

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: EMMA E. BOOKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Dawn Clayton

SAC Chair: Tony Torrence

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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 | Dawn Clayton | BA: English Literature MAT: Elementary Education MSE: Educational Administration & Supervision Certification: Elementary K-6 Education & Educational Leadership | 4 | 9 | Fruitville Elementary School: 2004-2008 2005: A 2006: A 2007: A 2008: A EEB: 2008-2012 2009: B 79% AYP Criteria Met 2010: C 85% AYP Criteria Met 2011: C 76% AYP Criteria Met 2012: C Grade |
| Assis Principal | Marya Fairchild | BS: Social Science Education MS: Social Science Education Certification: Education Leadership; Elementary | 5 | 5 | EEB: 2007-2012: 2008: C / AYP: 85% AYP Criteria 2009: B / AYP 79% AYP Criteria Met 2010: C/ AYP: 85% AYP Criteria Met 2011: C/ AYP: 76% Criteria Met 2012: C Grade |

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, Math, Writing | Dwana Washington | BA: Political Science Post-Bacc: Elementary Ed MSE Reading Education: 15 credits Certifications: National Board Certified Teacher: Grades 3-6 Middle Childhood Generalist, Elementary Education (1-6) | 22 | 12 | 2007-08 C AYP 85% met 2008-09 B AYP 79% met 2009-10 C AYP 87% met 2010-11 C AYP 77% met 2011-12 C Grade |

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 | Emma E. Booker will use best practices to retain high quality staff members. Mentors through our SCIP program will be assigned to all first year teachers to guide them through their first years. Weekly meetings as well as check ins throughout the year will occur. In addition, administration at Emma E. Booker will hire the very best candidates through a careful selection process and interview committee that has staff members serve as representatives on. | Principal, Assistant Principal, SCIP mentor | On going through the school year | |

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 |
| Out-of-Field Teachers: 3 Out of Field ESOL Instructional Staff: 1 | Out-of-Field Teachers receive written documentation from our HR department that states the necessity of taking the required coursework to become in-field. In addition, struggling teachers receive one-on-one support and coaching via the district's Performance Improvement Program. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 43 | 16.3%(7) | 7.0%(3) | 48.8%(21) | 27.9%(12) | 67.4%(29) | 0.0%(0) | 7.0%(3) | 9.3%(4) | 58.1%(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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| Celestine Campbell | Stephanie Williams | experience with grade level | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school questions, guidance, etc. |
| Ronique Major-Hundley | Sherral Williams | experience | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school |
| Makaya Moran | Sarah Hufford | experience with grade level and ESE students | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school questions, guidance, etc. |
| Tricia Varley | Sherry Martin | experience | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school |
| Tanisha Williams | Paola Morantes-Villalobos | experience with grade level | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school |
| Celestine Campbell | Alicia Frick | experience with grade level | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to: lesson planning, help with room set up, school |
| Dwana Washington | Laurice Bartley | experience | SCIP mentoring activities to include, but are not limited to lesson planning, help with room set up, school |

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

Professional Development for Science, Mathematics & Writing Instruction and Parent Involvement, supplemental direct instruction, extended learning beyond the school day

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

School house Links/YMCA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

21st Century Afterschool Program: Booker Boost
YMCA Reads
SES Tutoring
FCAT Academy program on Saturday
Morning ILS programs before school
In the Zone Morning Book Clu (2-5 grades)

Violence Prevention Programs

Scod Step Curriculum - Targeted Small Groups
October Bullying Prevention Month - Classroom instruction, whole school

Nutrition Programs

Fresh Fruit and Vegetable grant through Florida DOE
Mighty Milers

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Working in conjunction this year with Children's First to house an additional Pre-K program at our school, specifically focusing on students who will transition to EEB.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Emma E. Booker's RtI Leadership Team consists of: Paula Beard, Behavior Specialist, Augusta Obi, Guidance Counselor, Makaya Moran, Speech/Language Teacher, Jessica Rosenboom, School Psychologist, TBA, Social Worker, Linda Smith, ESE Resource Teacher, TBA, Truancy Worker, Connie Toops, RN, Dawn Clayton, Principal, Marya Fairchild, Assistant Principal

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, also known as our School-Wide Support Team (SWST) meets weekly with a set agenda to discuss children and groups of children within the RtI Tiered intervention process. The SWST team reviews relevant student data that is collected by teachers to determine the quality of the interventions and the impact of the interventions. When necessary, the SWST recommends additional diagnostic information, or coordination of programs to ensure that support is given to students within the RTI process.

In addition the SWST team reviews school wide data and makes recommendations for best practices and interventions that may be appropriate.

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

The school-based RtI Leadership Team reviewed relevant school and grade level progress monitoring and summative data and supported the implementation of the SIP strategies.

In addition the SWST will closely examine students who fail to make learning gains and determine appropriate ways to intervene.

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.

Tier I/II

Reading: FAIR, StoryTown Reading Curriculum assessments, SuccessMaker,

Mathematics: EnVision Math Benchmark assessments; District Mini-Assessments; SuccessMaker,

Science: Focus Assessments, Harcourt Science Assessments

Writing: District quarterly Writing Prompts

Behavior: Daily Point Sheets, FBA/BIP

Individual Diagnostic Assessments as needed

Tier III

Reading: FAIR, StoryTown Reading Curriculum assessments, SuccessMaker,

Mathematics: EnVision Math Benchmark assessments; District Mini-Assessments; SuccessMaker,

Science: Focus Assessments, Harcourt Science Assessments

Writing: District quarterly Writing Prompts

Behavior: Daily Point Sheets, FBA/BIP

Individual Diagnostic Assessments as needed

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During the "Teacher Pre-planning week" prior to the start of school, all of EEB staff received an in-depth orientation to the RTI process that included a focus on the knowledge and understanding of the key concepts of PS RtI including:

A common language

The problem solving model

The three tiers of instruction & intervention

Problem Solving Response to Instruction & Intervention (PS RtI) is a part of effective teaching which increases student achievement. In addition, quarterly RTI Professional Development is arranged for staff members via CPT meetings to delve deeper into understanding RTI

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

EEB will work collaboratively in CPT teams to help support MTSS. Three facilitators will work with teachers in small groups and/or individually with teachers to implement and support MTSS. Meetings will be available before/after school, during CPT times or teacher planning times. Each facilitator will help support and coordinate appropriate intervention (as needed) for identified students. Facilitators will work as the link between teachers and SWST.

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dwana Washington, Data Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, Marya Fairchild, Assistant Principal & Dawn Clayton, Principal

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

School based LLT works bi-weekly through our lead teacher meetings to identify best practices in the area of reading instruction. The group will examine Common assessments, lesson planning and curriculum specifications at each grade level.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT will be to ensure that CPTs are focused around planning and Instructional Focus Calendars at each grade level. The LLT will analyze data at each grade level, progress monitor and make recommendations based on this information.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/17/2012)

*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.

Collaboration with community agencies (e.g. Children's First, local VPK programs) to effectively transition children to kindergarten.
Pre-school visits to kindergarten classrooms (children and pre-school teachers observed and participated in kindergarten standards-based lessons.)
EEB staff wrote and was awarded a grant to support the implementation of Positive Behavior Support specifically for pre-school students and families.
In April of 2011, EEB staff started kindergarten screenings of pre-school children that provided specific feedback on upcoming kindergarten children and helped parents prepare their children for the transition and kindergarten standards.
Pre-school parent involvement project: Pre-school families that registered for school by August 1st received a backpack with educational materials. Parents were trained during registration on how to support their child's learning needs.
In addition we are housing a Children's First Pre-K program on our campus to increase collaboration with our ESE pre-k classroom.

*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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3 - 25%(65) Level 3,4,5 - 43%(111) | Level 3 - 29% Level 3,4,5 - 47% |

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 | Possible barriers include students who are entering FCAT tested grades well below proficiency. | iii remediation offered in both reading and math throughout the day as well as additional remediation on the Specials rotation. In addition we work with after school programs such as Booker Boost and Y reads for additional support. SES tutoring is housed on sight to allow small group and individual tutoring opportunities. In addition we have a before school reading club and 3 computer labs available to allow for additional time with independent reading and ILS. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | PM Data & Observation of classroom instruction | End of Year summative data |
| 2 | With 95% of students at or below poverty level, there are significant challenges with parent support. | Parent Involvement Liaison, Parent Resource room, Parent conferences, Family Fun Nights, Title I Open House Meeting, Fcat nights Parent training nights will be offered monthly to help parents with school as well as personal skills they will help them. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Parent Sign in sheets, Parent Surveys | Surveys, Percent of parents attending, FCAT scores |
| 3 | | | | | |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Potential barriers include students specific learning disabilities that may hinder students from acquiring specific skills at the same pace as their peers. | Individualized instruction at student specific levels. | Classroom teacher, Administration | Student progress monitoring data | FAIR, benchmark testing, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentag point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 18%(46) Level 3,4,5 - 43%(111) | Level 4,5 - 20% Level 3,4,5 - 47% |

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 | Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom. Students who come in at varying levels and progress at different levels. | Differentiate instruction daily in core instructional areas. | EEB Administration, Teachers | Review of data at CPT meetings. | Progress monitoring assessments such as FAIR, Math benchmark testing classroom assessments. |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge. | Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, thinking maps, and other high yeilding instructional strategies. | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2, AP3 | Prgress monitoring spreadsheets |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized instruction specifically targeted to student specific needs. | Classroom Teacher, Administration | Progress monitoring data for each student | FAIR, benchmark tests, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50%(82) | 54% |

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 | Wide variety of proficiency levels in classrooms. | Focused differentiated instruction during Intervention Block | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3. | Progress monitoring spreadsheets |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge. | Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, thinking maps, and other high yielding instructional strategies. | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3. | Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets. |
| 3 | High number of students performing below level in any given classroom. | Provide resource assistance for support of the above level students. Incorporate research based instructional strategies. Utilize small group instruction as much as possible in both reading and math. | Teacher, Administration | Progress monitoring in both reading and math. | Benchmark tests, Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, Weekly Storytown Test, FAIR |

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

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized and small group instruction targeted to student specific needs | Classroom Teacher, Administration | AP1 to AP3 progress monitoring, also utilize math benchmark testing | Progress monitoring data |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51%(23) | 55% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Lack of vocabulary in reading and math. | Enhance instruction of vocabulary through use of word walls, robust vocabulary and explicit instruction. | Teacher, Administration | Record, chart and keep track of student progress. | Progress monitoring spreadsheets. |
| 2 | | | | | |

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

Reading Goal #

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

5A : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 49 | 53 | 58 | 63 | 67 | |

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: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black 38%(70) Hispanic 59%(19) White 67%(10) | Black 50% Hispanic 59% Met AMO Target White 58% Exceeded AMO Target |

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 not making adequate learning gains in reading. | Differentiated instruction in reading block, as evidenced through small group instruction and lessons. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild, Classroom Teachers | Progress monitoring data, FAIR and Storytown assessments. Classroom walkthroughs and observations. | Progress monitoring spreadsheets, lesson plans, walkthroughs, observation notes |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | N/A | | | | |

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: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012- 1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22% | 34% |

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 | SWD not making adequate progress in one year to reach proficiency. | Individualized instruction, DI used in classrooms during reading block. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Review of lesson plans, classroom walk throughs, classroom observations. | Lesson plans, classroom observations |

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 FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012- 1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 42% | 53% |

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 | Anticipated barrier is lack of strong reading vocabulary. | Robust vocabulary infused into every lesson. In the zone reading modeled and encouraged during clas time. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Walk throughs, lesson plans, classroom observations. | Classroom evaluations and review of lesson pland and progres: monitoring 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Reading/ELA: | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Common Core: Text Complexity | All grade levels | Suzanne Naiman | School wide through CPT | September 2012 | CPT meetings | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild |
| Thinking maps | All grade levels | Dwana Washington and Thinking Maps team | School wide | School wide during pre-planning week and every Wed in Sept and Oct | 8 week session, after that through classroom observations and debriefing | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Extension of the Kindergarten Day through Kindergarten University. Time will be spent on reading and math to allow for additional time for students to learn foundational skills. | Kindergarten curriculum, teacher salaries and benefits. | Grant | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$5,000.00 |
| 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: \$5,000.00 |

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:

| 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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3 - 27%(70) Level 3,4,5 - 47%(121) | Level 3 - 31% Level 3,4,5 - 51% |

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 | Possible barriers include students who are entering FCAT tested grades well below proficiency. | iii remediation offered in both reading and math throughout the day as well as additional remediation on the Specials rotation. In addition we work with after school programs such as Booker Boost and Y reads for additional support. SES tutoring is housed on sight to allow small group and individual tutoring opportunities. In addition we have a before school reading club and 3 computer labs available to allow for additional time with independent reading and ILS. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | PM Data & Observation of classroom instruction | End of Year summative data |
| 2 | With 95% of students at or below poverty level, there are significant challenges with parent support. | Parent Involvement Liaison, Parent Resource room, Parent conferences, Family Fun Nights, Title I Open House Meeting, Fcat nights Parent training nights will be offered monthly to help parents with school as well as personal skills they will help them. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Parent Sign in sheets, Parent Surveys | Surveys, Percent of parents attending, FCAT scores |
| 3 | | | | | |

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 |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Potential barriers include students specific learning disabilities that may hinder students from acquiring specific skills at the same pace as their peers. | Individualized instruction at student specific levels. | Classroom teacher, Administration | Student progress monitoring data | FAIR, benchmark testing, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 20% (51) Level 3,4,5 - 47% (121) | Level 4,5 - 22% Level 3,4,5 - 59% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom. Students who come in at varying levels and progress at different levels. | Differentiate instruction daily in core instructional areas. | EEB Administration, Teachers | Review of data at CPT meetings. | Progress monitoring assessments such as FAIR, Math benchmark testing classroom assessments. |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge. | Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, thinking maps, and other high yielding instructional strategies. | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2, AP3 | Progress monitoring spreadsheets |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized instruction specifically targeted to student specific needs. | Classroom Teacher, Administration | Progress monitoring data for each student | FAIR, benchmark tests, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 66% (108) | 70% |

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 | Wide variety of proficiency levels in classrooms. | Focused differentiated instruction during Intervention Block | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3. | Progress monitoring spreadsheets |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge. | Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, thinking maps, and other high yielding instructional strategies. | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3. | Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets. |
| 3 | High number of students performing below level in any given classroom. | Provide resource assistance for support of the above level students. Incorporate research based instructional strategies. Utilize small group instruction as much as possible in both reading and math. | Teacher, Administration | Progress monitoring in both reading and math. | Benchmark tests, Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, Weekly Storytown Test, FAIR |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| 1 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized and small group instruction targeted to student specific needs | Classroom Teacher, Administration | AP1 to AP3 progress monitoring, also utilize math benchmark testing | Progress monitoring data |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71%(29) | 73% |

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 vocabulary in reading and math. | Enhance instruction of vocabulary through use of word walls, robust vocabulary and explicit instruction. | Teacher, Administration | Record, chart and keep track of student progress. | Progress monitoring spreadsheets. |
| 2 | | | | | |

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%.

5A : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 41 | 47 | 52 | 57 | 63 | |

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: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black 41%(76) Hispanic 71%(22) White 73%(11) | Black 46% Hispanic 51% Exceeded AMO Target White 41% Exceeded AMO Target |

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 | Wide variety of proficiency levels in classrooms. | Focused differentiated instruction during Intervention Block | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1 to AAP3 | Progress monitoring spreadsheets |
| 2 | High number of students performing below level in any given classroom. | Provide resource assistance for support of the above level students. Incorporate research based instructional strategies. Utilize small group instruction as much as possible in math | Dawn, Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Progress monitoring in both reading and math. | Benchmark tests, Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, Weekly Envision Tests |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | N/A | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|--|

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: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 24% | 31% |

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 vocabulary in reading and math. | Enhance instruction of vocabulary through use of word walls, robust vocabulary and explicit instruction. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Record, chart and keep track of student progress. | Progress monitoring data |
| 2 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master access points. | Individualized and small group instruction targeted to student specific needs | Classroom Teacher, Administration | AP1 to AP3 progress monitoring, also utilize math benchmark testing | Progress monitoring data |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48% | 45% Exceeded AMO Target |

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 | N/A | | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| I. Math: Dr. Thomasenia Adams will work with grade level teams to focus on specific SSS Math Standards. | All grade levels | Dr. Thomasenia Adams | All grade level teachers | Sept. 28, 2012 Oct. 26, 2012 Nov. 30, 2012 Jan. 22, 2012 (Professional Day) | Classroom observations | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Extension of the Kindergarten day to allow for additional time for essential reading and math foundational skills. | Kindergarten materials, teacher salaries, and benefits | Grant-5,000 was placed under reading budget | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$5,000.00 |
| 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: \$5,000.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 3 - 18% (16) Level 3,4,5 - 26% (23) | Level 3 - 22% Level 3,4,5 - 30% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Possible barriers include students who are entering FCAT tested grades well below proficiency. | iii remediation offered in both reading and math throughout the day as well as additional remediation on the Specials rotation. In addition we work with after school programs such as Booker Boost and Y reads for additional support. SES tutoring is housed on sight to allow small group and individual tutoring opportunities. In addition we have a before school reading club and 3 computer labs available to allow for additional time with independent reading and ILS. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | PM Data & Observation of classroom instruction | End of Year summative data |
| 2 | With 95% of students at or below poverty level, there are significant challenges with parent support. | Parent Involvement Liaison, Parent Resource room, Parent conferences, Family Fun Nights, Title I Open House Meeting, Fcat nights Parent training nights will be offered monthly to help parents with school as well as personal skills they will help them. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Parent Sign in sheets, Parent Surveys | Surveys, Percent of parents attending, FCAT scores |
| 3 | | | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | | |

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

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Potential barriers include students specific learning disabilities that may hinder students from acquiring specific skills at the same pace as their peers. | Individualized instruction at student specific levels. | Classroom teacher, Administration | Student progress monitoring data | FAIR, benchmark testing, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 8% (7) Level 3,4,5 - 26% (23) | Level 4,5 - 12% Level 3,4,5 - 30% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom. Students who come in at varying levels and progress at different levels. | Differentiate instruction daily in core instructional areas. | EEB Administration, Teachers | Review of data at CPT meetings. | Progress monitoring assessments such as FAIR, Math benchmark testing, classroom assessments. |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge. | Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, thinking maps, and other high yielding instructional strategies. | Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration | Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2, AP3 | Progress monitoring spreadsheets |

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 |
| 1 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized instruction specifically targeted to student specific needs. | Classroom Teacher, Administration | Progress monitoring data for each student | FAIR, benchmark tests, other classroom and school wide assessments. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Fifth grade students and teachers will have the opportunity to improve science knowledge by tackling the NGSSS Science Standards for the FCAT 2.0 with the newly revised Mad Science FCAT Pak. These workshops are exciting and hands-on and tailored to the FCAT annually assessed content areas. Note: Mad Science instruction will begin in January, however the expectations is that classroom teachers are to teach science according to the daily schedule provided by administration. | Grade 5 teachers and students | Mad Science, Classroom Teachers | Grade 5 | Thursdays on a set schedule from Sept to March | Weekly lessons reinforcing inquiry based thinking in grade 5 classrooms as evidenced through classroom observations. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild |

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 80%(68) | 82% |

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 lack of knowledge of the writing process and vocabulary use. | Additional training to teachers in the process of writing. Additional explicit instruction in the areas of vocabulary and writing development. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Growth from school wide writing benchmarks. | School wide writing prompts and state wide rubric scoring system. |

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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 15%(13) | 35% | | | | |
| 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 | Potential barriers include student specific learning disabilities that may require more additional time than same age peers to retain and master assess points. | Individualized instruction in writing. Additional time allotted to grade 4 SWD in writing through small group pull out. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Initial score on writing prompt compared to mid year scores. | Writing prompts scored according to statewide rubric |

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------|
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p> | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | |
| 94.9% (541/570) | 96.9% | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | |
| 169 | 158 | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | |
| 159 | 148 | |
| 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 | Many of our students are responsible for getting themselves to school on time. In addition, absences are often not explained or documented by our families and therefore become unexcused. | 1) We will continue to use our HSL to visit families and encourage them to have their students attend school regularly. 2) Send home a form families can document absences on. 3) Continue to offer parenting events and add additional events through the year that focus on attendance. 4) Utilize a curriculum called Attendance Matters and introduce and incorporate key attendance points into parent nights and trainings. | Marya Fairchild, Dawn Clements, Bernince Fuller | Daily attendance rate and student absence rate. Weekly meetings with HSL/social worker and truancy worker to monitor. | End of year data on 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 |
|--|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| PLC meetings reagrding attendance policy and contacts. | All grade levels K-5 | Marya Fairchild-met with each PLC team and went over attendance goals, procedures, outlined them in a memo, and clarified teacher responsibilities. | All grade level teachers, K-5 | PLC meetings in September | weekly monitoring of attendance, Excel spreadsheet on Sharepoint for teacher input and access. | Marya Fairchild |

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 69 | 41 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 48 | 48 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 66 | 38 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 43 | 43 |

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 at EEB often come to school without the social skills and appropriate behavior expected in a school setting. | Guidance will teach appropriate social skills lessons through the Second Step curriculum. EDT will be utilized for counseling and social skill groups. All classroom teachers will support and institute the school wide PBS plan including the 7 steps and Booker | Marya Fairchild | Decrease in OSS | OSS dates at the end of the 2011-12 school year |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | B's. Parents will be informed of the school wide PBS plan at all functions. | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

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 |
|--|---|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Review of PBS plan during Teacher pre-planning week PBS plan taught to new teachers through SCIP plan | All grade level teachers All new teacher | Marya Fairchild | School wide, New Teachers | Teacher pre-plan week SCIP meeting in September | PLC meetings as needed regarding student behaviors. Behavior Specialist to communicate and assist with data collection and monitoring of students in need. | Marya Fairchild, Paula Beard |

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> | | All parents at Emma E. Booker are expected and invited to attend one of the two parent conferences every year, choice of either one in the fall and one in the spring. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| Fall Parent conference 83% Spring Parent conference 89% | | Fall conference 90% Spring conference 90% | | | |
| 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 often express that they themselves are missing the skills necessary to help students on HW and needed skills for FCAT. | Parent Involvement evenings such as: Family Fun Night, 2 Parent Conferences, FCAT Night, Math and Reading Night, Partners in Print, ESOL Family night. | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild | Parent Conference percentages; 90% overall. | Parent Conference sign ins. |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Parent Involvement modules focusing on strategies that can increase parent participatin in school. | All grades K-5 | Dawn Clayton | School Wide | 6 parent modules released for teachers to complete | PLC meetings to review modules and share parent involvement strategies | Dawn Clayton, Marya Fairchild |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Extension of the Kindergarten Day through Kindergarten University. Time will be spent on reading and math to allow for additional time for students to learn foundational skills. | Kindergarten curriculum, teacher salaries and benefits. | Grant | \$5,000.00 |
| Mathematics | Extension of the Kindergarten day to allow for additional time for essential reading and math foundational skills. | Kindergarten materials, teacher salaries, and benefits | Grant-5,000 was placed under reading budget | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$10,000.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$10,000.00 |

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 (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.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

The SAC committee meets monthly to review set and review school goals. The SAC committee is a vital team that will review parent involvement activities, set school goals and review the progress of academic goals.

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

| Sarasota School District EMMA E. BOOKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 65% | 62% | 72% | 33% | 232 | 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% | 53% | | | 115 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 56% (YES) | 55% (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 | | | | | 458 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Sarasota School District EMMA E. BOOKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 68% | 62% | 78% | 33% | 241 | 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 | 61% | 49% | | | 110 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 58% (YES) | 49% (NO) | | | 107 | 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 | | | | | 458 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |