FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Annette DeGoti

SAC Chair: Linda Deighan

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: PENDING

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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	Mrs. Annette DeGoti	ESOL, PRIMARY ED, ED LEADERSHIP	4	15	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A B A B AMO N High Standards Reading 52 78 67 63 58 High Standards Math 56 75 75 79 72 Lrng Gains -Reading 67 68 62 68 63 Lrng Gains -Math 59 66 62 72 75 Gains-Rdg- 25% 78 60 40 63 67 Gains-Math- 25% 55 63 67 77 67
Assis Principal	Mrs. Maria Rivero	ELEM ED, ESOL, ED LEADERSHIP	4	3	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A B A B AMO N High Standards Reading 52 78 67 63 58 High Standards Math 56 75 75 79 72 Lrng Gains -Reading 67 68 62 68 63

					Lrng Gains -Math 59 66 62 72 75 Gains-Rdg- 25% 78 60 40 63 67 Gains-Math- 25% 55 63 67 77 67

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 Coach	Maribel Gonzalez	Bachelor of Science ELEM ED, ESOL, Certification: Elementary Education, Reading Endorsement and ESOL	8	8	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A B A B AMO N High Standards Reading 52 78 67 63 58 High Standards Math 56 75 75 79 72 Lrng Gains -Reading 67 68 62 68 63 Lrng Gains -Math 59 66 62 72 75 Gains-Rdg- 25% 78 60 40 63 67 Gains-Math- 25% 55 63 67 77 67

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1.Provide Professional Development opportunities that enhance teacher professional advancement.	Administration, Reading Coach, Department Chair	June, 2013	
2	2. Provide teachers with in house leadership roles.	Administration, Reading Coach, Department Chair	June 2013	
3	3. Provide an in house Professional Learning Community.	Administration, Reading Coach, Department Chair	June 2013	
4	4. Provide Professional Development opportunities that provide teachers new and innovative teaching styles and techniques.	Administration, Reading Coach, Department Chair	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0-Out of Field 0-Not Highly Effective	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
32	0.0%(0)	34.4%(11)	31.3%(10)	31.3%(10)	31.3%(10)	100.0%(32)	6.3%(2)	3.1%(1)	68.8%(22)

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
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A
Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities. The District coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to students. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with District personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that proved early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program and Supplemental Educational Services.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

Title I, Part D
Miami-Dade County Public Schools receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach Program. Services are coordinated with the District Drop-Out Prevention programs.

Title II

Title II
Miami-Dade County Public Schools uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL; training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III

Title III
Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and immigrant students by providing funds to implement and/or provide:
• tutorial programs (K-12)
• parent outreach activities through school CIS and the Bilingual Department (K-12)
• professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers (K-12)
• coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers (K-12)
• reading and supplementary instructional materials (K-12)
• hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL and immigrant students (K-12, RFP Process)

Title X- Homeless

Title X- Homeless
The Homeless Assistance Program at Frances S. Tucker Elementary seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community. Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assist schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students. The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and is provided with all entitlements. Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign to all the schools-each school is provided a video and curriculum manual and a contest is sponsored by the homeless trust-a community organization. Project Upstart provides tutoring and counseling to twelve homeless shelters in the community.. The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Frances S. Tucker Elementary will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs
• The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, elementary counselors, and TRUST Specialists.
• Training and technical assistance for elementary, middle, and senior high school teachers, administrators, counselors, TRUST Specialists, and Safe School Specialists is also a component of this program.
• Trust Specialists and/or Elementary School Counselor focus on counseling students to solve problems related to drugs and alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation, family violence, and other crises.
• In accordance with the Florida Statute "Jeffrey Johnston Stand Up for All Students Act and the Miami-Dade County Public Schools Policy Against Bullying and Harassment, the Bullying and Violence Prevention Curriculum will be implemented in all grade levels Pre-K through 5th to increase awareness, prevention and education in order to promote a safe school environment. An anonymous bullying and harassment reporting system will be in place in addition to individual counseling referrals as needed.

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs
1) Frances S. Tucker Elementary adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through Physical Education and Health curriculum.
The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Head Start
Head Start programs are housed in several Title 1 schools and/or communities. Joint activities including professional development and transition processes are shared. Through affiliation agreements, the Summer VPK program is provided at the Head Start sites.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Career and Technical Education
Frances S. Tucker Elementary infuses career awareness throughout the curriculum. Students participate in Career Day activities every year. Volunteers, community members and parents join forces to expose students to their careers in a variety of presentations. Frances S. Tucker Elementary promotes increased graduation rates by participating in a Higher Education Spirit Day in which students focus on their own educational futures and prepare for the demands of life in a competitive, global, high-tech economy.

Job Training

N/A

Other

Other
Parental: Frances S. Tucker Elementary School involves parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I program and extends an open invitation to our school's Parent Resource Center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

Frances S. Tucker Elementary School increases parental engagement/involvement through developing (with ongoing parental input) our Title I School Parent Compact (for each student); our school's Title I Parent Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I orientation meeting (Open House) and other activities such as:
• Science/Health Fair
• Book Fair Night
• Parent workshops such as: FCAT/SAT Standardized Testing, Homework Help, Mentoring, Self Esteem, Health & Nutrition, Computer Skills 101, Computer Skills 101 Part 2, Careers & Job Skills, Resources/Switchboard of Miami, Bullying, and Computer/Portal Presentation

Frances S. Tucker Elementary School conducts informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents and facilitates workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedules as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

The Voluntary Public School Choice Program (I Choose!), a federally-funded grant, is a District-wide initiative designed to assist in achieving the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' District's Strategic Plan goal to expand the availability of and access to high quality public school choice options for all the parents in Miami-Dade County. The Voluntary Public School Choice Program's grant funds are used to evaluate curriculums, inform parents of educational options, and re-culture teaching practices to establish quality school environment.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the School-Based MTSS/RtI Team.
1. School-Based MTSS/RtI Team is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following: Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources; Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.
2. The School-Based MTSS/RtI Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as: the school's Reading, Science, and Behavior Specialist/SPED Chairperson Special Education Teacher, School Guidance Counselor, and School Social Worker.
3. School-Based MTSS/RtI Team is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to students' academic and behavioral needs. School-Based MTSS/RtI Team uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions. The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum classroom. The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support. The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally. There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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 following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.
The School-Based MTSS/RtI Team will:
1. Monitor academic and behavioral data and evaluate progress by addressing the following important questions:
What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
How will we respond when students have not learned? (MTSS/Response to
Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
How will we respond when students have learned or already know?
(enrichment opportunities)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular School-Based MTSS/RtI Team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations of the annual measurable objectives.

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 MTSS/RtI Team will:
1. Monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through monthly data gathering and data analysis.
2. Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. Provide support and interventions based on data and student needs.

MTSS Implementation

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

Data will be used to guide/drive instructional decisions for all students to:
• Adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific academic needs of students
• Modify the delivery of behavior management systems to promote positive behavior
• Tweak the allocation of school-based resources
• Provide targeted professional development in the areas of teacher needs to help deliver instruction
• Monitor student progress in order to identify and develop interventions and promote learning gains

Academic data will include:
• FAIR Assessments
• Interim Assessments
• FCAT 2.0/SAT
• Progress Monitoring using the computer program easy.CBM
• Student Data Pyramids
• Student Grades
• School site specific assessments, i.e. biweeklies, monthly writing prompts

Behavior data will include:
• Monitoring of Attendance
• In house Detentions
• Parent Meetings
• Referrals of student behavior, i.e. FAB/BIP
• Suspensions
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The School-Based MTSS/RtI Team will:
• Train all teachers and staff in the School-Based MTSS/RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
• Provide support for school staff to understand basic School-Based MTSS/RtI principles and procedures; and

• Maintain ongoing dialogue with teachers to ensure their understanding of the correlation between the School-Based MTSS/RtI model and the academic development of students and their specific learning needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The implementation of MTSS/RtI involves the use of existing and new skill sets and practices. The implementation and support of MTSS/RtI will be facilitated by a strong system of professional development and support (technical assistance and coaching). Sufficient resources will be a allocated to maximize accurate and sustained implementation:
Administrators will ensure the existence of adequate resources for implementation and cost-effectiveness of the intervention (s).This level of implementation requires resource distribution to empower the MTSS/RtI team to organize, coordinate, and sustain efforts. Our school-based action plans redirect our resources to support the following:
• Sufficient personnel for coordination and implementation
• Time for teams to meet and plan (minimum once a month)
• Professional development to increase knowledge
• Facilitation and coaching responsibilities
• Continuous meaningful evaluation
• Materials and resources for implementation activities

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Frances S. Tucker Elementary School's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will consist of all important stakeholders involved in making educational decisions to better meet the specific needs of students. This team consists of the following personnel:
*Principal- Mrs. DeGoti
*Assistant Principal- Mrs. Rivero
*Literacy Coach- Ms. Gonzalez
*Media Specialist- Mrs. Robinson
*EESAC Chairperson- Ms. Deighan
*Counselor- Mrs. Vilenski
*SPED Department Chairperson- Ms. Dukes
*Department Chairperson for 4th-5th Grade- Ms. Akins

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees will serve on this team which will meet at least once a month. The LLT will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being active participants in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. During school site visits, the District team will review the minutes from LLT meetings and have a dialogue with the team regarding the meetings. The reading coach will serve as a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coach will share his/her expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coach will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP and the MTSS/RtI Model. The reading coach will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development. The LLT will consider student assessment data, classroom observational data, teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP), and School Improvement Plans (SIP) when planning professional development. The LLT will monitor lesson plans during regular classroom visitations. Principals will evaluate what they see instructionally and expect it to match what is on the plans. Teachers needing assistance will be supported by the LLT. The LLT will monitor collection and utilization of assessment data, including progress monitoring data (FAIR Assessments), District interim assessment data, observational data, and in-program assessment data. Progress monitoring and interim data will be collected a minimum of three times per year. In-program assessments will be administered as the program dictates (weekly or monthly). This data will be used to determine intervention and support needs of students by:

• participating in the Data Analysis Team meetings after each FAIR assessment period;
• analyzing the progress monitoring data with reading coach;
• directing the reading coach to meet with grade level/departments to review their progress monitoring (FAIR) data
• monitoring that the reading coach uses the data to differentiate teacher support as evidenced by the coach's log and classroom visitations; and
• monitoring the teacher's use of data driven instruction during classroom visitations.

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees will serve on this team which will meet at least once a month. The LLT will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being active participants in all Literacy Leadership Team meetings and activities. During school site visits, the District team will review the minutes from LLT meetings and have a dialogue with the team regarding the meetings. The reading coach will serve as a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. The coach will share his/her expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. The reading coach will work with the Literacy Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP and the MTSS/RtI Model. The reading coach will provide motivation and promote a spirit of collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team to create a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with teachers and administrators; and providing professional development. The LLT will consider student assessment data, classroom observational data, teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP), and School Improvement Plans (SIP) when planning professional development. The LLT will monitor lesson plans during regular classroom visitations. The principal will evaluate what they see instructionally and expect it to match what is on the plans. Teachers needing assistance will be supported by the LLT. The LLT will monitor collection and utilization of assessment data, including progress monitoring data (FAIR Assessments), District interim assessment data, observational data, and in-program assessment data. Progress monitoring and interim data will be collected a minimum of three times per year. In-program assessments will be administered as the program dictates (weekly or monthly). This data will be used to determine intervention and support needs of students by:

• participating in the Data Analysis Team meetings after each FAIR assessment period;
• analyzing the progress monitoring data with reading coach;
• directing the reading coach to meet with grade level/departments to review their progress monitoring (FAIR) data
• monitoring that the reading coach uses the data to differentiate teachers support as evidenced by the coach's log and classroom visitations; and
• monitoring the teacher's use of data driven instruction during classroom visitations.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/9/2012)

*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.

Title I Administration assists Frances S. Tucker Elementary by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. In selected school communities, the Title I Program further provides assistance for pre-school transition through the Home Instruction for Parents of Pre-school Youngsters (HIPPY) Program. HIPPY provides in-home training for parents to become more involved in the educational process of their three- and four-year old children.
At Frances S. Tucker Elementary School, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed upon entering Kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in the development of robust instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed with the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) and Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) which will gauge basic academic skill development and academic school readiness of incoming students.
Screening data will be collected and aggregated once District provides the data results. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data.
The District will establish or expand the "Welcome to Kindergarten" program to build partnership with local early education programs, including the in-school pre-kindergarten program. Through this joint venture, parents and children will gain familiarity with kindergarten as well as receive information relative to the matriculation of students at the school. The principal will also meet with the directors of neighborhood centers and provide visits/orientations to the parents and students of the neighboring centers.

*Grades 6-12 Only

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 25% (41) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 28% (47).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (41)	28% (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	1a.1. 3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application and the lowest content focus was Compare/Contrast. Students have limited skills comparing/contrasting elements, topics, settings, characters, and problems within one text. 4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis: Fiction/Non Fiction and the lowest content focus was Descriptive Language. Students have limited skills identifying and explaining the use of descriptive language to describe mood and imagery. 5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test	1a.1. Students will utilize Venn Diagrams, One Sentence Summarizers, and Content Frames to compare/contrast elements, topics, settings, characters, and problems within one text. Students will utilize SuccessMaker, as part of Differentiated Instruction, and target Compare/Contrast. Students will create an active, ongoing Positive and Negative Mood Words Chart and incorporate a Mood/Setting Chart with poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Students will utilize SuccessMaker, as part of Differentiated Instruction, and target Descriptive Language.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports (including SuccessMaker reports) to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments as well as SuccessMaker reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

	was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process and the lowest content focus was Text Features Students have limited skills reading and organizing informational text and text features to perform a task.	Students will use how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features (subtitles, headings, charts, graphs, diagrams, etc.) and to locate, interpret and organize information. Students will utilize SuccessMaker, as part of Differentiated Instruction, and target Text Features.			
2					

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 35% (7) of students achieved levels 4, 5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 40% (8).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (7)	40% (8)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Reading Category Reading Comprehension. Students have limited skills associating spoken words and connected speech with supporting graphics during story reading.	Students will be provided opportunities to hear stories/text that are supported with symbols/graphics	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% (43) of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 27% (45).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (43)	27% (45)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application and the lowest content focus was Text Structure. Students have limited abilities identifying text structure and explaining how it impacts meaning in text.	Students will utilize informational text structure charts to identify compare/contrast, cause/effect, and sequence of events. Students will utilize Weekly Readers that will provide enrichment activities which target text structure within and across texts.	Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and District Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 20% (4) of students achieved level 7 or above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 7 or above student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 23% (5).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (4)	23% (5)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Reading Category Word Recognition and Vocabulary. Students have limited skills showing some recognition of vocabulary within personal experiences.	Teacher will present pictures of vocabulary related to reading and personal experiences and ask questions with anticipation of a student non-verbal response, i.e. facial expression, and movement.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 70% (71) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75% (76).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	70% (71)		75% (76)		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary and the lowest content focus was Multiple Meanings. Students have limited skills understanding multiple meaning words in text.	Students will utilize word arrays to comprehend multiple meaning words.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 46% (6) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 56% (7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (6)	56% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Reading Category Reading Comprehension. Students have limited skills selecting a picture in response to a question within a story or instructional context.	Teacher will model discussion related to the text read and ask questions during read alouds and provide single or multiple picture choices for student to indicate a response.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 78% (N<30) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.

	Reading Goal #4:	Our goal for the 2012 -2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83% (N<30).
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	78% (N<30)	83% (N<30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process and the lowest content focus was Text Features.

Students have limited skills to interpret graphical information such as legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys | Students will utilize real-world documents such as how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites and use the text features to locate, interpret and organize information.

Students will utilize SuccessMaker, as part of Tier 2 Intervention, and target Text Features. | MTSS/RtI | Review formative data reports (including SuccessMaker reports) to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. | Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments.

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. |

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #

Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

5A : |

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53	58	62	66	70	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5B: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 38% (21) of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 14 percentage points to 52% (29). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White:

Black: 38% (21)

Hispanic:

Asian:

American Indian: | White:

Black: 52% (29)

Hispanic:

Asian:

American Indian: |
| 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	5B.1. Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application and the lowest content focus was Author's Purpose and Author's Perspective. Students have limited skills identifying the author's purpose in text and understanding how the author's perspective influences text.	Students will utilize the Author's Purpose Chart in conjunction with grade-level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a particular mood, entertaining or explaining. The author's perspective should be recognizable in text. Students should focus on what the author thinks and feels.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 57% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 61%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (29)	61% (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	5B.1 ELL: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction and the lowest content focus was Descriptive Language.	5B.1. Students will use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery. Students will also note how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team	5B.1. Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	5B.1. Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% (8) of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 13 percentage points to 39% (11).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

26% (8)	39% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text/Research Process and the lowest content focus was Text Features. Students have limited skills interpreting graphical information such as legends, illustrations, diagrams, charts and keys.	Students will incorporate the Text Feature Chart when utilizing real-world documents such as how-to articles, brochures, fliers, and websites and use the text features to locate, interpret and organize information.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 51% (77) of students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 7 percentage points to 58% (88).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (77)	58% (88)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 Vocabulary and the lowest content focus was Base Words and Affixes. Students have limited skills determining the meaning of the new word formed when a know affix is added to a known word.	Students will refer to the Common Morpheme Chart in order to build their general knowledge of words and word relationships.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Success Maker Training	K-5th grade	District PD Liaison Reading Coach	K-5th grade teachers	September 17, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Classroom Implementation and Data Reports	Administration
Best Practices	K-5th grade	Reading Coach	K-5th grade teachers	September 17, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Classroom Implementation	Administration

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 46% (33) of students are proficient in Listening/Speaking.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

46% (33)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency in Listening as noted on the 2012 CELLA assessment was Short Talks. Students have limited skills listening to an orally delivered passage of 25 to 50 words and after hearing the passage choosing the picture option that most closely reflects the information in the passage, i.e., main idea, inferences, predictions, details. The area of deficiency in Speaking as noted on the 2012 CELLA assessment was Personal Opinion. Students have limited skills expressing a personal opinion or preference and supporting it not so much logically but fluently and coherently	Students will be taught visual literacy by spending a good deal of time discussing the illustrations, charts, and graphs that appear on the cover and in the book. These materials are provided to teach readers about the topic and provide essential information as well as to stimulate interest. Teacher will encourage students to speak in class as much as possible. Structure conversations around books and subjects that build vocabulary. Instead of simple "yes" or "no" questions, ask questions that are interactive and meaningful. For example, "Has this happened to you? What do you think? What should we change?" In these ways, students will learn the academic English they will need to succeed in future schooling.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-benchmark assessments that require Listening/Speaking. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment.

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 34% (24) of students are proficient in Reading.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
34% (24)	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The area of deficiency in Reading as noted on	Students will learn to retell in their own words	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor	Formative: Mini-benchmark

				student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	assessments that require Reading.
1	the 2012 CELLA assessment was Retelling.	and correctly sequence the events of the story. Students can use visuals such as pictures or story maps as components of the retell. The teacher should model a retell with a brief passage and then move on to more complex text. Retells can be for expository as well as narrative text. Students can practice retelling in partners or groups with others who have read the same text.			Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment.

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 35% (25) of students are proficient in Writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
35% (25)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency in Writing as noted on the 2012 CELLA assessment was Elaboration.	Students will use reading response journal/logs which provide opportunities for students to record their thoughts and questions about anything they are reading, including content area or research material. Reading response logs are important components of reading discussion groups in which students share their written responses to initiate and continue discussion about specific text.	MTSS/RtI	Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust student elaborations as needed.	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 31% (52) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by ¬¬¬4 percentage points to 35% (58).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (52)	35% (58)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. 3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category Geometry and Measurement. Students have limited skills describing and analyzing properties of two-dimensional shapes; examining and applying congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes; and selecting appropriate units, strategies and tools to solve problems involving perimeter. 4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category Geometry and Measurement. Students have limited skills developing an understanding of area and determining the area of two-dimensional shapes and classifying angles. 5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics	Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, and volume; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Mini Benchmark Assessments (BATS) to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS). Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Test was Reporting Category Expressions, Equations, & Statistics. Students have limited skills using the order of operations to simplify expressions which include exponents and parentheses				

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 43% (9) of students achieved levels 4,5, and 6 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4,5,and 6 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 48% (10).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (9)	48% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Number Sense. Students have limited skills counting objects while touching them.	Students will use counting boards to match objects with numbers on a line.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 21% (35) of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 22% (37).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (35)	22% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Number: Operations and Problems. Students have limited skills developing an understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence; understanding decimals, including the connection between fractions and decimals; and identifying factors and multiples within the context of fractions.	Provide instructional support and enrichment for students to develop quick recall of addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.	Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Mini Benchmark Assessments (BATS) to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS). Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 5% (1) of students achieved level 7 or above proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 7 or above student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 8% (2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1)	8% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Number Calculations. Students have limited skills identifying "how many" in groups.	Students will be provided opportunities to count objects in a group in the context of real world applications.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 61% (63) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 66% (68).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (63)	66% (68)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Number: Base Ten and Fractions. Students have limited skills generating equivalent fractions and simplifying fractions.	Use Mini-Benchmarks lessons to provide grade-level appropriate activities that focus on fractions and related concepts.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Review formative monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS) data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS); District Interim Data Reports; Success Academy Mini-Assessments, Student Authentic Work. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2011-2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 39% (5) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 49% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (5)	49% (6)

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Patterns. Students have limited skills copying a simple sequence of sounds, movement, shapes, or objects.	Students will be presented with a visual, auditory, or motor sequence and be asked to imitate or respond to with the similar action.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 55% (N< 30) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 10 percentage points to 65% (N<30) .

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	55% (N<30)	65% (N<30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Number: Operations and Problems. Students have limited skills developing understandings of multiplication and division and strategies for basic multiplication facts and related division facts	Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of multiplication and related division facts.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Review formative monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS) data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Monthly Mini-Benchmark Assessments (BATS); District Interim Data Reports; Success Academy Mini-Assessments, Student Authentic Work. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Money. Students have limited skills using pre-determined amounts to participate in a purchase.	Teachers will provide the students with the amount of money to exchange for a purchase, within the context of a real world scenario.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :	Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54	58	63	67	71	

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 results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 40% (22) of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 11 percentage points to 51% (29).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: Black: 40% (22) Hispanic:	White: Black: 51% (29) Hispanic:

Asian: American Indian:		Asian: American Indian:		

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	Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement. Students have limited skills selecting appropriate units, strategies and tools to solve problems involving perimeter as well as developing an understanding of area and determining the area of two-dimensional shapes	Provide grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use of geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter and area.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Review formative monthly On-Target Assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Monthly On-Target Assessment; District Interim Data Reports; Success Academy Mini- Assessments, Student Authentic Work. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 59% of students in the ELL subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (30)	63% (32)

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	5B.1. ELL: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement and the lowest content focus was Elapsed Time. This deficiency is attributed to the limited understanding of the concept of time using identifiers such as: month, week, day, hour, and minutes.	5B.1. Implement a daily math journal focusing on elapsed time problems.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team	5B.1. Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	5B.1. Formative: Monthly On-Target Assessment; District interim data reports; Success Academy Mini Assessments, student authentic work. Summative: Results from 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 23% (7) of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 9 percentage points to 32% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (7)	32% (9)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Number: Operations and Problems.

Students have limited skills developing understandings of multiplication and division and strategies for basic multiplication facts and related division facts</td>
<td>Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of multiplication and related division facts.</td>
<td>MTSS/RtI</td>
<td>Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.

Review formative monthly On-Target Assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.</td>
<td>Formative: Monthly On-Target Assessment; District Interim Data Reports; Success Academy Mini- Assessments, Student Authentic Work.

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 53% (80) of students in the ED subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 58% (88).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (80)	58% (88)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement.

Students have limited abilities describing and analyzing properties of two-dimensional and three-dimensional shapes.</td>
<td>Provide grade-level appropriate activities that analyze attributes and properties of two- and three-dimensional shapes/objects.</td>
<td>MTSS/RtI</td>
<td>Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.

Review formative monthly On-Target Assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made</td>
<td>Formative: Monthly On-Target Assessment; District Interim Data Reports; Success Academy Mini- Assessments, Student Authentic Work.

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</table>

				and adjust instruction as needed.	Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Implementation of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	3rd-5th grade	Assistant Principal	3rd-5th Grade Teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Classroom Implementation	Literacy Leadership Team
Fractions: Hands-On Strategies	3rd-5th grade	Assistant Principal	3rd-5th Grade Teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Classroom Implementation	Literacy Leadership Team

Mathematics Budget:

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

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:

The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	indicate that 32% (20) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 36% (23).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (20)	36% (23)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Physical Science. Students have limited abilities developing higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency.	Provide activities for students to design science projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in Physical Science.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Sensory Integration. Students are limited in developing the adequate skills to respond to appropriate environmental sensory stimuli, including vision, hearing, smell and touch.	Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to develop skills to respond appropriately to sensory stimuli, including vision, hearing, smell and touch.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 8% (5) of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 10% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (5)	10% (6)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Physical Science. Students have limited skills in actively participating in the process of science inquiry	Ensure that instruction includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force and motion	Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
2	Students have limited access to a curriculum that supports the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	Identify students scoring a 4 or 5 on the Reading and Mathematics portion of the FCAT 2.0 and provide them with enrichment activities such as Explore Learning GIZMOS and Science Quick Piks, a supplemental curriculum that supports state standards.	Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to Instructional Focus Calendar and the District Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

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				
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Nature of Science. Students have limited abilities understanding the differences between the habitats of plants and animals.	Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry – based learning opportunities for students to develop skills to differentiate between habitats of plants and animals.	MTSS/RtI	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Review of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)	Pre-K to 5th grade	Lead Teacher	All Science teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Professional Development Record of Attendance Lesson Plans	Literacy Leadership Team
Inquiry into Science	Pre-K to 5th grade	Lead Teacher	All Science teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Professional Learning Communities	Literacy Leadership Team
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	Pre-K to 5th grade	Lead Teacher	All Science teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Professional Development Record Of Attendance Lessons Plans	Literacy Leadership Team

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 71% (35) of students achieved a level 3 or higher. . Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 74% (36).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (35)	74% (36)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was Reporting Category Writing Application and the lowest content focus was Support. Students have limited skills attending to the quality of details, and using relevant, logical and plausible support in their writing.	During Writing Intervention instruction, students will engage in sufficient, specific, and relevant development of support, i.e. elaboration that includes concrete details and pertinent information that helps the reader construct mental images.	Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data. Administer and score students' monthly writing prompts to monitor students' progress and to adjust focus as needed.	Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment was Writing Category Writing Conventions. Students have limited skills and abilities demonstrating a purposeful response to select pictures related to words for use in writing documents.	Teacher will provide errorless picture/symbol choices for the student to select in the context of a specific writing activity.	MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	Review formative data reports to monitor student progress using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) and adjust instruction according to data.	Formative: Mini-assessments correlated to the Unique Learning System curriculum. Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Helping Teachers Strengthen Their Students' Writing Instruction	3rd and 4th grade	Reading and Writing Coach	3rd and 4th grade Reading/Language Arts teachers	October 26, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Grade level cumulative Writing activity	Literacy Leadership Team

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

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:	The 2011-2012 average daily attendance rate was 95.61% (422). The expected attendance performance rate for the 2012-2013 school year is a .50% increase to 96.11% (424).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.61% (422)	96.11% (424)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
140	133
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
129	123

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	Attendance rate increased from 95.4 to 95.61 for the 2011-2012 school year. Change in start times for the 2011-2012 school year attributed to the high level of tardiness for the intermediate grade levels, as well as early excused.	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non-attendance to the Truancy Child Study Team (TCST) for intervention services. The incentive attendance program that will be implemented is the school-wide ticket store. *MDCPS Truancy Intervention Program 2012-2013.	Manager.MTSS/RtI	Monthly updates to Administration by the Grade Book Manager.	TCST logs and attendance rosters.
2	Attendance truancy increased due to lack of incentive plan to motivate students to come to school on time and daily.	Establish a support group that includes staff, family and students in order to create a welcoming climate for the family. Create student-focused programs, activities for the students, and offer support to students and their families during relocation.	Administration, EESAC, and Attendance Review Committee	Administration and EESAC will monitor support group's meetings, their recommendations and implementation strategies	Attendance Report Bulletin from COGNOS

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 Conference Strategies	All Grade Levels	CIS Facilitator/ Attendance Manager	All Homeroom Teachers	November 6, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Teachers must keep a running record of parent teacher conferences	Literacy Leadership Team

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives /School Store	Educational Supplies	EESAC	$350.00
			Subtotal: $350.00
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: $350.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by one.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
13	12
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
8	7

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The total number of indoor and outdoor suspensions decreased from 36 incidents during the 2010-2011 school year to 13 in the 2011-2012 school year. It shows a decrease of 23 incidents. There are limited opportunities to recognize students for positive behavior.	F.S. Tucker will utilize the Student Code of Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the use of Elementary SPOT Success Recognition program. Counselor will provide teachers with raffle tickets to purchase items at the school-wide ticket store as a reward for good behavior.	Leadership Team	Monitor Spot Success report by grade level, and monitor report on student outdoor suspension.	Participation Log for students who are recognized with raffle tickets and complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with a monthly suspension report.

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
The Student Code of Conduct	Grades K-5	School wide	School wide	August 20, 2012 Ongoing throughout the academic school year	Classroom walkthrough will be utilized to monitor teacher's implementation and enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct. Monitor Spot Success monthly report.	Literacy Leadership Team
The Student				OPEN HOUSE/PTA MEETING	Review communication sheets/logs to determine the number of contacts made with parents of students who	Literacy

Code of COnduct	Grades K-5	School Wide	School Wide	Ongoing throughout the academic school year	have been placed on outdoor suspension. Review parent participation log for the Student Code of Conduct workshop	Leadership Team

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Ticket Store	Incentives	EESAC/School	$350.00
			Subtotal: $350.00
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: $350.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	NA
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
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
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						

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:	STEM Goal #1: The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Science Test indicate that 32% (20) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 36% (23).
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Physical Science.\n\nStudents need additional opportunities to extend scientific investigations using the science inquiry approach.	Students will participate in our school-wide science fair in December 2012, with top finalists participating in the District Science and engineering fair in January, 2013.	Science Coach, Science Fair Committee	Science Fair Judging Rubric	Formative: Interim Assessments, Science Fair Rubric Scores\n\nSummative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Fair Practices	K-5th	Science Coach	Science Fair Committee	October 2012 December 2012	School & Regional Science Fairs	Administration

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
Attendance	Incentives /School Store	Educational Supplies	EESAC	$350.00
Suspension	Ticket Store	Incentives	EESAC/School	$350.00
				Subtotal: $700.00
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: $700.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ꞁn Priority	ꞁn Focus	ꞁn Prevent	ꞁn NA

Are you a reward school: ꞁn Yes ꞁn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/8/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Ticket Store	$350.00

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

For the 2012-2013 school year, a new EESAC Chair and 4 EESAC members had to be elected. At the first EESAC meeting, the Chair

and members were elected. After the election, the School Improvement Plan was reviewed and goals were discussed for the 2012-2013 EESAC committee. EESAC will conduct monthly meetings to discuss and address school curriculum data and School Improvement Plan implementation.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	75%	76%	53%	282	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	68%	66%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	63% (YES)			123	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					539	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
FRANCES S. TUCKER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	75%	90%	46%	278	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%	62%			124	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	40% (NO)	67% (YES)			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					509	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested