

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL AT NORTH MANATEE

District Name: Manatee

Principal: Jennifer Lucas

SAC Chair: Alan Hensley

Superintendent: Tim McGonegal

Date of School Board Approval: 09/25/2012

Last Modified on: 10/21/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Jennifer Lucas	BA, Finance M, Edl K-6 ESE	1	1	School received a B grade. 66% proficient in reading and 70% proficient in math. 64% met standards in writing and 74% met in science. 63%made learning gains in reading and 62% made gains in math. 47% lowest quartile made gains in reading and 70% in math. School made 92% of AYP
Principal					
Principal	Jennifer Lucas	BA, Finance Mgmt. masters EDL, K-6 and ESE	2	2	Entering year 2, we had a large group of struggling 3rd and 4th graders and focused on that group. Although the school received a C grade, the new cut scores in proficiency and a very low middle school group in a combo school is what impacted our grade the most. Our 3/4 graders proficiency and learning gains outperformed the district. Our goal this year is to remediate over 45 3rd graders who are reading below grade level.

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)
All	Deanna Smith	Ba in Elem Masters in ESE K-6 ESE ESOL	1	2	10 years of teaching and coaching experience. 3 years of ESE experience as team leader and compliance. Serves as instructional coach to lead PD and support teachers in the classroom.
All	Debbie Veldkamp	BA Elem Ed Masters Elem Ed Beginning Masters in Guidance. PK-6 ESE ESOL	1	1	8 years of teaching experience and served as team leader for Primary math. Serves school as ESOL liasion, ese teaching support and behavioral RtI team chair.

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	Partner with local colleges and universities Education Programs	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Professional development and team support	Curriculum Coordinator, Instructional Coaches, Administrator, Academic Teamm leaders	Pre-service planning and workshops in summer, ongoing throughout the year, continuous improvement model as needed.	
3	Share teachers with sister Imagine schools when they need to relocate	enttire staff in 6 schools	ongoing	

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
2	Ongoing support via pre observation conversations, post obervation meetings, instructioanl coach support with model lessons.

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
29	6.9%(2)	55.2%(16)	37.9%(11)	0.0%(0)	13.8%(4)	86.2%(25)	20.7%(6)	0.0%(0)	34.5%(10)

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
Samantha Del Ponte	all K-5 CHILD teachers	Samantha has 5 years experience as a CHILD coach and will continue to help trian staff in CHILD delivery	Subject area planning meetings, peer observations, webinars for PD, example station activities
Lisa Quiles and Beckie Britto	Shannon Checchin, Kyle Rence, Jennifer Zuppinger and Jacob Whalen	Lisa is the most These teachers are experienced in subject area and project CHILD. Both will serve as mentors and Beckie is attending district and state trainings to help improve our FCAT Writes proficiency scores.	Subject area planning meetings, peer observations, team planning, PD
Anna Neri	Patrick Scully, Mallorie Ray, Lindsey Mills, Meredith Lawson, Renata Ovelar	Anna is experienced, completed more PD in reading than most and is working in Masters in Curriculum. She is also well versed in FAIR and data driven instruction and tier 2 interventions	Subject area planning meetings, peer observations
Shelly Sanders/Kristina Whightsel	Jennifer Dormichev, Leslie Grover, Deborah Swift	Shelly has a proven track record for student learning gains as does Kristina. Both will be working with teachers to use data to drive the instructional focus and bring project based math learning and math journals into every class.	Subject area planning meetings, peer observations
Stephanie Marshall	Patrick Anderson, Deborah Clark, Lee Maxwell and Lori Peacock	Stephanie will serve as team lead for new middle school team and help develop teachers in	team planning, shared values and team based support. Liasion to administrator

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Jennifer Lucas/Principal/Facilitator, Deanna Smith/ESE Coordinator/Intervention Coordinator, Samantha DelPonte/Gifted consult/CHILD coordinator, Debbie Veldkamp/ESE teacher/Guidance support, Kristin Zahniser/Speech Pathologist, Marie Volkhart district psychologist liaison, Patricia Wengenfeld district social worker liaison, Bob Hunt district ESE liaison

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

The team meets every other Monday am. Universal data and progress monitoring data are reviewed and plans are updated/revised based on the data. The RtI team then brings the updated data and plans to their cluster mates and subject area mates through PLC's.

Every 6 weeks the team meets with staff to disaggregate student data, review progress and move students in rti groups, and into new appropriate tiers of rti model. (now MTSS)

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 district benchmark assessment data, FAIR data, SAT 10 data and FCAT data are all used to analyze school wide, grade level and content specific data to identify current achievement levels and expected achievement levels. The master schedule has built in time for RtI and common planning time for cluster teachers. After school FCAT boot camp is also being offered to level 1 and 2 students in reading and math.

Middle school students have Reading and Math intensives for all level 1 and 2 scores.

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.

District benchmark assessment data, FAIR data, SAT 10 data and FCAT data are all used to analyze school wide, grade level and content specific data to identify current achievement levels and expected achievement levels. District benchmark data and FAIR data are reviewed after each of the three test administrations. SAT 10 and FCAT data are reviewed at the beginning and end of the year. The PMRN and district benchmark and Quick Query systems are used to aggregate and display data. Data is shared with stakeholders at SAC, PTO, LLC board meeting, cluster meetings, staff, and student goal setting meetings.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Three Wednesdays of every month are available for professional development. Our region curriculum coordinator, ESE coordinator and district liaisons are scheduled to provide the professional development across the year. Professional development will be provided for the RtI Team and classroom teachers.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Jennifer Lucas/Principal/Facilitator, Deanna Smith/ESE Coordinator/Intervention Coordinator, Dawn Patterson/Primary Math-Science Teacher, Megan Floyd/Primary Reading Teacher-ESOL Coordinator, Lisa Quiles/Primary Writing Teacher, Mark Martell/Middle School SS Teacher, Beckie Britto/Intermediate Math-Science Teacher, Samantha DelPonte/Primary Gifted Teacher/CHILD Coordinator

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

The team meets the second Tuesday of every month before student arrival. Universal data and progress monitoring data are reviewed and plans are updated/revised based on the data. The RtI team then brings the updated data and plans to their cluster mates and subject area mates through PLC's.

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

Professional development in the areas of data analysis, gradual release, making meaning of reading, differentiated instruction and RtI implementation.

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.

*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.

All middle school teachers will use common reading comprehension strategies. Math journals and science journals will be used.

*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:	The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 on the 2011 FCAT Reading will increase from 58% to 62%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%	62%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are entering our school behind	Collect prior data, reassess immediately, identify weaknesses and provide intervention and remediation	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Debbie Veldkamp	standardized assessment windows, interpretation of data, providing remediation, tracking MTSS process	follow up assessments, observation of small groups, comparison of data points collected
2	New staff	mentoring new staff and providing intense professional development in core subject areas	Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith, Samantha Del Ponte, Lisa Quiles, Debbie veldkamp, Anna Neri Beckie Britto	provide PD with follow up activities and assessments. Provide feedback after teacher evals and observations,	researched based teacher observation tools, formalized observation and evaluation rubrics, follow up activities for PD workshops
3	Lack of parent support at home	Educate parents on their role in child's education and provide workshops to help them assist their students with at home learning; fact fluency, reading fluency, spelling lists etc. Literacy Nights, student led data chats and Parent gallery walks planned quarterly to involve families in the success of the student.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith	increased proficiencies and learning gains on OPM assessments, decreased number of students in tier2 or tier3 interventions, increased number of students moved from interventions to services when appropriate. Increased parent support and attendance at academic based events.	end of year progress monitoring: SAT 10 learning gains, FCAT proficiencies and learning gains, learning gains of lowest quartile and increased PRS in FAIR.
4	Movement to full implementation of Common Core, increased expectations for student performance.	training staff on Common Core in pre-service and in-service days. assigning team leaders to support classroom instruction and develop an inter-campus PLC for common core implementation and planning.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Anna Neri, Beckie Britto, Shelly Sanders	increased rigor and expectations in the lessons (lesson plans, walk throughs, formal observations, student sample work)	end of year progress for students, and increased proficiencies in performance on FCAT 2.0 and end of year tests aligned to Common Core.
	Core instruction of tested reading strategies does not always follow the gradual release model. Explicit modeled	Reading teachers will use a lesson plan template that follows the components of the gradual release model.	Principal	Leadership team reviews FAIR OPM in comprehension to determine the percent of students scoring at	FAIR OPM in reading comprehension strategies.

5	comprehension reading strategies followed by guided practice with teacher support and ending with student independent practice.		medium levels on reading comprehension strategies.
---	---	--	--

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:	
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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percentage of students scoring Level 4 and 5 on the 2011 FCAT Reading will increase from 27% to 37%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(89)	37% (89)

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	Change in FCAT 2.0 format	Increase student reading stamina. Expose students and teachers to fcac 2.0 test specs. Increase amount of nonfiction and informational text. Increased expectations in math and science to include writing in response to reading.	Jennifer Lucas, Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith,	compare student scores post FCAT from 2010-2011. increased number of students proficient	New school scores, and school grade, and progress towards AYP
2	Reading instruction often does not include higher level reading comprehension thinking strategies.	Daily teacher lesson plans will note instruction of higher level reading comprehension strategies through use of teacher read aloud.	Principal	Leadership team will review the FAIR OPM data in reading comprehension to determine the percentage of students	FAIR OPM in reading comprehension

scoring scoring high on reading comprehension.

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:	
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 reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 73% to 75%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%	75%

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	Proficient students don't get enough intensives or attention	Increase focused work during RtI time for proficient students also. Provide growth strategies and challenge those students	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Dawn Patterson, Samantha Del Ponte, Jennifer Zuppingner	Monitor growth of proficient/accelerated learners through FAIR, SAT 10 and new FCAT scores.	post standardized test data
2	Small group instruction does not always align to the specific needs of the students	Teachers implement small group instruction that aligns to the specific needs of individual student needs.	Principal	Leadership team reviews FAIR diagnostic data to determine specific needs of individual students.	FAIR OPM

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:	
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 reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will remain at least the same. It was our highest achievement.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%	78%

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 in lowest quartile more than 1 year behind.	Provide RtI and intensives to help get them caught up and provide FCAT boot camp outside school hours to provide more support. Provide free FCAT tutoring camps for those in lowest quartile. Offer reading and math camp in fall and spring for 6-8 weeks each.	Beckie Britto, Deanna Smith, Jennifer Lucas,	ongoing progress monitoring of benchmark assessments, graphed data for performance and post FCAT scores.	benchmark assessments, FAIR and post FCAT score reports.
2	The thirty minutes of instruction outside of the 90 minute reading block is not sufficient.	Increase the instructional time from 30 minutes daily by implementing after school tutoring.	ESE Coordinator	Leadership team will review FAIR OPM data.	FAIR OPM

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 :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	This sub group did not count for 2009-2010.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	identifying sub groups and determining their weaknesses individually. 50% free and reduced lunch (230) 24% ESE (110) and 20% ESOL (20) 40% minority groups (230)	review all enrollment forms, data reports and sub group identifiers. Pull data reports from Focus to identify and service all subgroups. Provide specific services for ESE and data track their growth. provide teachers with strategies to meet needs for tier1 and tier2 instruction in ESE and ESOL.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Philip Alexander, Samantha Del Ponte, Debbie Veldkamp, Kristin Zahnheiser	measure progress through OPM on FAIR, math benchmarks, Focus achieves data and writing prompts each month.	analysis of AYP data after 2012 score reports.
2	Supplemental instruction does not focus enough on vocabulary instruction.	Teachers will provide explicit vocabulary instruction.	Principal	Leadership will review FAIR diagnostic data.	FAIR OPM

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
	Ell students often go unserved and teachers neglect to use research based strategies to support their learning.	ESOL coordinator will meet with staff to identify each child in the team that is identified as ELL and provide required services, modifications	Debbie veldkamp	AYP growth in this subgroup and year end proficiencies or learning gains for these students.	FCAT, OPM

1	and strategies for instruction. Purchase supplemental resources needed for those students required by law and increase bilingual texts and written communication home.		
---	--	--	--

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:	
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
1	The population for this group has doubled as we have grown in enrollment. We currently have 24% students (110) on iep that range from Sp only to Sp. LD, EBD and all inclusive.	Increase number of full and part time staff specilized to help service these needs. Create a schedule of services to meet the demands of the IEP and to support the primary teachers with strategies and modification tools for classroom success.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Kristin Zahnheiser, Debbie Veldkamp	OPM during the year in benchmarks and assessments. Decreased student retention and increased learning gains for this group.	FCAT. FAIR and other end of year alternative assessments.
2	students significantly behind in their grade level, requiring intense remediation and support	Set school wide RtI time for those students to have 30 min RtI in addition to pull out services through ESE specialist. Students to be tracked on PST data problem solving sheets and core teachers trained in ESE straegies. Students will receive remediation and scaffolding.	Deanna SMith	monitoring RtI records, OPM through FAIR, SAT 10 learning gains, problem solving worksheets.	FAIR, SAT 10, benchmarks, FCAT

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring Level 3 or higher on the 2011 Reading FCAT will increase from 19% to 45%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (19)	45%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The Economically disadvantaged students often have contributory issues that affect academic performance. 50% of students may not have consistent transportation to before/after tutoring programs, may not have quality breakfast, may not have internet access at home for home learning, may not have parental support for academic growth, may not have access to resources or support.	Provide free tutoring on carefully scheduled FCAT camps to allow for free early/after care for those in need, provide healthy breakfasts during testing windows, provide additional free resources for home practice or support, provide parents with information and resources to help their children. Provide parents with professional development workshops on how to help their children at home. Invite local libraries to campus to register for library cards for free access to resources and events.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith,	OPM for all standardized testing options, meeting with PST to measure student's growth and performance, meeting with teachers to manage students' presence in class, performance and red flags (truancies, tardies, lack participation in home learning or activities)	SAT 10 results in spring to measure overall learning gains, FCAT scores, student success in classroom grades and mitigation of other contributory issues (tardies, behavior, absences etc)
2	The amount of time spent reading books at the students current reading level is not sufficient.	Teachers will incorporate independent reading as daily station.	Principal	Leadership team will review FAIR OPM in reading comprehension.	FAIR OPM

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
Making Meaning	K-8	Deanna Smith and Lindsey Mills	all new Reading teachers K-8	2 days pre-service and midyear workshop	classroom observations and walk-throughs, student performance, students journals	Jennifer Lucas and Deanna Smith
Implementing Common Core for K-2, partial implementation 3-8.	K-8	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith	all reading and language arts teachers	2 days pre-service and 4 days throughout the year. Topics include vocab instruction, close reading, phonics and conferring.	classroom observations and walk-throughs, student performance, peer observations, instructional coaching model lessons.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith

Reading 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 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:

No Data Submitted

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The percentage of students scoring Level 3 in Math on the 2012 FCAT will increase from 57%-62%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%	62%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are entering our school behind	Collect prior data, reassess immediately, identify weaknesses and provide intervention and remediation	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Debbie Veldkamp	standardized assessment windows, interpretation of data, providing remediation, tracking MTSS process	follow up assessments, observation of small groups, comparison of data points collected
2	New staff	mentoring new staff and providing intense professional development in core subject areas	Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith, Samantha Del Ponte, Lisa Quiles, Debbie veldkamp, Anna Neri Beckie Britto	provide PD with follow up activities and assessments. Provide feedback after teacher evals and observations,	researched based teacher observation tools, formalized observation and evaluation rubrics, follow up activities for PD workshops
3	Lack of parent support at home	Educate parents on their role in child's education and provide workshops to help them assist their students with at home learning; fact fluency, reading fluency, spelling lists etc. Literacy Nights, student led data chats and Parent gallery walks planned quarterly to involve families in the success of the student.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith	increased proficiencies and learning gains on OPM assessments, decreased number of students in tier2 or tier3 interventions, increased number of students moved from interventions to services when appropriate. Increased parent support and attendance at academic based events.	end of year progress monitoring: SAT 10 learning gains, FCAT proficiencies and learning gains, learning gains of lowest quartile and increased PRS in FAIR.
4	Movement to full implementation of Common Core, increased expectations for student performance.	training staff on Common Core in pre-service and in-service days. assigning team leaders to support classroom instruction and develop an inter-campus PLC for common core implementation and planning.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Anna Neri, Beckie Britto, Shelly Sanders	increased rigor and expectations in the lessons (lesson plans, walk throughs, formal observations, student sample work)	end of year progress for students, and increased proficiencies in performance on FCAT 2.0 and end of year tests aligned to Common Core.
5	Pacing of sunshine state standards are not always aligned with testing dates.	Teachers will be provided with a pacing guide to use when planning the year.	Principal	Leadership team will review benchmark assessment data.	Benchmark assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: 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:		Students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2011 Math FCAT will increase from 20% to 26%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
20%(89)		26%(89)		

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	Change in FCAT 2.0 format	Increase student reading stamina. Expose students and teachers to fcats 2.0 test specs. Increase amount of nonfiction and informational text. Increased expectations in math and science to include writing in response to reading.	Jennifer Lucas, Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith,	compare student scores post FCAT from 2010-2011. increased number of students proficient	New school scores, and school grade, and progress towards AYP
2	Higher level cognitive math thinking strategies are not always embedded in instruction.	Subject area meetings will focus on sharing high level math thinking strategies across grade levels.	Principal	Leadership team will review benchmark data and share with grade level teams.	Benchmark math 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:

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:	The number of students making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 64% to 65%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%	65%

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	Proficient students don't get enough intensives or attention	Increase focused work during Rtl time for proficient students also. Provide growth strategies and challenge those students	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Dawn Patterson, Samantha Del Ponte, Jennifer Zuppinger	Monitor growth of proficient/accelerated learners through FAIR, SAT 10 and new FCAT scores.	post standardized test data
2	Teachers not implementing supplemental instruction on a regular basis.	Subject area meetings will focus on planning supplemental instruction for three 30 minute sessions per week.	Principal	Leadership team and grade level teams will monitor assessment results.	Benchmark 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:

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:	The percentage of the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math will increase from 57% to 67%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%	67%

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 in lowest quartile more than 1 year behind.	Provide RtI and intensives to help get them caught up and provide FCAT boot camp outside school hours to provide more support. Provide free FCAT tutoring camps for those in lowest quartile. Offer reading and math camp in fall and spring for 6-8 weeks each.	Beckie Britto, Deanna Smith, Jennifer Lucas,	ongoing progress monitoring of benchmark assessments, graphed data for performance and post FCAT scores.	benchmark assessments, FAIR and post FCAT score reports.
2	Interventions used are not always matched to individual student needs.	Subject area meetings will use the problem solving process for students not responding to interventions.	Principal	Leadership team and grade level teams will review assessment data	Weekly assessment tied to SSS

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 :	<input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	This sub group did not not count this year.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0%	0%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	identifying sub groups and determining their weaknesses individually. 50% free and reduced lunch (230) 24% ESE (110) and 20% ESOL (20) 40% minority groups (230)	review all enrollment forms, data reports and sub group identifiers. Pull data reports from Focus to identify and service all subgroups. Provide specific services for ESE and data track their growth. provide teachers with strategies to meet needs for tier1 and tier2 instruction in ESE and ESOL.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Philip Alexander, Samantha Del Ponte, Debbie Veldkamp, Kristin Zahnheiser	measure progress through OPM on FAIR, math benchmarks, Focus achieves data and writing prompts each month.	analysis of AYP data after 2012 score reports.
2	Core instruction does not involve the use of math journals.	Subject area meetings will focus ways to incorporate the use of math journals in daily core instruction.	Data Coach	Leadership team and grade level teams will analyze benchmark data	benchmark assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in 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
1	ELL students often go unserved and teachers neglect to use research based strategies to support their learning.	ESOL coordinator will meet with staff to identify each child in the team that is identified as ELL and provide required services, modifications and strategies for instruction. Purchase supplemental resources needed for those students required by law and increase bilingual texts and written communication home.	Debbie veldkamp	AYP growth in this subgroup and year end proficiencies or learning gains for these students.	FCAT, OPM

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:	
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
1	The population for this group has doubled as we have grown in enrollment. We currently have 24% students (110) on iep that range from Sp only to Sp. LD, EBD and all inclusive.	Increase number of full and part time staff specilized to help service these needs. Create a schedule of services to meet the demands of the IEP and to support the primary teachers with strategies and modification tools for classroom success.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Kristin Zahnheiser, Debbie Veldkamp	OPM during the year in benchmarks and assessments. Decreased student retention and increased learning gains for this group.	FCAT. FAIR and other end of year alternative assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The number of economically diadantaged students making annual yearly progress on the 2011 FCAT Math will increase from 19% to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%	25%

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 Economically disadvantaged students often have contributory issues that affect academic performance. 50% of students may not have consistant transportation to before/after tutoring programs, may not have quality breakfast, may not have internet access at home for home learning, may not have parental support for academic growth, may not have access to resources or support.	Provide free tutoring on carefully scheduled FCAT camps to allow for free early/after care for those in need, provide healthy breakfasts during testing windows, provide additional free reosurces for home practice or support, provide parents with information and reources to help their children. Provide parents with professional development workshops on how to help their children at home. Invite local libraries to campus to register for library cards for free access to	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith,	OPM for all stadardized testing options, meeting with PST to measure student's growth and performance, meeting with teachers to manage students' presence in class, performance and red flags (truancies, tardies, lack participation in home learning or activities)	SAT 10 results in spring to measure overall learning gains, FCAT scores, student success in classroom grades and mitigation of other contributory issues (tardies, behavior, absences etc)

		resources and events.			
2	The gradual release of responsibility model is not always followed during Core instruction.	Teacher lesson plan template will include the gradual release model.	Principal	Leadership and grade level teams will review benchmark assessment data	benchmark assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

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:

The number of students scoring a Level 3 on FCAT Science will reach 55-60%

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%	55%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are entering our school behind	Collect prior data, reassess immediately, identify weaknesses and provide intervention and remediation	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Debbie Veldkamp	standardized assessment windows, interpretation of data, providing remediation, tracking MTSS process	follow up assessments, observation of small groups, comparison of data points collected
2	New staff	mentoring new staff and providing intense professional development in core subject areas	Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith, Samantha Del Ponte, Lisa Quiles, Debbie veldkamp, Anna Neri Beckie Britto	provide PD with follow up activities and assessments. Provide feedback after teacher evals and observations,	researched based teacher observation tools, formalized observation and evaluation rubrics, follow up activities for PD workshops
3	Lack of parent support at home	Educate parents on their role in child's education and provide workshops to help them assist their students with at home learning; fact fluency, reading fluency, spelling lists etc. Literacy Nights, student led data chats and Parent gallery walks planned quarterly to involve families in the success of the student.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith	increased proficiencies and learning gains on OPM assessments, decreased number of students in tier2 or tier3 interventions, increased number of students moved from interventions to services when appropriate. Increased parent support and attendance at academic based events.	end of year progress monitoring: SAT 10 learning gains, FCAT proficiencies and learning gains, learning gains of lowest quartile and increased PRS in FAIR.
4	Movement to full implementation of Common Core, increased expectations for student performance.	training staff on Common Core in pre-service and in-service days. assigning team leaders to support classroom instruction and develop an inter-campus PLC for common core implementation and planning.	Jennifer Lucas, Deanna Smith, Anna Neri, Beckie Britto, Shelly Sanders	increased rigor and expectations in the lessons (lesson plans, walk throughs, formal observations, student sample work)	end of year progress for students, and increased proficiencies in performance on FCAT 2.0 and end of year tests aligned to Common Core.
5	Core instruction does not always include the use of science labs.	The master schedule includes time for all grade levels to receive weekly instruction in the science lab.	Principal	Leadership team and grade level team will review benchmark test data.	Benchmark science 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:

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 Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the 2011 FCAT Science will increase from 11% to 17%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11%	17%

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	Change in FCAT 2.0 format	Increase student reading stamina. Expose students and teachers to fcata 2.0 test specs. Increase amount of nonfiction and informational text. Increased expectations in math and science to include writing in response to reading.	Jennifer Lucas, Dawn Bingham, Deanna Smith,	compare student scores post FCAT from 2010- 2011. increased number of students proficient	New school scores, and school grade, and progress towards AYP
2	Science standards are not adequately covered prior to the FCAT.	Teachers to use pacing guides for instructional planning.	Principal	Leadership team and grade level team will analyze benchmark assessment data.	Benchmark 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:	
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
No Data Submitted						

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		The percentage of students scoring Level 3.5 and higher will grow from 62%-65%			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
62%		65%			
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 few opportunities to engage in authentic writing.	Teachers will implement the writing units of study with fidelity.	Principal	Writing data will be reviewed after each of three writing common assessments.	District writing common 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing 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					

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

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		By July 2011 the percent of students accruing 10 or more days absent in a one year period will decrease by 6%.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
96.51% (242 students: Please note the attendance rate was based on enrolled students at end of year)		98% (423)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
16% (39 of 242 students)		10% (42 of 423 students)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
13% (32 of 242 students)		7% (29 of 423 students)			
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 do not have an intrinsic desire to be at school and arrive on time.	Provide students with positive reinforcement for attendance and on time arrival.	Teachers	Registrar will review attendance data and determine the number of students with excessive absences and tardies.	Monthly attendance data
2	Parents are not aware of county/school policy and its effect on student learning	Send attendance notifications to parents, use absence data as "red flag" for RtI process immediately, keep parents informed of upcoming test windows, enforce Manatee County policy including consequences	Teachers, PST	teacher attendance reports, principal reports on Focus and registrar	Focus weekly attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	By July 2012 the number of suspensions will decrease from 10 to 3.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0% (0)	0% (0)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0% (0)	0% (0)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
4% (10)	2% (8)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4% (10)	2% (8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Few opportunities exist for students to establish relationships with adult mentors.	Implement a mentor program before, during or after school.	Parent volunteers implementing the new Mentor/Listening program for middle school	School suspension reports will be reviewed monthly.	School suspension data
2	New students do not understand expectations or are used to another school's policy and procedures.	Train all staff, parents and students on PBS program. Review expectations as necessary with students when they make mistakes.	PBS Team/Leadership Team	Review of referrals with Leadership team	Referral book and review of teacher in class behavior logs through RtI process.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement	
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Parents responding always or often to the parent survey question, "I volunteer at our school" will increase from 49% to 75%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
44% (108)	75% (415)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Parents that do volunteer work outside of the school are not aware that those hours count.	Parent involvement task force will add shout outs to the schools weekly newsletter highlighting how parents have volunteered outside of the school.	Parent Involvement task force	Review fall pre parent survey data	Parent survey data
2	Parents want to contribute but work during the day and don't know how else to volunteer	Send out "calls for help" giving parents unique and specific volunteer requests that are not standard or daily.	Homeroom teachers, SAC, PTO, principal	Increase in parent involvement in and outside school. Increase in teachers acknowledging receipt of goods or services.	Parent surveys, teacher surveys, PTO volunteer log
3	Communication between parents and teachers.	Create a Volunteer Coordinator position and teacher liasions at each academy level to serve on PTO to help ensure parent-teacher communication lines are open and effective.	Dea Savage, PTO volunteer coordinator and 3 identified teachers.	increased volunteer hours logged in school, increased parent survey responses, increased staff responses to survey.	Shared Values survey, Character Ed survey, Parent Survey, Re-enrollment rates, retention rates.

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

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:		To introduce a STEM program designed to help students close the gap between the NGSSS and new CCSS. To challenge students to increase their performance in the stem standards requirements.			
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	Funding	Applied to participate in the Manatee County RTTP grant request for STEM funding and programming.	Jennifer Lucas	We will find out in 2013 if we are selected and approved to participate in the grant program under the umbrella of the district RTTT STEM award.	grant award 2013

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Parent Satisfaction Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Parent Satisfaction Goal Parent Satisfaction Goal #1:		Parent satisfaction is based upon re-enrollment as well as parents who would recommend our school to others. This can be measured through our end of year parent surveys.		
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
82% re-enrollment for qualified students K-7th.		88%		
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						

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 Satisfaction Goal(s)

Shared Values Goal:

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

1. Shared Values Goal Shared Values Goal # 1:	Shared Values is based upon the community's commitment to justice, integrity, and fun. This is measured through our spring shared values surveys. The staff has an opportunity to qualify the school's performance and grade it.			
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:			
C/B	80% of the staff will grade our school an A.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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						

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 Shared Values Goal(s)

Economic Sustainability Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Economic Sustainability Goal		To decrease our projected deficit and to work towards a balanced budget. This is best achieved through maintaining current enrollment of 378 students and increasing enrollment over the course of the school year.		
Economic Sustainability Goal # 1:				
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
378 students plus 58 VPK.		385 students plus 10 preschool students ages 2-3.		
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				

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						

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 Economic Sustainability Goal(s)

School Development Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. School Development Goal		To build enrollment through marketing initiatives, community relations, parent satisfaction and student achievement.		
School Development Goal # 1:				
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
VPK-8th grade, significantly under capacity.		develop preschool and grow enrollment throughout the school, particularly at Kinder level by Fall 2012.		
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						

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 School Development Goal(s)

Character Education Goal:

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

1. Character Education Goal Character Education Goal # 1:	To strengthen the character development of our staff and students through a myriad of activities and service learning. To demonstrate proficiency through recognition awards, low referral rates, and student responses on the character surveys.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
	To apply for and receive a Promising Practices award and to apply for a state character award.

Previously won a character award in 2009.	For 85% of students to respond on the surveys that they feel safe at school, that they can resolve conflicts without violence and that they know what behavior is expected of them. Also for 85% of students to report that they know their teachers care about them.			
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						

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

Academic Achievement Goal:

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

1. Academic Achievement Goal Academic Achievement Goal #1:	To maintain our B grade and to work towards an A within 2 years. Most importantly, to increase our AYP in the low SES groups and hispanic groups.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
Free and Reduced and Hispanic did not make AYP.	To grow from 92% AYP to 98%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 Academic Achievement Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Review yearly goals and approve SIP. Serve as book review committee as necessary. Review mid-year data reports and revise or support current academic growth plans. Help support school growth and parent policies and procedures, specifically related to the volunteer effort.



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

Manatee School District IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL AT NORTH MANATEE 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	66%	70%	64%	74%	274	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	63%	62%			125	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?	47% (NO)	70% (YES)			117	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					516	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Manatee School District IMAGINE CHARTER SCHOOL AT NORTH MANATEE 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	57%	83%	47%	251	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	40%	58%			98	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?	43% (NO)	55% (YES)			98	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					447	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested