificates for veteran teachers	Director of Elementary and Early Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Principal- ; Michael Kilts- Supervisor of Federal Programs	July 2012-June 2013	
5	5. Retain- Support teachers to improve instructional practices through the evaluation process developed through Race to the Top using the Marzano Frameworks.	Director of Elementary Education- Cheryl McDaniel; Teacher Evaluation Manager- Don Wilson; Principal-	September 2012- June 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
N/A	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
45	6.7%(3)	24.4%(11)	44.4%(20)	24.4%(11)	22.2%(10)	100.0%(45)	15.6%(7)	0.0%(0)	17.8%(8)

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
Tonya Gardner	Kacee Pittman	Kacee is a first year teacher that has been placed in the middle school setting. Tonya is a veteran middle school teacher who has received many awards and commendations on her teaching style.	Classroom observations; lesson planning meetings; lesson breakdowns; checklists that are designated by the district
Amy Moss	Hannah Jones	Amy is the reading lead teacher. Hannah will be teaching reading in the sixth grade. Amy has helped develop the reading curriculum plan for GRS and will help Hannah navigate through the reading requirements.	Classroom observations; lesson planning meetings; lesson breakdowns; checklists that are designated by the district
Anna Scott	Brian Collins	Brian previously worked with Anna as a paraprofessional in an ESE classroom. Anna has a positive rapport with Brian and has extensive knowledge of the problems Brian may face as a first year teacher.	Classroom observations; lesson planning meetings; lesson breakdowns; checklists that are designated by the district

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition

programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students receiving additional remediation are assisted through services such as after-school programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents.
Contact is maintained with Maria Pouncey, Migrant Program Coordinator. Established collaboration includes but is not limited to: a) assistance with interpretation for migrant parents at IEP meetings, parent meetings, teacher conferences, etc., b) Summer school or in-home tutorials for migrant students, and c) supplementary educational materials for teachers serving migrant students. Migrant staff will monitor grades, attendance and confer, as needed, with teachers and parents regarding academic progress. Supplementary tutorials are offered to Priority for Services students on a regular basis during the school year, all other migrant students will receive tutorial services as needed. Home visits are conducted as needed based on grades and attendance, and to offer health education and assistance to meet social service needs.

In-home tutorials with highly qualified personnel are offered during the summer for migrant eligible students. The curriculum is designed to improve reading comprehension, language expression, and writing.

Title I, Part D

Supplemental Support is provided for our Teen Parenting Program with the addition of a computer lab with support to Level I and Level II middle/ high school students with access to ClassWorks and after-school tutoring.

Title II

Title IIA funds were used :

To improve and increase teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and enable teachers to become highly qualified;

Give teachers and principals the knowledge and skills to help students meet challenging State academic standards;

Improve classroom management skills;

Are sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused and are not one-day or short-term workshops;

Advance teacher understanding of effective instruction strategies that are based on scientifically based research;
To help reduce the student teacher ratio
To provide incentives for teachers to add reading endorsement to their certificates
Funds were used to pay the salaries for seven extra teachers to help reduce the teacher student ratio and 6 teachers received $2400.00 as a one-time bonus for adding reading endorsement to their certificate. ($317,277.22 salaries and $70,317.84 benefits).
Funds were also used to provide supplemental professional development activities during the summer that assisted teachers and staff with understanding how to use technological tools with their academic subjects ($32,406.33).

Title III

n/a

Title X- Homeless

Title X – Homeless District Liaison works with schools to provide resources for students who are identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI Funds are provided to enrich the remediation opportunities for students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence and Prevention Programs: The district promotes a Safe Drug Free Environment at all schools. Random drug testing for students involved in extra curricular activities.

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs: Our District supports the Jackson County Wellness Policy

Housing Programs

n/a

Head Start

Head Start
The School District of Jackson County provides various early childhood programs serving children birth to 5 years old. These programs consist of Early Head Start, Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education.
Early Head Start serves children from birth to 3 years old who meet eligibility requirements mandated by federal regulations. Early Head Start in Jackson County grants priority and ensures services to children of mothers who participate in the district's Teenage Parenting Program.
The Jackson County School District's prekindergarten program serves children who meet eligibility requirements for Head Start, Voluntary PreK and Exceptional Student Education programs at six different sites. Although funded separately, all preschool programs complement one another in many ways and are integrated to provide the most developmentally appropriate environment for three and four year old children. These programs share staff, implement a common curriculum and follow the same daily schedule of activities both indoors and outdoors within their individual school sites. Comprehensive health and family services are provided to all families, although only required for Head Start. This collaboration makes available many inclusion opportunities for children with disabilities simultaneously meeting Head Start federal regulations for enrollment opportunities.

Adult Education

Adult Education offers programs in: Adult Basic Education, High School Credit Completion, and GED (General Educational Development) Study.

Career and Technical Education

Career and Technical Education programs integrate essential skills in an applied setting, thus strengthening and supporting a rigorous and relevant curriculum. Jackson County School District further utilizes form JC-346(Vocational Component of an ESE student's IEP) to coordinate teaching methods between the individual school's ESE departments and the Career and Technical Education departments

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal Randy Ward: Functions as the Instructional Leader; provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal Ken Granger: ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI and ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation.

RtI Team Leader - Jenny Bryan: Participate in collection and analysis of data; provides services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention based on individual student needs; directs activities of the team.

Record Keeper - Barbara Melvin: Participates in collection and analysis of data; documents and completes all paperwork required in the meetings; serves as the time keeper; announces agreed-upon time periods for discussion and other activities, and informs the team when time is running short.

Data Coach/Technology Specialist - Kristy Edwards: Provides expertise and technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and other staff regarding data management and display.

Content Specialist/Staff Liaison - Vicki Taylor: Provides guidance and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; assists in training the interventionist in using curricular materials/interventions when necessary. Key communicator with staff.

Behavior Specialist - Anna Scott: Assists in student data collection; provides assistance in identifying function of appropriate behaviors and in designing Behavior Intervention Plans when necessary. This person may also assist in training the

interventionist on behavioral strategies when necessary.

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 MTSS team will meet once a month to identify students who are falling behind in academics or are having repeated behavior problems in the classroom in order to move them into tier II. The team will meet three times per year to review baseline, midyear, and end of the year data to identify areas of need in tier 1 instruction. The MTSS team collaborates with other teams such as the School Advisory Council, grade group teams, positive behavior support teams, and literacy team to analyze areas of need/behavioral domains, and initiates instructional modifications as needed to increase student achievement for all students.

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

The MTSS team's role in developing and implementing the school improvement plan is to provide resources and support to students and staff to achieve the goals listed in the plan. It is the MTSS team's job to ensure student needs are being met across the campus, both behaviorally and educationally. Therefore, it is imperative that the team understands the school goals and works to help teachers bridge the gaps of student achievement in the classrooms. The team meets three times a year after universal screenings to engage in data-base problem solving to evaluate the goals of the SIP and target core, supplemental and individual student needs. The results are shared with the SAC.

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.

T1,T2,T3 - PMRN/FAIR reports (reading), JCPA (reading & math K-2), Thinklink (math, reading), Performance matters (reading, math, science, writing, discipline), Pinnacle (reading, math, science), District Writing, Office Discipline Referrals/TERMS

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Staff Liaison on the SST will continue to collaborate with grade groups on the PS/MTSS process. District PS/MTSS Coordinator will continue to provide training and consultation with the school-based SST throughout the school year. New teachers will receive training on the PS/MTSS process as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through district wide trainings, as well as on site trainings and consultation, and through collaboration with all other school-based teams focusing to improve student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Vicki Taylor, Amy Moss, Nicole Kleiser, Ashley Pelt, Linda Long, LeAnna Hataway, Anna Scott, Mackenzie Johnson, Tonya Gardner, Randy Ward

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

The school-based will meet quarterly to look at reading ThinkLink and FAIR results and make recommendations for improvement in reading instruction.

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

The team will analyze data and assist teachers in making instructional decisions for reading school-wide.

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.

The District Pre-Kindergarten staff requires the following procedures to be followed:

Prekindergarten Staff will:
1. Meet with Kindergarten staff and Parent Representative to plan transition activities and complete a participants list for the meeting.
2. Complete a Transition Data Form for each student.
3. Meet with Prekindergarten parents for an end-of-year comprehensive conference.
4. Return the Transition B Planning Form to their Support Services Coordinator.

Kindergarten Staff will:
1. Meet with PreK teachers to plan transition activities.
2. Conduct a learning activity with all PreK students.
3. Provide materials related to Kindergarten to parents.

Support Services Coordinator will:
1. Meet with PreK/K teachers for planning of transition activities.
2. Coordinate and meet with parents at the end-of-year comprehensive Conference.
3. Collect participant list from: Transition Planning Meeting, School Readiness Meeting, and Family Comprehensive Conference.

4. Attach participants list to Transition Form B and file in PreK office.

*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.

As a team, we are creating Reading Strategy Focus Calendars. These calendars will have focus lessons for content area teachers that can be infused into the lesson plans and instructional delivery. The skills will be posted in the classrooms to make students aware of the focus lessons. Lesson plans will be checked periodically to ensure that these strategies are being incorporated by every teacher.

*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?

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2012, 29% of students in grades 3 through 8 scored a level 3 on reading. We hope to bring up our bubble students and fluent level twos to a level three this year increasing our percentage from 29% to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (127) of students in grades 3-8 scored a level 3	36% (165)

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	Testing format; lack of self-monitoring comprehension skills	practice tests in FCAT format; perform explicit instruction in reading comprehension in all subject areas; provide time for Lexia computer program for struggling students	Administrators	ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR; STAR; teacher created assessments
2	Using reading skills in the content area	Teachers will be given a reading strategy to cover in the content areas once a month to improve student comprehension.	Administrators	ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR; STAR; teacher created assessments
3	Teachers' understanding of data	Provide 3 sessions throughout the year to improve teacher understanding of all data (FAIR, STAR, Thinklink and FCAT)by identifying students who are scoring below grade level on assessments and identifying which strand in the subject has the lowest scores for each assessment.	Administrators	Ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR; STAR; FCAT; Thinklink
4	Lack of resources i.e., informational text and leveled text for below grade level students.	Vicki Taylor has worked with the county specialist to gather text sets and leveled readers for all classes.	Administrators	Student Achievement Results/Ongoing Progress Monitoring	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	We have three alternatively assessed students. Last year, two of the three scored a level 4,5, or 6 with the other scoring a level 7. We would like to maintain these students' levels or help them move up.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(2)	66%(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	Lack of resources i.e., informational text and leveled text for below grade level students.	Vicki Taylor has worked with the county specialist to gather text sets and leveled readers for all classes.	Administrators	Onging progress monitoring	Thinklink, Alternative Assessment, Teacher created 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. Reading Goal #2a:	From 2010-2011, the percentage of students scoring level 4 or 5 in reading exceeded our goal of 27%. Grand Ridge students increaased from 24% (100 students) to 33% (133 students). In 2012, 35% (164) of Grand Ridge students will score a level 4 or 5 on the reading assessment portion of the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 33% (133) of students tested in grades 3 through 8 scored a level 4 or 5 in reading.	In 2012, 35% (approximately 164) of students at Grand Ridge School will score a level 4 or 5 on the reading portion of the 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	Testing format; lack of self-monitoring comprehension skills	practice tests in FCAT format; provide explicit instruction in fix-up strategies for comprehension; Lexia computer program practice for struggling readers;ongoing reading practice through accelerated reader	All content area teachers will infuse the reading benchmarks in lesson plans and instructional delivery;administrators	ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR; STAR; teacher assessments
2	Student motivation	Teachers will work to include text that is interesting to higher level students.	Vicki Taylor/Randy Ward	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Of the three alternatively assessed students at GRS, one scored a level 7. We would like to keep this student at a level seven and possible add another student for a total of 66% scoring a level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(1)	33%(1) to 66%(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	Student motivation	Teachers will work to include text that is interesting to higher level students.	Vicki Taylor/Randy Ward	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Last year, over half of our students in grades 4 through 8 showed learning gains by making one year's growth or maintaining or gaining a level.. We hope to continue the student growth by having 60% of our students showing learning gains for the 2013 assessments.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (220) of students made reading learning gains.	60%(278)

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 scored lowest on reference/research	Teachers will increase instruction on reference and research both in the classroom and in the computer lab by using the online Newsbank program purchased by the district.	Teacher and principal	formal and informal assessments	FCAT explorer, teacher made tests, teacher observation
2	Online testing	Students will practice taking online assessments with the Thinklink test and FAIR; struggling readers will receive additional practice through Lexia.	Teachers/Vicki Taylor/Kristy Edwards	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	We would like to see all three alternatively assessed students make learning gains on this year's test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(2)	100%(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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Based on the previous year's test, 55% of our 4th through 8th graders made learning gains. This year, we would like to improve to 60% of our lowest 25% making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (56) of lowest 25% made learning gains	60%(72)

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 struggle with self motivation and often lack parental support and/or involvment.	We will increase small group activities with high-interest curriculum and provide occasional rewards. We will encourage parent communication through progress reports and student planners.	Teacher and Assistant Principal	Teacher observation of participation, formal assessment	teacher made tests, daily assignments

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : At GRS, 38% of black students are proficient in reading while 67% of white students are proficient in reading. This leaves a gap of 28%. We hope to reduce this gap over the next five years to 14%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62	65	69	72	76	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	At GRS, we will try to reduce the amount of non-proficient students over the next five years to half of the current non-proficiency rate.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:67% (207) proficient; 33% (103) non-proficient Black:39% (32) proficient; 61% (51) non-proficient	White:70% Black:45%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers' understanding of data	Provide sessions throughout the year to improve teacher understanding of all data (FAIR, JCPA, JCMA, Thinklink and FCAT) so that they can target specific student needs in their instruction.	Administrators	Ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR, STAR , FCAT, JCPA, JCMA, Thinklink
2	Closing the achievement gap	Providing opportunities to extend student learning in critical thinking classes with both remediation and enrichment; providing remediation in the mornings before school for elementary and middle school students, as well as pull out programs during the day.	Administrators	Ongoing progress monitoring	FAIR, STAR, FCAT, JCPA, JCMA, Thinklink
3	Family support	We will have parent nights for parents to attend school functions; teachers will perform parent conferences as needed.	Randy Ward	Student assessment scores	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Students with disabilities scoring a level 3 or above will increase from 39 to 45 percent.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

39%(13)	45%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students struggle with self motivation	We will increase small group activities with high-interest curriculum and provide occasional rewards.	Administrators; Teacher	Teacher observation of participation, formal assessments	Teacher made tests, daily assignments, FCAT
2	Student struggle with grade level reading instruction	We will implement the Lexia reading program to provide appropriate leveled reading instruction.	Administrators;teachers	Teacher observations, formal assessments	Thinklink, FAIR, FCAT
3	Online testing	Students will practice taking online assessments with the Thinklink test and FAIR.	Teachers/Vicki Taylor/Kristy Edwards	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT, FAIR

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Last year, the percent of students that fell in the economically disadvantaged population was approximately 59%. Of those students, 63% (255) scored a level three or above this year. We hope to improve that 4 percentage points and have at least 65% (230) of economically disadvantaged students scoring a level three or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (255) of economically disadvantaged students scored a level three or above.	65% (230) of economically disadvantaged students will score a level three 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	Capacity to remediate this number of students	Differentiated Instruction in classroom/small groups ; provide remediation time in the mornings before school and pull out remediation during school	Classroom teacher/remediation teacher	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT

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 Institute	3-8	Mrs. McDaniel	Curriculum Team	4 day summer training	Thinklink Assessment, FCAT	Administrators
NGCARPD	6-8	Mrs. McDaniel	Core Teachers in Middles school	60 hours facet to face training and 30 hours of practicum	Thinklink Assessment, FCAT	Administrators
Kathy Oropalo	K-8	Mrs. McDaniel	Reading Teachers	3 days during the year	Thinklink Assessment	Administrators

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lexia	Computer Based Reading Program	Title 1a	$5,000.00
Renaissance Learning	Accelerated Reader Program		$0.00
NewsBank	Computer Based Program	Title 1a	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $6,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Promethean Boards/Projectors purchased for Kindergarten and First grade	Computer hardware	1/2 cent sales tax	$7,000.00
			Subtotal: $7,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Differentiated Instruction	Reading Consultant, Kathy Orapallo for 3 days	District	$4,500.00
Common Core Institute	Train Teachers in Common Core	Race to the Top	$3,000.00
NGCARPD	Training for middle school teachers to add to reading strategies used in the core curriculum.	Race to the Top	$0.00
			Subtotal: $7,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $20,500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In elementary math, 39% of the students scored a level three on the 2012 FCAT. We would like to improve this by keeping our threes there or higher and bringing up our twos
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (42)	42%(46)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have trouble recalling their multiplication and division facts when prompted and applying them to problem solving.	Provide practice time for students.	Teachers	Student grades; assessment data	Teacher created tests; FCAT Explorer
2	Students have difficulty applying different strategies to solve math problems.	Provide manipulatives and pictures to help students picture what is being asked in the question; Implement teaching strategies using all learning styles.	Administrators; Teachers	Student grades; assessment data	Teacher created tests; FCAT Explorer
3	Change of standards/instructional shifts	Math teachers will work with the district consultant Lynda Walker to ease the transition to common core standards.	Administrators/Teachers	Student Assessment data	FCAT, Thinklink
4	Online Testing for assessments and fifth grade FCAT	Practice by testing Thinklink online; in grades 3-5 use the Think Through Math online program	Administrators	Student assessment Data	Thinklink

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2012, 24% of elementary students in grades 3 through 5 scored a level 4 or above. To improve this percentage, we plan to push our higher level threes up to a level four or five.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (27)	28% (27)

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	Online testing	Allow students time to practice testing on a computer with the Thinklink assessment; provide lab time to use Think Through Math	Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor/Classroom Teachers	Student achievement scores	FCAT, Thinklink

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2012, 73% of students in grades 4 and 5 showed learning gains from the previous testing year. Our goal for 2013 is to have 75% of our elementary students showing learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (51)	75% (56)

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 have difficulty applying reading strategies to solve math problems.	Provide manipulatives and visuals to give students the opportunity to see the problems.	Administrators; Teachers	Student grades; assessments	Teacher created tests; FCAT Explorer; FCAT; Thinklink
2	Online Testing	Provide practice with the online testing format through Thinklink	Administrators	Student assessments	Thinklink, FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 4 and 5, over fifty percent of the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT. We hope to continue this upward movement to 55% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (9)	55% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental involvement and knowledge of what is happening in the curriculum.	Use planners to communicate homework and study needs for students.	Teachers	Student grades; assessments	Teacher created tests; FCAT Explorer; FCAT
2	Lack of parental support	Providing opportunities for parents to volunteer in the classrooms; parent nights; conferences; opportunities for homework activities that involve parents	Classroom teachers/Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor	Student Assessment Scores/Parent Involvement	FCAT, thinklink

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 : Our current achievement gap of proficiency between black students and white students in elementary grades is 26%. We will continue to try and reduce the gap between these student subgroups by 2017 so that 87% of our total student

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62	65	69	72	76	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	We hope to increase both subgroups in our current population as calculated by our AMO projections over the next five years. This equals out to a three percent increase in the white subgroup and a five percent increase in the black subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 73% proficient Black: 47% proficient	White: 76% Black: 52%

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 have difficulty applying reading strategies to solve math problems.	Provide manipulatives and visuals to give students the opportunity to see the problems.	Administrators; teachers	Student grades; assessments	Teacher created tests, FCAT, FCAT Explorer,
2	Online Testing	Provide practice with the online testing format through Thinklink.	Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor	Student assessment scores	Thinklink, FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	We hope to increase the amount of proficient students with disabilities to 41% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (12) not proficient, 34%(6) proficient	59%(11) not proficient, 41%(5) (proficient

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	Vocabulary Development	Teachers are working to provide print rich environments, and incorporate math and reading strategies for math lessons. Teachers are working to expose students to more math vocabulary.	Administrator	Student Assessment Data	Thinklink, 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	We hope to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students who are proficient to 60% on the 2013 assessment data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (34) not proficient, 55% (41) proficient	40%(39) not proficient, 60% (58) proficient

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	Parent Communication/Parental support	Providing opportunities for parents to volunteer in the classrooms; parent nights; conferences; opportunities for homework activities that involve parents	Administrators; teachers	student grades; assessment data; parent night attendance	FCAT; teacher created assessments;

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In 2012, 35% of middle school students tested scored a level 3. By focusing on our lower level bubble students, we will try to increase the number scoring a level 3 in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%(117)	37%(138)

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 materials for common core transition	The Principal and instructional coach are working with teachers to ease the transition and provide supplies and materials based on need.	Administration	Student Assessment Scores	FCAT, Thinklink
2	Online testing	Provide opportunities to practice online testing through Thinklink; provide online math practice with Think Through Math	Administrators/Teachers	Student Assessment Data	Thinklink

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2012, 32% of middle school students scored a level 4 or above. We hope to maintain this goal and increase the students scoring in this range by 2% for the 2013 FCAT assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (108)	34% (127)

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	Online testing	Use the thinklink assessment as a practice for online testing; schedule lab time for math practice online with Think Through Math	Administration	Student Assessment scores, student grades	FCAT, Thinklink, Teacher created 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 group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Of the three students tested through alternative assessment, two scored a level 7. We would like to maintain these students and keep them from sliding back.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(2)	67% (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	Lack of background knowledge and vocabulary	Provide concrete examples of new concepts and associations with vocabulary	Classroom teacher	Student assessment scores	Florida Alternative Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2012, 65% of students tested made learning gains in math. This year
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65%(214)	67% (250)

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	practice materials for online testing	Computer practice time for online testing through Think Through Math; Assessing math online using Thinklink.	Administration	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	In 2012, all three of our alternatively assessed students made learning gains in math. We plan to continue to show student growth and maintain 100% learning gains on Florida's Alternative Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%(3)	100%(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	Lack of real world examples	The classroom teacher will work with students to show real world applications for students to improve performance in math.	Classroom teacher/Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor	Student Assessment Data	Florida Alternative Assessment, teacher created 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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The number of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in 2012 was 60%. We hope to improve this number to 62% this year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%(49)	62%(58)

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 motivation	Teachers are working with Lynda Walker to find best practices and improve instruction to engage all students.	Administration	Student Assessment Data	FCAT, Thinklink

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%.

Middle School Mathematics Goal #

5A : The achievement gap in middle school math is 26%. Our data indicates that 70% of white students and 44% of black students are proficient in middle school math. We hope to reduce this to 13% over the next 5 years.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62	65	69	72	76	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	GRS will increase the percentage of proficient students by 3% for white students and by 6% for black students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:70% (194) proficient; 30%(82) non-proficient Black:44%(20) proficient; 56% (25) non-proficient	White:73% proficient Black:50% proficient

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 transportation for extended learning opportunities	Provide funds for transportation	Michael Kilts	Compare number of participants for school year 2011-12 and 2012-13 in extended learning opportunities and examining FCAT and progress monitoring data	FCAT 2013

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	We will try to boost our SWD proficiency level 8% for a total of 27% proficient in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(5) proficient	27% proficient

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 background knowledge and vocabulary	Provide concrete examples of new concepts and associations with vocabulary	Classroom teacher/Administration	Student Assessment Data	Thinklink, 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The Economically Disadvantaged students in middle school had a 54% math proficiency level. We hope to increase that to 59% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (99)	59%

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 motivation	Teachers are working with Lynda Walker to find best practices and improve instruction to engage all students.	Administration	Student Assessment Data	FCAT, Thinklink

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	In 2012, all GRS algebra 1 students passed the EOC with a level 3 or above. This year, we would like to keep everyone at a level three or above, but we would like to keep our percentage of those scoring a level 3 low and move others to a level 4 or higher. We would like to have the number scoring a level three at 20% or below.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23%(6) - no students scored below a level 3	20%(4)- keep the number of students scoring a level 3 low and move students to a level 4 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	Online testing	Students will practice completing math problems on the computer through think through math and thinklink assessments.	Classroom teacher/Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor	Student assessment data	Thinklink, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	In 2012, 78%(22) of students in Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. We would like to increase this percentage to 80% for the spring 2013 assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(22)	80%(18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Online testing	Students will practice completing math problems on the computer through think through math and thinklink assessments.	Classroom teacher/Randy Ward/Vicki Taylor	Student Assessment Data	EOC, Thinklink

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A : All students in Algebra 1 scored proficient on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62	65	69	72	76	

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:

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	100% of all subgroups scored a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White - 100% (25) Black - 100% (1)	White - 100% Black - 100%

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	Algebra EOC Online Testing	Use Thinklink as a practice for online testing; use Think Through Math to gain more online practice	Teacher/Administration	Student Assessment Data	Thinklink; Algebra EOC

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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	100%(3) of economically disadvantaged students taking Algebra 1 scored a level 3 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (3)	100%

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	Algebra online testing	Provide online testing practice through Thinklink and Think Through Math practice	Teachers/Administration	Student Assessment Data	Thinklink; Algebra 1 EOC

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC 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
Linda Walker, Math Consultant	3-8	Mrs. McDaniel	School-wide	3 days for year	Thinklink	Randy Ward

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Think Through Math	Computer Based Math Program	Title 1a	$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
NGSS Consultation	Linda Walker, Math Consultant	Title 1a	$3,300.00
			Subtotal: $3,300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,300.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2012, the percentage of fifth and eighth graders scoring a level 3 was 46%. Our goal for this year is 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%(55)	54%(59)

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' knowledge base	Provide a more thorough science curriculum in all grades, not just FCAT tested grades; work with district resource teacher to incorporate Common Core requirements at all levels so that tested grades will have a better base of knowledge	Classroom teachers; administrators	Student grades; administrative observations	thinklink; teacher created test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above	In 2011, 9% (11) of students tested in FCAT science

Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	scored a level 4 or higher, showing a gain of two percentage points from the prior year. In 2012, at least 15% (26) of students tested will score a level 4 or higher in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (11) of students in grades 5 and 8 scored a level 4 or above in science.	At least 15% (26) of students will score a level 4 or above in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Solid science knowledge base for all students	Teachers will work with our district science teacher to produce lessons at every grade level to build adequate background knowledge for the fifth and eighth grade testing years.	Administrators	Student achievement	Teacher created tests; FCAT; Thinklink

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

District Science resource teacher	3-8	District Science Teacher/Randy Ward	3-8 Science teachers	As outlined by district policy; as needed by teachers	Thinklink assessments; classroom assessments	Administration

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
Promethean Board installs in seventh and eighth grade science	computer hardware	1/2 cent sales tax	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Resource Teacher	District Support	Title 1a	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $4,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $9,000.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2012, 79% of fourth and eighth graders tested scored a level 3.0 or higher on their FCAT writing Test. We will try to maintain and increase this percentage to 80% for 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79%(117)	80%

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	Excessive student absences and tardies negatively effect learning.	Teachers will increase communication with parents through phone calls, letters/notes, and parent nights.	Teachers, administrators, data entry operators	Review of student attendance each nine weeks.	Pinnacle contact log.
2	Student lack of background knowledge	encourage use of virtual field trips in the	Teachers, administrators	Teacher evaluation of Wednesday Writes and	Student FCAT writing scores.

	and experiences.	classrooms		JC Writes	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Students scoring a level four or above last year was at 27%. We hope to increase this number to 30% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(40)	30%

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 amount of time given to take the writing test	Timed classroom assessments; instructions on planning and writing in classroom	Classroom Teacher	JC Writes	FCAT writing

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics 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 Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 the average attendance rate was 94%. This year, Grand Ridge school would like to continue the improvement and achieve an attendance rate of 95%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.07	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

269	200
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
33	30

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	Parent participation in making sure students get to school.	Utilize office personnel and resource officer to contact parents; Increase communication with parents through phone calls, letters/notes, and parent nights.	Teachers, administrators, data entry operator	Review of student attendance each nine weeks.	Pinnacle contact log, Parent contact log
2	Transportation for students, sometimes parents are having a difficult time getting students to school	Provide phone calls checking on students when they are our; calling parents when we see a pattern of excessive absences.	Administration	Pinnacle reports	Attendance Rate at the end of the year and pinnacle.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In 2011-2012, the number of students given in-school suspension was 45, down from 73 in the previous year; we will reduce that number this year to 40. The number of students given out-of-school suspension in 2010-2011 was 84 down from 89 in the previous year; we will reduce that number this year to 79.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
57	50
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
45	40
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
192	170
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
84	79

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	Having a common way to give rewards/consequences for behavior.	This year, Tonya Gardner will head up our Positive Behavior support team. This team will analyze behavior data to find implementation ideas for	Randy Ward	Comparison of previous years suspension data to current years data.	We will look at the number of office referrals and hope that the numbers decrease.

		rewards/consequences for all students.			

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
Anti-bullying/Positive Behavior Support	K-8	Tonya Gardner	School Wide	1 day of Anti-Bullying with a guest speaker; PBS ongoing and data analyzed at the end of each nine weeks	suspension rates	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In the past, the parent involvement has been very low at Grand Ridge School. Typically, our parent involvment percentages for the school year are around 35%. We would like to see this percentage improve to 50% or higher for the 2011-2012 school year.

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Currently, parent involvement percentages are running about 35%.	We would like to improve parent involvement percentages to above 50%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents who work evenings or nights cannot attend after school functions.	Grand Ridge School will provide opportunities for parents to be participate in school activities during school hours.	Administrators; Teachers	Tally the number of parents participating at different times during the school year, including sign in sheets, parent conferences, IEP mtgs.	Sign in sheets in the office and classrooms.
2	Parents are not informed of activities.	Provide links to activities on the school website; send home a monthly newsletter that lists campus happenings; provide dates in the district-wide calendar.	Administrators; Teachers; Office Staff	Keep a total of participants for each event.	Sign in sheets in the office and classrooms

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Lexia	Computer Based Reading Program	Title 1a	$5,000.00
Reading	Renaissance Learning	Accelerated Reader Program		$0.00
Reading	NewsBank	Computer Based Program	Title 1a	$1,000.00
Mathematics	Think Through Math	Computer Based Math Program	Title 1a	$0.00
				Subtotal: $6,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Promethean Boards/Projectors purchased for Kindergarten and First grade	Computer hardware	1/2 cent sales tax	$7,000.00
Science	Promethean Board installs in seventh and eighth grade science	computer hardware	1/2 cent sales tax	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $12,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Differentiated Instruction	Reading Consultant, Kathy Orapallo for 3 days	District	$4,500.00
Reading	Common Core Institute	Train Teachers in Common Core	Race to the Top	$3,000.00
Reading	NGCARPD	Training for middle school teachers to add to reading strategies used in the core curriculum.	Race to the Top	$0.00
Mathematics	NGSS Consultation	Linda Walker, Math Consultant	Title 1a	$3,300.00
Science	Science Resource Teacher	District Support	Title 1a	$4,000.00
				Subtotal: $14,800.00
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: $32,800.00

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

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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Jackson School District GRAND RIDGE SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	76%	86%	49%	282	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	65%	66%			131	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	72% (YES)	60% (YES)			132	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					545	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Jackson School District GRAND RIDGE SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	65%	78%	51%	266	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	64%	67%			131	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	67% (YES)			127	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					524	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested