

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: GEORGE W. CARVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Cheryl E. Johnson

SAC Chair: Dr. Carlos A. Insignares

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Cheryl E. Johnson	BA in Communication and Management from the University of Florida MS in Elementary Education from Nova Southeastern University Ed. D. in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University. Certified in: Speech 6-12, Elementary Education, and	10	18	School Year 12 11 10 09 School Grade C C A B High Standards- Rdg 52 71 72 67 High Standards- Math 48 68 71 67 Lrng Gains -Rdg 72 69 68 74 Lrng Gains - Math 63 50 63 67 Gains Rdg 25 69 61 76 63 Gains Math 25 53 50 63 50 Science 36 51 51 41

		School Principal (All Levels)			
Assis Principal	Judith Melendez	BS in GeoScience and Secondary Education from Jersey City State College MA in Secondary Bilingual Science from Fairleigh Dickenson University Certification in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University Certified in: Earth-Space Science 6-12, General Science 5-9, Middle Grades Endorsement and Educational Leadership (All Levels)	1	11	School Year 12 11 10 09 School Grade C A A A High Standards- Rdg 52 92 97 92 High Standards- Math 48 94 96 94 Lrng Gains -Rdg 72 71 78 77 Lrng Gains - Math 63 77 68 73 Gains Rdg 25 69 70 79 70 Gains Math 25 53 74 76 63 Science 36

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)
Reading	Denise M. Del Valle	Elementary Education K-6 ESOL Endorsement	2	2	School Year 12 11 School Grade C C High Standards- Rdg 52 71 High Standards- Math 48 68 Lrng Gains -Rdg 72 69 Lrng Gains - Math 63 50 Gains Rdg 25 69 61 Gains Math 25 53 50 Science 36 51

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	Attend District-hosted recruitment events to recruit HOUSSE certified teachers	Principal	June, 2013	
2	Partnering New Teachers with Veteran Teachers	Assistant Principal	June, 2013	
3	Provide leadership opportunities for highly qualified teachers in various areas and committees	Principal/Assistant Principal	June, 2013	
4	Continuous Utilization of IPEGS	Principal	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
Non-Highly Effective-0 Teaching Out of Field-0	Ensure that teachers are completing their course work.

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
36	2.8%(1)	19.4%(7)	52.8%(19)	25.0%(9)	33.3%(12)	86.1%(31)	5.6%(2)	8.3%(3)	69.4%(25)

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
Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

G.W. Carver Elementary provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate evidence based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring data collection and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program includes an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs population such as homeless, migrant and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

At G.W. Carver Elementary, the district Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Title II

At G.W. Carver Elementary the District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- Training to certify qualified mentors for New Teacher (MINT) Program
- Training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL

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

Title III

At G.W. Carver Elementary, services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

1. The Homeless Assistance Program at G.W. Carver Elementary seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, school, and the community.
2. Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and the transportation of homeless students.
3. The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.
4. Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign to all the schools-each school is provided a video and curriculum manual and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a-community organization.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

Violence Prevention Programs

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers and counselor at G.W. Carver Elementary.

Nutrition Programs

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

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

G.W. Carver participates in Kids and the Power of Work (KAPOW). A program that exposes students to a career curriculum presented by mentors from different industries.

Job Training

Other

G.W. Carver Elementary will involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center or parent area in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

G.W. Carver Elementary will increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our school's Title I School-Parent Compact; our school's Title I Parent Involvement Plan; scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting; and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

G.W. Carver Elementary will conduct formal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule

workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents, This impacts our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI team consists of: The Principal, Assistant Principal, School Counselor, Reading Coach, an Intermediate General Education Teacher and a Primary Education Teacher.

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?

School Administrators: Incorporates the use of data-based decision-making, monitors and assesses instructional personnel through observations thus providing support through analysis, ensures adequate professional development for instructional personnel to facilitate innovative educational trends, and provides ongoing communication with parents pertaining to school-based plans and activities.

Selected General and/or Special Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Presents information regarding explicit instruction for the core and content area subjects, partakes in the collection of student data, utilizes student data to deliver instruction and/or intervention to Tier 1 students, and collaborates with colleagues to implement activities, instruction, and intervention for Tier 2/3 students.

Instructional Reading Coach: Identifies and analyzes data to develop intervention approaches utilizing the Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan. Works with district personnel to assist in the implementation of school core content standards/programs.

School Counselor: Engages in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of student data, collaborates with instructional personnel to develop and implement behavior intervention plans, and provides support and assistance for problem-solving activities.

The leadership team meetings will center on infusing current educational trends in the academic preparation of our students to meet district, state and national standards, while taking current education trends into account. The team will meet once a month to engage in the following activities:

- Review academic and behavioral data and evaluate progress to make instructional decisions and intensify instruction and interventions.
- Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and needs.
- Maintain communication with staff for input and feed back as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
- Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
- Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.

Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of the subgroups within the expectations for Adequately Yearly Progress.

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

In order to establish the School Improvement Plan (SIP), The RtI leadership team will confer with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and School Administrators. As a result, the team will present student data, ranging from Tier 1 through Tier 3, students in the lowest 25%, and identified subgroups in order to establish precise expectations for core instruction.

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

The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and intervention to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehension Assessment Test (FCAT), Stanford Achievement Test-10, (SAT-10)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation, Interim Assessments

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

End of the Year: FAIR, FCAT, SAT-10

Frequency of Data Days: once a month for data analysis

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

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

2. Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR Assessment
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science Assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific Assessments

Behavior

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspension/Expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance

Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development on the implementation of RtI will be provided to the instructional staff during their common planning time. Smaller sessions will also be offered throughout the year.

G.W. Carver Staff member will participate in district professional development and support of RtI.

Dr. Cheryl E. Johnson, Principal, Denise Del Valle, Reading Coach, Tarcia Black, Reading Teacher, and Catherine Fernandez, Reading Teacher. Also, other principal appointees will serve on this team.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Team has developed Professional Development needs for the next school year. Professional development will be provided during grade levels' planning times and small group sessions will occur throughout the year. Professional Development will also be provided on District Professional Development designated days. Training on more test data utilization to drive instruction will be implemented throughout the year. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will also evaluate additional staff development needs during monthly meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Cheryl E. Johnson, Principal, Yoelin Cabrera-Fernandez, Reading Teacher, Ms. Del Valle, Reading Coach, Tarcia Black, Reading Teacher, and Catherine Fernandez, Reading Teacher. Also, other principal appointees will serve on this team.

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

The role of G.W. Carver Elementary's Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of literacy knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The team will meet once a month.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team's major initiatives for this year will include:

- Infusing literacy throughout the school community
- Creating a literacy vision for the school

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.

In April of each academic year, G. W. Carver Elementary articulates with the local Head Start program and invites parents, students, and Head Start faculty to visit our Kindergarten program. In addition, our Kindergarten teachers have an open house for the general public. We will provide attendees and those parents interested in our school information and pertinent documentation describing our curriculum and related academic programs.

At the beginning of each school year, all incoming Kindergarten students are administered the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR). All the students are assessed within the areas of Phonemic Awareness (sound and word discrimination, rhyming, blending, segmentation), Alphabetic Principle (letter-sound correspondence, decoding, sight-word reading), Passage Understanding (predicting, Identifying information from stories, retelling and summarizing, making connections), and Oral Vocabulary (concept naming and use, categorization, vocabulary development and use). FAIR will be administered and the data aggregated prior to the end of September, 2009. The date will be used to organize the daily academic instruction for all students.

FAIR will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine student learning gains in order to determine the need for changes to the instructional/intervention programs.

*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.

*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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 23 % of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 28 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (63)	28% (77)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the percent of students achieving above proficiency decreased by 7 percentage points as compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. Grade 3: The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, notes a need of improvement in Reading Category 2: Reading Application Grades 4 and 5: The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, notes a need of improvement in Reading Category 3: Literary Analysis.	Students in third grade use grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose and main idea. Students will also be able to identify casual relationships and compare and contrast within the text. Students will identify and interpret elements of story structure with text and will understand descriptive language that defines modes and provides imagery.	MTSS/RTI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Student Work Folders will be monitored. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: FAIR and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 28 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

26% (72)		28% (77)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the percent of students achieving above proficiency decreased by 3 percentage points as compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. FCAT levels 4 and 5 students need to further their development in Reporting Category 4: Informational Text/ Research process.	In order to increase the amount of students scoring at proficiency levels 4 and 5, students will be exposed to non-fiction texts that provide information through the use of text features, graphics, legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts, and keys. They will locate, interpret, and organize information while identifying the validity and reliability of information within and across texts.	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Student Work Folders will be monitored. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: FAIR and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 74 % of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (115)	79% (122)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test , the percent of students making learning gains increased by 5 percentage point as compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. FCAT Students making Learning Gains need further development in Reporting Category 2: Reading Application	Students will use grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose /perspective, main idea, cause and effect, comparisons, and chronological order.	MTSS/RTI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Student Work Folders will be monitored. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: FAIR and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.
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
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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 74 % of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase student achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 79 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (115)	79% (122)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test , the percent of students making learning gains increased by 5 percentage point as compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. FCAT Students making Learning Gains need further development in Reporting Category 2: Reading Application	Students will use grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose /perspective, main idea, cause and effect, comparisons, and chronological order.	MTSS/RTI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Student Work Folders will be monitored. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: FAIR and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #3b:		Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.		
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
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 results of the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 61% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 5 percentage points to 66%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (21)	66% (23)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the number of students in the lowest 25 % making learning gains increased by 11 percentage points. Grade 3: The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, notes a need of improvement in Reading Category 2: Reading Application Grades 4 and 5: The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test	Students in third grade use grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose and main idea. Students will also be able to identify casual relationships and compare and contrast within the text. Students will identify and interpret elements of story structure with text and will understand descriptive language that defines mood and provides imagery.	MTSS/RTI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Voyager Passport Checkpoints will be monitored for fidelity. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed. The Success Maker program will also be monitored to ensure that students are demonstrating satisfactory performance on reading benchmarks.	Formative: FAIR and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

notes a need for improvement in Reading Category 3: Literary Analysis			
---	--	--	--

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 #					
	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53	58	62	66	70	

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:	<p>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that we did not have sufficient students in the Asian or American Indian category to count as a subgroup.</p> <p>Blacks: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30 % of students in the Black Subgroup achieved proficiency.</p> <p>Our goal is for the 2012-2013 school year is increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 40% proficiency for students in the Black subgroup</p> <p>Hispanics: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 54 % of students in the Hispanic Subgroup achieved proficiency.</p> <p>Our goal is for the 2012-2013 school year is increase student proficiency by 7 percentage points to 61% proficiency for students in the Hispanic subgroup.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 30% (21) Hispanic: 54% (92)	Black: 40% (28) Hispanic: 61% (104)

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
<p>Black: Data reveals that the amount of students in the Black subgroup meeting proficiency has decreased by 17 percentage points when compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.</p> <p>Black students need further support in Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis and appropriate placement in tier intervention.</p>	<p>Students in the black subgroup will increase their proficiency in Literary Analysis by learning to identify and interpret elements of story structure within a text. Students will also engage in activities that will allow them to understand and describe different examples of descriptive and figurative language.</p> <p>Utilizing data, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be</p>	MTSS/RTI	<p>To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Intervention Schedules, Checkpoint Assessments, and progress monitoring forms will be used to ensure that progress is made.</p> <p>FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.</p>	<p>Formative: Voyager Intervention Assessment, FAIR Assessment Data, and Interim Assessments</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment</p>

1	<p>Hispanics: Data reveals that the amount of students in the Hispanic subgroup meeting proficiency has decreased by 10 percentage points when compared to the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.</p> <p>Hispanics: Hispanic students have limited vocabulary that hinders their comprehension of texts. Further development in Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary is necessary for this subgroup.</p>	<p>identified and placed in the appropriate interventions within the first semester of the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>Teachers will use research-based strategies to teach meaning and increase vocabulary through the use of prefixes, suffixes, root words, multiple meaning words, antonyms, synonyms, and word relationships. Students will also learn to identify context clues that will help them to determine meanings of unfamiliar words.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5C:</p>	<p>For the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, we did have an ELL subgroup, however they made adequate progress.</p>
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
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:

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5D:</p>	<p>The results of the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that we did not have sufficient students in the SWD category to count as a subgroup.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	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
	We are unable to	Students in the SWD	MTSS/RtI	FCIM will review Voyager	Formative:

1	compare the 2012 FCAT 2.0 reading proficiency level of students with disabilities with the 2011 FCAT 2.0 results because we did not have a sufficient amount of students to create a subgroup last year. Students with disabilities need further instruction in Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis.	subgroup will increase their proficiency in Literary Analysis by learning to identify the author's mood in a story. Students will also engage in activities that will allow them to understand and describe different examples of descriptive and figurative language.	Checkpoints and Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Voyager Intervention Checkpoints, FAIR Assessment Data, and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 54% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is for the 2011-2012 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 59% proficient for students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (92)	59% (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	As noted on the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test , the number of student in the Economically Disadvantage subgroup meeting proficiency has decreased by 8 percentage points when comparing the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test & 2010 administrations of the FCAT Reading Test. Instruction for students in this subgroup must be further intensified for Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction.	Upon starting school, students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will be placed into intervention in a timely fashion. RtI and ensuring that students are a able to identify and explain the use of descriptive, idiomatic, and figurative language to describe people, feelings, and objects.	RtI Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy Student Work Folders will be monitored insuring progress is being made adjusting instruction as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR Assessment Data, Student Work Folders Summative: 2012 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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
Success Maker	3-5	Reading Coach	Intervention Teachers	September 2012	Progress Monitoring Forms	Principal and Assistant Principal
Voyager Intervention Training-Refresher	K-5	Reading Coach	Intervention Teachers	September, 2012	Student Work Folders & Voyager Passport Checkpoint Logs	Principal and Assistant Principal
Assessment debriefing and Data Analysis	3-5	Reading Coach	Language Arts Teachers	October, 2012	Class Walk Through	Principal and Assistant Principal

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:	The results of the CELLA 2012 Spring Oral Skills (Listening/Speaking) Test indicate that 49% of students tested in grades kindergarten through fifth achieved proficiency.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
49% (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	<p>Listening: Our ELL population has demonstrated a need for additional instruction in listening comprehension skills.</p> <p>Speaking: Our ELL students show a deficiency in their ability to read fluently and with the correct intonation. Additionally, our ELL students have difficulty expressing themselves and answering open-ended question with elaboration.</p>	<p>In order to increase student proficiency, the teacher should use simple and direct language, listening carefully to his/her own language use, and try to adapt it to meet the students' level of English understanding. During small group sessions, the teacher will restate content at a slower rate when needed, however will ensure that intonation and stress patterns become distorted. Teachers will also restate simple sentences as complex sentences to demonstrate rephrasing.</p> <p>In order to increase student proficiency the teacher will use think/read aloud strategies used to slow down the reading process, and model the correct format to answer open-ended question with elaboration.</p>	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teachers' observations will be used to monitor progress and FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	<p>Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR Assessment Data</p> <p>Summative: 2013 CELLA results</p>

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

The results of the CELLA 2012 Spring Reading Test indicate that 33% of students tested in grades kindergarten through fifth achieved proficiency.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

33% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students of difficulty comprehending high order thinking concept in English.	The use of graphic representation during teacher- lead centers assists the students in expressing and defining their own individual responses and prepares them for verbal sharing in response groups. The illustrations provide a communication channel beyond words for	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teachers' observations will be used to monitor progress and FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	<p>Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR Assessment Data</p> <p>Summative: 2013 CELLA results</p>

	assisting comprehension.			
--	--------------------------	--	--	--

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the CELLA 2012 Spring Writing Test indicate that 29% of students tested in grades kindergarten through fifth achieved proficiency.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

29% (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	ELL students demonstrated difficulty using expressive written language.	The use of reading response journal/logs provide students the opportunity to record their thoughts and questions about anything they are reading, including content area or research material; a components of reading discussion groups in which students share their written responses to initiate and continue discussion about specific text.	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teacher's observation and teacher review of the reading response journal/logs will be used. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Interim Assessments, FAIR Assessment Data Summative: 2013 CELLA results

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 2.0 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates that 26% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (71)	31% (85)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Students who achieved FCAT level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test demonstrated a decrease of 1 percentage point when comparing the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test & 2011 administrations of the FCAT Mathematics Test.</p> <p>The following Reporting Categories need to be addressed:</p> <p>In Grade 3: Number: Fractions</p> <p>In Grade 4: Number: Operations and Problems</p> <p>In Grade 5: Expressions, Equations and Statistics</p>	<p>In grade 3, develop an understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence through the use of manipulatives and concrete examples.</p> <p>In grade 4, teachers will develop an understanding of decimals, including the connections between fractions and decimals; develop quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts and fluency with whole number multiplication; use and represent numbers through millions in various contexts; use models to represent division; estimate and describe reasonableness of estimates; determine factors and multiples; relate fractions to decimals and percents and generate equivalent fractions and simplify fractions.</p> <p>In Grade 5, teachers will use the properties of equality to solve numerical and real world situations; and use the order of operations to simplify expressions which include exponents and parentheses.</p>	MTSS/RTI Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, we will review mini assessment results to ensure students are progressing adequately. In addition, FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	<p>Formative: Mini Assessments, Interim Assessments, Student Work Folders</p> <p>Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</p>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.
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
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:	The result of the 2011- 2012 FCAT 2.0 mathematics test indicates that 20% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 22%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (55)	22% (61)

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 who achieved FCAT levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test demonstrated a decrease of 11 percentage points when compared the 2011 administrations of the FCAT Mathematics Test. Students scoring a Level 4 or 5 need further enrichment in mathematical practices to ensure and increase at this level of performance.	During differentiated instruction levels 4 and 5 students will receive instruction using Go Math enrichment materials.	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Go Math mini-assessments will be used to monitor student progress. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Math Interim Assessments, Go Math mini-assessments, student generated work folders. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.
--	--

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
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:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 64% of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 69%. Students who achieved FCAT Learning Gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test demonstrated an increase of 14 percentage points when compared to the 2011 administrations of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (100)	69% (108)

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 following Reporting Categories need to be addressed: In Grade 3: Number: Fractions In Grade 4: Number: Operations and Problems In Grade 5: Expressions, Equations and Statistics	In grade 3, develop an understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence through the use of manipulatives and concrete examples. In grade 4, teachers will develop an understanding of decimals, including the connections between fractions and decimals; develop quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts and fluency with whole number multiplication; use and represent numbers through millions in various contexts; use models to represent division; estimate and describe reasonableness of estimates; determine factors and multiples; relate fractions to decimals and percents	MTSS/RtI Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teachers will monitor data reports from the technology program to ensure skill mastery. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Mini Assessments, Interim Assessments, Student Work Folders Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

	and generate equivalent fractions and simplify fractions. In Grade 5, teachers will use the properties of equality to solve numerical and real world situations; and use the order of operations to simplify expressions which include exponents and parentheses.		
--	--	--	--

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:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.
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
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:	On the 2011 - 2012 FCAT Mathematics test 56 % of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions remediation in order to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25 % by 10 percentage points to 66 %. Students who are identified as FCAT Lowest 25% on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test demonstrated a increase of 6 percentage point when compared to the 2011 administrations of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (23)	66% (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
The students in the lowest 25% making learning gains lack	Mathematics teachers will provide instructional support needed for	MTSS/RTI Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Administration	Formative: Mini Assessments, Interim

1	proficiency in basic mathematical concepts such as multiplication and division.	students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts. They will also learn to build fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, multiplication and division of whole numbers, and addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals in a small group setting.	will conduct periodic walkthroughs to ensure that students are received small group instruction during Mathematics. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Assessments, Student Work Folders, Walkthrough Logs Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
---	---	--	--	---

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	50	54	59	63	68	

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:	Black: The results of the 2011 - 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates that 30% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 38% . Hispanic: The results of the 2011 - 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates that 49 % of students in the Hispanic subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 30% (21) Hispanic: 49% (83)	Black: 38% (26) Hispanic: 59% (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
Black: According to the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, there was a decline of 1 percentage point in the amount of students in this subgroup who achieved proficiency when compared to the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. This subgroup needs improvement in the	Black: Students in this subgroup will engage in activities that will further develop their understanding of Geometry and Measurement through the use of manipulatives. Additionally, students will be provided with grade-level appropriate activities that promote describing, analyzing, comparing, and	MTSS/RtI Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Go Math mini-assessments will be used to monitor student progress. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Go Math Mini Assessments, Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

1	<p>Geometry and Measurement reporting category.</p> <p>Hispanic: According to the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, there was a decline of 15 percentage point in the amount of students in this subgroup who achieved proficiency when compared to the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. This subgroup needs improvement in the Number Concepts and Operations reporting category.</p>	<p>classifying models that will develop their understanding of measurement.</p> <p>Hispanic: Students in this subgroup will be provided with the instructional support needed to recall addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.</p>		
---	--	---	--	--

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5C:</p>	<p>For the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, we did have an ELL subgroup, however they made adequate progress.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
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
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:

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5D:</p>	<p>For the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, we did have an SWD subgroup, however they made adequate progress.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
0% (0)	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
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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that that 39 % of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 8percentage points to 47 % .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (77)	47% (93)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 39% if students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency. This is a decline of 12 percentage points when compared to the 2010-2011 results of the FCAT 2.0 mathematics test where 51% of students in the ED subgroup were proficient. Students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup need further instruction in the Numbers and Operations subgroup.	Teachers will provide students in this subgroup with contexts for mathematical exploration so that they are able to develop an understanding of numbers and operations through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice	MTSS/RtI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, Go Math mini-assessments will be used to monitor student progress. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Go Math Mini-Assessments and student generated work, Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	K-2 3-5 Mathematics	Grade Level Chairperson/RtI Team	K-5 Teachers	Monthly	Mathematics Grade Level meetings	Grade Level Chairs and Assistant Principal

Differentiated Instruction During the mathematics Instructional Block	K-5 Mathematics	Grade Level Chairperson/RtI Team	K-5 Teachers	Monthly	Mathematics Small Group schedule	Grade Level Chairs and Assistant Principal
Success Maker	Grades K-5 Mathematics	Grade Level Chairperson/RtI Team	K-5 Grade Mathematics Teachers	September 26, 2012	Intervention Schedule; Reports from Computer Assisted Program (CAP)	Grade Level Chairs and Assistant Principal

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.		The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Science Test indicates that 26% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3).			
Science Goal #1a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students achieving proficiency in Science by 5 percentage points, to 31 %.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
26% (25)		31% (29)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was reflected in the Physical Science content cluster.	Provide opportunities for teachers to apply physical and chemical science concepts in real-world scenarios, and conduct laboratory investigations that include calculating, manipulating, and solving problems. Instruction in grades K-4 adhere to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides	MTSS/RTI	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, teachers will monitor Science Student Work Folders. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Mini Assessments, Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 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:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA
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
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 results of the 2011 - 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicates that 9% of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students achieving above proficiency in Science by 2 percentage points to 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (9)	11% (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
In the areas of Life and Environmental	Provide students with challenging and	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the	Formative: Mini Assessments,

1	<p>Science our students showed no change in the average percent correct, as shown by the comparison of the 2011 and 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test.</p> <p>Level 4 and 5 students lack enrichment activities that will challenge them and enable them to demonstrate additional progress.</p>	<p>enriching assignments and scientific experiments that will allow them to expand their knowledge of scientific concepts.</p>	<p>strategy, teachers will monitor Science Student Work Folders. FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.</p>	<p>Interim Assessment</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment</p>
---	---	--	---	--

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

<p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.</p> <p>Science Goal #2b:</p>	<p>Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
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
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
FCAT Science 2.0 Next Generation SSS	3-5th Grade	Gabriel Garcia	Grade Level Science Teachers	Monthly	Student Work Samples	Assistant Principal

Science Budget:

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.		The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicates that 73% of students achieved proficiency in writing.			
Writing Goal #1a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase proficiency by 3 percentage points to 76%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
73% (59)		76% (61)			
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 genre assessed on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was narrative. Students showed deficiency in their ability to elaborate and use descriptive details in their writing.	During writing instruction, teachers will incorporate mentor text to model the importance of elaboration. Students will utilize teacher conferencing or peer editing to: • Add supporting details (show, not tell). • Use examples, statistics, comparisons, vivid descriptions and specific word choice. • Substitute active verbs for common verbs and specific words for	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy student work folders and monthly writing prompt recording sheets will be monitored and FCIM will review Formative Assessment Reports to ensure that progress is being made and that adjustments are made as needed.	Formative: Scores on the monthly writing assessments, District Baseline Writing Test, District End of Year Writing Test Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment

	general words. • Substitute an effective ending appropriate to the audience and purpose by using universal word endings. • Respond to other writers and receive feedback from peers using TAG (T-telling something you like, A-asking a question, G-giving a suggestion).		
--	---	--	--

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:	Currently our school does not have students who qualify to take the FAA.
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
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
Teaching students to elaborate and teaching teachers to effectively use the rubric for instruction	3-5	Reading Coach	3rd-5th Grade Language Arts Teachers	October 31, 2012	Monthly Writing Prompts	Principal; Assistant Principal; Reading Coach

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 Attendance Goal # 1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (7 or more), and excessive tardiness (7 or more) by 1%. Also, our goal for the 2012-2012 school year is to increase attendance to .5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.57% (551)	96.07% (554)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
137	130
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
136	129

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
	Inability to allocate personnel to meet with parents to address excessive absences in an adequate and timely fashion, has been an	Teachers will identify and refer students who have excessive absences or tardiness to the school counselor. The	Leadership Team	To determine the effectiveness of the strategy, daily attendance and COGNOS data will be monitored	Attendance Records System(IPS)-Attendance/Tardy Reports

1	issue. Inability to allocate personnel to meet with parents to address excessive tardiness, in an adequate and timely fashion, has been an issue.	counselor will meet with parents to discuss any possible assistance the school can provide to improve absences or tardiness The Assistant Principal will meet with the parents to conduct a Tier Two Level Meeting if there is no improvement in the student's attendance.		
---	--	---	--	--

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance/Tardy Monitoring Procedures	K-5	Assistant Principal	K-5th Grade Teachers	August, 2012 through June, 2013	Attendance/Tardy Reports	Leadership Team

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the total number of out-door suspensions from 3 to 3 students. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the total number of in-door suspensions from 0 to 0 students. The total number of students suspended out-of school decreased from 14 students during the 2010-2011 school year to 5 students during the 2011-2012 school year, a decrease of 9 incidences
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
5	5
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	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	An inability to allocate personnel to recognize students for exhibiting positive behavior with fidelity in an adequate and timely fashion.	Utilize the Student Code of conduct and provide incentives for positive behavior. Use Do the Right Thing referrals to reinforce positive behavior during the school year and reward students during the morning announcement. Ongoing school-wide focus on Character Education throughout all grades.	Leadership Team	Monitor the COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate. Monitor student behavior student case management reports on a bi-weekly basis.	Monthly COGNOS suspension report, Daily student behavior chart and Student Case Management Report.

(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
School Wide Discipline Committee Meetings	Various Staff Members	Administration	Leadership Team	Weekly	Classroom walkthroughs, Posted Behavior Chart, Daily Student Behavior Chart, Monitor of suspension rates through COGNOS	Principal; Assistant Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 10% from 65% to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
65%	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	Parents have limited understanding of student data and how it affects teaching and learning.	Provide information on assessment data to parents and explain the data during PTA meetings, MTSS/RTI conferences, ESSAC meetings and Teacher/Parent conferences. Post additional testing information in the PTA newsletter.	Leadership Team	Review sign in sheets to determine parent participation in school-wide activities.	ConnectEd logs, review volunteer logs and sign in sheets and teacher conference logs.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Understanding Data and CCSS	Open to All	Reading Coach	Parents	August, 2012 through June, 2013	Review volunteer logs and sign in sheets and teacher conference logs.	Administration

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

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:		Increase opportunities for STEM applied learning by integrating STEM benchmarks through Math and Science projects/instruction.			
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	Time constraints for ensuring STEM standards are integrated and STEM practices are implemented in the classroom during Science and Mathematics courses.	Include and teach STEM benchmarks through Math and Science projects/instruction and provide access to STEM activities/projects through school sponsored clubs.	Science Chairperson and Leadership Team	Review focus calendars, lesson plans, student folders, and student grades using the FCIM process.	Formative: Teacher made tests. Summative FCAT Math and Science 2.0, Science projects - Fairs

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
Science Inquiry Processes	K-8	Science School Liaisons	Science Teachers	September 26, 2012	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Informal Observations, Student Grades, Monthly Assessments, Science Fair Projects	Administrative Team

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 checked="" type="radio"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
---	--	--	-------------------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Tutoring Program and additional resources	\$2,999.00

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

The George Washington Carver Elementary Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) has a defined vision and goals for student achievement. The EESAC is dedicated to strengthening student achievement and school wide success. The EESAC meets monthly as per state and district guidelines to monitor school wide decisions which affect instruction and delivery of programs and to

foster an environment of professional collaboration among the educational stakeholders of the school. In fact, one of the EESAC's primary goals is to develop, implement, and monitor the SIP goals and to assist in assuring all objectives and action steps are achieved. After carefully reviewing last year's data, it is the recommendation of the EESAC to continue strengthening our reading, mathematics, writing, and science programs along with increasing parental tutorial program involvement. The EESAC also provides recommendations related to technology, safety, staffing and student support services as well as discipline, attendance, and instructional materials. The members of the EESAC receive annual school-site budget training and uses consensus along with faculty and staff input to determine how the designated funds will be expended. School wide implementation of the state adopted district textbooks and supplementary materials and resources will be utilized to supplement and enhance the curriculum. The EESAC continues to seek outside support and enhancements from Dade Partners, Community Members and our P.T.A.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District GEORGE W. CARVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	68%	69%	51%	259	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	69%	50%			119	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?	61% (YES)	50% (YES)			111	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					489	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District GEORGE W. CARVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	71%	81%	51%	275	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	68%	63%			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?	76% (YES)	63% (YES)			139	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