

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: WESTSIDE K-8

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Dr. Zundra Aubrey

SAC Chair: Tracey Hay

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: October 10, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/13/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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. Eric Cantrell	Ed.D.	1	12	This is my eighth year as a Principal. I've opened another elementary school. I've led two different elementary schools to an A and have participated in the leadership of another A elementary school. I have 5 years as an elementary Assistant Principal. I have 7 years as an elementary or middle school teacher.
Assis Principal	Dr. Karen Vislocky	Ed.D.	1	5	This is my sixth year as an Assistant Principal. My previous four years have been at a middle school.
Assis Principal	Mark Ferguson	Masters	1	23	I have 15 years experience as a Principal. I have been at elementary and middle school levels. The school grades have ranged from a B-D. My last year as a principal my school moved from a D to a B.

### 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)
Literacy	Polly Prather	Masters	2	7	I have taught 4th and 5th grade. This is my seventh year as a literacy coach.
Math/Science	Brian Koster	Masters	2	1	I have experience teaching sixth, seventh, and eighth grade mathematics. This is my second year as a math/science coach and my first year as coach at Westside.

## 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	We incorporate PLC and the F.I.S.H. philosophy to recruit and retain high quality teachers at our school.	Eric W. Cantrell, Ed.D., Principal	June 2011	

## 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
No data submitted	

## 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
91	13.2%(12)	50.5%(46)	24.2%(22)	12.1%(11)	34.1%(31)	82.4%(75)	6.6%(6)	1.1%(1)	36.3%(33)

## 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
Polly Prather	David Ludwig	literacy coach	Mentors and mentees have monthly gatherings before school
		Assistance with acclimating to Westside	Mentors and mentees

Veteran Teachers	Teachers new to Westside	and/or the school district; pairs are assigned based on curriculum or grade level	have monthly gatherings before school. They also meet unofficially as needed.
------------------	--------------------------	---	---

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

#### Title I, Part A

Title I Part A funds were used to provide extra support in the form of a math/science resource specialist and two reading specialists. These instructional leaders will help students as well as teachers as they work to increase student achievement.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

#### Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support migrant students within the district.

#### Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Funds are also used for teacher professional development.

#### Title III

Title III is providing support for our English Language Learners. ELL Paraprofessionals assist teachers with our ELL students in the classroom.

#### Title X- Homeless

Our district office for special programs will coordinate with our school guidance staff to meet the needs of our increasing number of Families In Transition (FIT). We also have a parent liaison that will work with the FIT families.

#### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

We will offer SAI tutoring services by certified teachers each day after school. Transportation is provided.

#### Violence Prevention Programs

We have an anti-bullying program combined with our RtI program in an effort to reduce incidents of violence.

#### Nutrition Programs

Our school food services program designs nutrition programs that will meet student needs.

#### Housing Programs

N/A

#### Head Start

N/A

#### Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Jennifer Fender, Guidance Counselor, Roger Brown, Dean of Students, Keri Haley, ESE teacher, Alexandria White, ESE teacher, Dr. Cantrell, Principal, Mark Ferguson, A.P. Elementary, Dr. Vislocky, A.P. Middle School, Jennifer Ludwig, Elementary teacher, Brian Koster math/science coach, Polly Prather, literacy coach

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

The RtI Leadership Team meets as needed as part of our PLC process. Time is allotted each week for this team to meet as needed. This team will oversee all student interventions per the input of teachers during the weekly PLC meetings.

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?

RtI Leadership provides input regarding student needs relative to achievement and learning gains. Information is gathered via our weekly PLC meeting format.

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.

Data management is provided through our weekly PLC format in which student needs are discussed and separate RtI meeting for success of student interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained on RtI throughout the year via our weekly PLC meeting format.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Justin Douglas (ESE), Jacqueline Rivera (ELL), Jennifer Fender (RtI), Polly Prather (literacy coach), Marie Troop (reading specialist), Joseph Madigan (reading specialist), Rachel Barenie (Kindergarten), Sandra Padin (Grade 1), Lindsay Coburn (Grade 2), Cherie Dowd (Grade 3), Katie Parisi (Grade 4), Wendi McFarland (Grade 5), Kim Azis (MS Language Arts), Jackie Schroeder (MS Reading), Dr. Karen Vislocky (Administrator), Dr. Eric Cantrell (Administrator)

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

The LLT will meet once a month after school. The team will meet with a set agenda focusing on the SIP, parental involvement, and higher-order reading instruction.

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

The team will focus on SIP, parental involvement, and higher-order reading instruction.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

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

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

The highly qualified elementary school teachers will assess their students using ECHOS and FAIR to identify the needs of students and drive instruction.

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All teachers will be given the opportunity to obtain a reading endorsement. Teachers in all content areas are required to incorporate reading strategies into their lessons. LFS strategies will help incorporate reading and writing strategies into each content area. All second through eighth grade reading teachers are administering DRA to identify the learning needs of students.

### \*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:

<p>1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #1a:</p>	<p>Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms. Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.</p>
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% of the students scored 3 or above on the FCAT	79% of the students will receive a 3 or above on the FCAT

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #1b:</p>	
--	--

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	Based upon teacher IPDP information we will seek to have 72% or higher of our students meet or exceed the state goal of Level 3 on 2009-10 FCAT Reading Assessment. At least 35% of those students will achieve a level 4 or 5.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26.2% of the students achieved a level of 4 or 5 in reading on the 2010 FCAT	35% of the students will achieve a level of 4 or 5 in reading on the 2011 FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; benchmark assessments, classroom walkthroughs

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  Reading Goal #2b:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms. Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will
---	--

		be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
62% of the students made learning gains in reading		79% of the students will make learning gains in reading			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:		Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms. Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading		79% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading			



Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms. Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 73% on grade level; Hispanic: 52% on grade level	White: 80% will be on grade level; Hispanic: 79% will be on grade level

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms.
--	--

Reading Goal #5C:		Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
40% of the ELL students were on grade level		79% of the ELL students will be on grade level			
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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:		Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms. Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
37% of SWD were on grade level		79% of SWD will be on grade level			
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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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.		Students determined to be at-risk will be targeted for special assistance in small group. Differentiated groups will be developed determined on assessment data. ELL and reading specialists will work with individual students in small groups. Literacy Coach will observe teachers by visiting classrooms during reading instruction and provide feedback regarding methods to improve reading instruction in all classrooms.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Reading Goal #5E:		Opportunities for peer observation will be provided to teachers. Book Fairs, Families Building Better Readers, and Mysteries in the Middle will be held. The lowest quartile students will be pulled by the teacher for iii (immediate, intensive intervention) in the area of reading. All teachers will be invited to obtain a reading endorsement. Reading strategies will be emphasized in all content areas.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
58% of Economically Disadvantaged students were on grade level		79% of Economically Disadvantaged students will be on grade level			
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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; DRA; FAIR and ORF

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

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

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

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% of the students were on grade level	80% of the students will be on grade level

### 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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 2a:	74% or higher of our students will realize a score of Level 3 or higher as evidenced on the FCAT Math (2011). Of those students 35% will score a level 4 or 5.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26.2% of the students achieved a level 4 or 5 on the 2010 math FCAT	35% of the students will achieve a level of 4 or 5 in math on the 2011 FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; benchmark assessments, classroom walkthroughs

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  
Mathematics Goal #2b:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
---	--

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

64% of the students made learning gains in math	80% of the students will make learning gains in math
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math	80% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #



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

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5B:</p>	<p>Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>White: 68% were on grade level; Hispanic: 44% were on grade level</p>	<p>White: 80% will be on grade level; Hispanic: 80% will be on grade level</p>

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #5C:</p>	<p>Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>36% of ELL students were on grade level</p>	<p>80% of the ELL students will be on grade level</p>

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% of SWD were on grade level	80% of SWD will be on grade level

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT;

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% of the Economically Disadvantaged students were on grade level	80% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be on grade level

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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in

mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal # 1a:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal # 1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal # 2a:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	
---	--

Mathematics Goal #3b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #4:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Middle School Mathematics Goal #				
		5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5B:				

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  
 Mathematics Goal #5D:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.				
Algebra Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Algebra Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3B:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3C:		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>



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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

# Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

--	--	--	--	--	--

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3B:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3C:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #3D:

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

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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.				
Geometry Goal #3E:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.  Science Goal #1a:			Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons. Hands-on labs will be emphasized on a weekly basis.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
44% of 330 students scored level 3 in science			50% of the tested students will score level 3 in science		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1			Dr. Zundra Aubrey Math/Science Coach Elementary Science Teachers Middle School Science Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring with formative assessments	

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	50% or higher of our students will realize a score of Level 3 or higher as evidenced on the FCAT Science (2011). Of those students 20% will achieve a level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6.5% of the students achieved a level 4 or 5 on the 2010 science FCAT	20% of the students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the 2011 science FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; benchmark assessments, classroom walkthroughs

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

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

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Differentiated groups will be determined on assessment
--	--

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	data and targeted in small group instruction daily as needs arise. Teachers will engage students with higher-order instruction using LFS strategies. Students will receive intervention during and after school as necessary for remediation. The math and science coach will implement professional development for teachers to develop content knowledge and instructional strategies. Teachers will be mentored as necessary along with model lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% of the students were on grade level in writing	95% of the students will be on grade level in writing

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Ongoing formative assessments; FCAT; Osceola Writes monthly

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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



No Data Submitted

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.				
Civics Goal #1:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels

4 and 5 in Civics.			
Civics Goal #2:			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted			

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

## 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:		Students cannot learn if they are not present in school. Therefore, ensuring student attendance must be at the forefront of the school's goals.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
The attendance rate for the 2009-2010 school year was 94%.		Student attendance for the 2010-2011 school year will meet or exceed 96%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
During the 2009-2010 school year, 18 students had ten or more absences.		The number of students with excessive absences will be at most five students.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
During the 2009-2010 school year, 17 students had ten or more tardies.		The number of students with excessive tardies to school will be at most five students.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra instruction before and after school. Parents will be encouraged to attend parent activities held on a monthly basis.	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Attendance rate	ODMS attendance data

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	It is the goal of Westside K-8 to keep all students in their appropriate learning environments. To that end we seek to control behavior with positive support instead of out-of-school suspensions. If a student requires an alternative classroom environment, in-school suspension will be utilized. However, sometimes a students behavior forces an out-of-school suspension consequence.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
141 students were given in-school suspension during the 2009-2010 school year	We expect no more than 70 instances of in-school suspension
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
141 students were given in-school suspension during the 2009-2010 school year	We expect no more than 70 students to receive in-school suspension.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
91 students were given out-of-school suspensions during the 2009-2010 school year	We expect no more than 20 instances of out-of-school suspension
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

91 students were given out-of-school suspensions during the 2009-2010 school year		We expect no more than 20 students to receive out-of-school suspension			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support at home	Parent involvement opportunities such as "Families Building Better Readers", "Mysteries in the Middle", and Science and Math family nights	Dr. Eric Cantrell	The number of students suspended should decrease.	The number of students suspended

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

## 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>	Parental involvement is crucial to student success. Westside has planned monthly activities after school to allow parents to become involved with their students' education. Families Building Better Readers, Mysteries in the Middle, and Science and Math nights are designed to build academic relationships with parents. The school has created a Parent Involvement Committee to help organize events to get parents into the school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Parents were actively involved in the SAC and PTO. However, parental activities were limited, and few school-wide events were planned.	50% of the students' parents will attend the monthly parent involvement activities

### 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	Mobility Rate	Students will receive extra interventions both during school and after school	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Ongoing progress monitoring	Number of parents that attend the parent events
2	Attendance Rate	Parents will become more involved with the school, therefore will encourage their children to attend school.	Dr. Eric Cantrell	Improved attendance rate	Attendance data

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

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

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

## Parent Involvement Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. CTE				
CTE Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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



CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



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

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Osceola School District WESTSIDE K-8 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	60%	94%	44%	269	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	67%	64%			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?	74% (YES)	72% (YES)			146	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					546	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Osceola School District WESTSIDE K-8 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	62%	88%	42%	261	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	62%	64%			126	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	62% (YES)			122	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					509	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested