

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: TATUM RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Eric Jackson

SAC Chair: Lu Cox

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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	Eric Jackson	B.A. in Political Science Education M.S. in Ed. Computing M.A. in Ed. Leadership	1	9	
Assis Principal	N/A				

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)
	N/A				

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	Group interviews with grade level team participants	Principal	On-going	
2	30-90 day interviews with new staff	Principal	On-going	
3	Regular meetings with teachers and teams	Principal/AP Intern	On-going	
4	Partnering new staff with veteran teachers	Principal and Lead Mentor Teacher	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	4.1%(2)	4.1%(2)	44.9%(22)	46.9%(23)	87.8%(43)	100.0%(49)	6.1%(3)	6.1%(3)	65.3%(32)

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
Alisha Jennings	As needed	Exemplary Model for Teacher Support	Provides support to teachers and administration for teacher evaluation and professional development
Samantha Cataline (School Level)	Vada Kehrer and Sarah Ramos	Exemplary Model for Teacher/School Support	Introductory tour and orientation for new teachers and interns

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, AP Intern, School Counselor, ESE/ESOL Liaison, Speech/Language Practitioner, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, ESE Teachers, and Classroom Teachers

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

The team meets once a week to review summative and formative data and identify school, grade, and individual student academic needs. Based on the data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed. Student progress will be monitored and individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

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 Leadership Team will employ continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the grade level teams, the SAC and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional need. On a monthly basis, District-based Leadership Team in collaboration with School-based Leadership Team will oversee the implementation of the SIP Plan.

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.

The school uses a variety of reports produced by the district office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP (EMO) subgroup data by reading, mathematics, science and writing is utilized. Further, the school will participate in the FAIR reading assessment, utilize the Florida Achieves Science assessment, as well as a district-level math assessment. Data from SuccessMaker (ILS) are reviewed to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The entire faculty has been trained in the MTSS process but further training will occur on specific interventions. Staff will participate in collaborative, professional development modules throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

We are incorporating monthly teacher support sessions to help monitor progress and assist with intervention ideas.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal- Eric Jackson
Asst Principal (Intern)- Kristi Jarvis
Kindergarten- Tori Kannaday
Grade One- Eileen Kaliher
Grade Two- Joy Myers
Grade Three- Lori O'Brien
Grade Four- Kim Richardson
Grade Five- Kelly Rogers
ESE- Susan Marsh

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

The Literacy Leadership Team function as our school's curriculum leaders. The team has developed a one year plan to initiate research regarding best practices and implementation of Common Core State Standards. The team will take a leadership role to study, promote, and integrate high quality instructional practices aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

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

Gather, conduct reearch, discuss, prioritize, and plan focused training and awareness for K- 5 teachers to fully implement CCSS in the classroom by 2014. Teachers will implement literacy skills embedded with differentiated instruction and STEM aligned with CCSS.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

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

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

<p>1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #1a:</p>	<p>By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.</p>
--	---

<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>Level 3 - 24%(85) Level 3,4,5 - 81%(289)</p>	<p>Level 3 - 28% Level 3,4,5 - 83%</p>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development</p> <p>Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards</p>	<p>Teachers will emphasize differentiated enrichment instruction Teachers will emphasize differentiated instruction Teachers will provide students will access to higher text complexity selections Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC</p> <p>Teachers hired to conduct after school tutoring</p>	Administration Team leaders	<p>Review FAIR, Storytown Theme Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning Implementing strategic and specific instructional strategies</p>	<p>FAIR, FCAT, Storytown Theme Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool</p>

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 57%(204) Level 3,4,5 - 81%(289)	Level 4,5 - 59% Level 3,4,5 - 83%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Eagle Academy is designed to meet the learning needs of our gifted population Teachers will emphasize differentiated enrichment instruction Teachers will provide students with access to higher text complexity selections Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team leaders	Review FAIR, Storytown Theme Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FAIR, FCAT, Storytown Theme Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(186)	82%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize differentiated enrichment instruction Teachers will emphasize differentiated instruction Teachers will provide students with access to higher text complexity selections Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team leaders	Review FAIR, Storytown Theme Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning RTI process Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FAIR, FCAT, Storytown Theme Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77%(48)	81%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize differentiated intensive instruction Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC Teachers hired to conduct after school tutoring	Administration Team leaders	Review FAIR, Storytown Theme Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning RTI process Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FAIR, FCAT, Storytown Theme Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81	83	84	86	88	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

White 83%(257)
Hispanic 70%(15)

White 83% Met
Hispanic 82%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%	61%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%	72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%	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
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
Close Reading, Text Complexity aligned with Common Core State Standards	K-5	Suzanne Naiman, Eric Jackson	Entire Faculty	August 17	FAIR Assessment, Walkthroughs, on-going professional development	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis
FCAT Writes Workshop	K-5	Patti Brustad	Registered participants	October 19	Formative writing assessments	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis
Successmaker	K-5	Marla Myers	Entire Faculty	October 1	Progress monitoring	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Successmaker	Targeted instruction	n/a	\$0.00
After school tutoring program	Remedial grade 5 reading skills instruction for lowest quartile students	Internal funds	\$500.00

			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Testmaker	Teacher-generated formative assessment tool for instruction	PTO	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Tutor	After school tutoring support	School-based	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
			Grand Total: \$2,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	
CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 31%(110) Level 3,4,5 - 76%(273)	Level 3 - 33% Level 3,4,5 - %78

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize differentiated instruction Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team leaders	Envision Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning RTI process Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FCAT, Envision Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 46% (163) Level 3,4,5 - 76% (273)	Level 4,5 - 47% Level 3,4,5 - 77%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize differentiated enrichment instruction Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team leaders	Envision Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning	FCAT, Envision Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (187)	83%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize differentiated instruction Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team leaders	Envision Tests, and Successmaker data CPT planning RtI process Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FCAT, Envision Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (44)	80%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding complexity of curricular standards	Teachers will emphasize intensive differentiated instruction Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC	Administration Team Leaders	Review FOCUS, EnvisionTests, and Successmaker data CPT planning RtI process Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FOCUS, FCAT, Envision Tests, TES observations Focused classroom walkthroughs aligned with PRIDE evaluation tool

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68	71	74	77	80	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White- 78% Hispanic- 63%	White- 72% Exceeded Hispanic- 58% Exceeded

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%	78% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%	39% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%	64% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Successmaker	K-5	MARLA MYERS	Faculty schoolwide	October 1, 2012	IPDP Classroom Obs Grade team minutes	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis
FCAT Testmaker	K-5	Kristi Jarvis	Faculty Schoolwide	PLC times throughout first quarter	Classrom Obs Grade Team minutes	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Testmaker	Software to support student preparation for FCAT Math	Parent Teacher Organization	\$1,000.00
After school tutoring program	Remedial math skills instruction for lowest quartile students	Internal funds	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
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: \$1,500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently

Science Goal #1a:	demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 35%(43) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(87)	Level 3 - 39% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Lack of teacher depth of understanding with complexity of curricular standards, advanced science content and skills	Student tracking of performance data Professional development training aligned with IFC Teacher and aide hired to support science lab preparation and planning K-5	Administration Team Leaders	CPT planning Monitor science lab usage	FCAT Testmaker Science Benchmark Tests FCAT Science scores

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

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

Science Goal #1b:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal #2a:

By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Level 4,5 - 36%(44) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(87)		Level 4,5 - 40% Level 3,4,5 - 73%		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science workshops aligning with Instructional Focus Calendar	K-5	Brad Porinchak	Registered participants	November 16	PLC minutes Walkthroughs	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis

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
FCAT Testmaker	Program to monitor student progress in science	PTO	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
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
Teacher and aide science lab preparation and planning	order and prepare science labs for K-5	School fund	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
			Grand Total: \$3,500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
93%(113)	93%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding State focus of curricular standards Difficulty with maintaining high levels	Teachers will emphasize differentiated instruction Daily writing exercises across all content areas FCAT Testmaker will be utilized to progress monitor writing	Administration Team Leaders	Review Benchmark Writing Prompt Tests Student conferences CPT planning minutes	Benchmark Writing Assessment results FCAT Writing scores

of achievement in writing	Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC			
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
--	---

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

51%(62)	55%
---------	-----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills Limited funds for outside professional development Depth of understanding regarding State's focus of writing benchmarks Difficulty with maintaining high levels of achievement in writing	Student tracking of performance data Instructional focus calendar training Monthly professional development trainings aligned with IFC FCAT Testmaker Student Conferences	Administration Team Leaders	Writing Prompt Benchmark assessments FCAT Testmaker to progress monitor with writing Implementing strategic and specific instructional interventions	FCAT Writes District Writing Assessments

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease .</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p>
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.8% (728/760)	97.8%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

193	178				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
91	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	Tardiness/absenteeism of students from out of District	Daily phone calls, attendance letters, refer chronic absenteeism to MTSS	Administration Teachers Registrar Truancy Worker Guidance Counselor Social Worker	Monitor daily attendance, monitor patterns	Daily attendance, work habits data collection/Crosspointe reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Crosspointe	K-5	Roy Pinchin	All Faculty and Staff	August 17, October 26	As needed	Eric Jackson, Kristi Jarvis

Attendance Budget:

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:		By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
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			
8		8			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
6		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		Implement PBS strategies Use CPT time to monitor and plan behavior interventions and assess effectiveness	Administration School Counselor MTSSS Team Teachers	CPT notes SWST/MTSSS notes	Crosspointe reports

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
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	Working and Single parent participation and involvement	Initiate a newly formed "Fathers Being Involved" (FBI) parent group Parent Information Night Fundraising Events Academic Support and celebration activities/events	Administration Teachers PTO Board PALS Volunteer Coordinator	Parent conference turnout data School event participation	Parent conference data and notes; attendance rosters

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 Information Nights	K-5	Teachers	Parents/guardians	September 5, 6	Teacher/parent conferences	Teachers

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:

Increase integration of STEM-related content and skill development into core content areas

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	Teacher readiness levels to effectively and regularly integrate science, technology, engineering, and math into core content areas	<p>On-going professional development in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math</p> <p>Technology teacher dedicated to infusing computer technology into core content areas of study</p> <p>Creation of newly formed Robotics Club</p> <p>Continuation of Odyssey of The Mind</p> <p>Hiring of math tutor to provide remedial support</p>	Administration	<p>Walkthroughs</p> <p>PLC Minutes</p> <p>Culminating Events</p>	<p>FCAT math and science</p> <p>Rate of student participation in club activities</p>

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Successmaker	Targeted instruction	n/a	\$0.00
Reading	After school tutoring program	Remedial grade 5 reading skills instruction for lowest quartile students	Internal funds	\$500.00
Mathematics	FCAT Testmaker	Software to support student preparation for FCAT Math	Parent Teacher Organization	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	After school tutoring program	Remedial math skills instruction for lowest quartile students	Internal funds	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FCAT Testmaker	Teacher-generated formative assessment tool for instruction	PTO	\$1,000.00
Science	FCAT Testmaker	Program to monitor student progress in science	PTO	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
Reading	Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
Reading	Close Reading/Text Complexity	Training	n/a	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Tutor	After school tutoring support	School-based	\$500.00
Science	Teacher and aide science lab preparation and planning	order and prepare science labs for K-5	School fund	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,500.00
				Grand Total: \$7,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/5/2012)

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
Professional development for Literacy Leadership Team	\$2,238.00

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

Determine the use of school improvement funds for professional development; monitor student and school progress; assist in the development of School Improvement Plan; encourage an active parent group and business partnership.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District TATUM RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	84%	95%	78%	348	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	80%	55%			135	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?	79% (YES)	59% (YES)			138	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					621	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District TATUM RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	92%	88%	78%	349	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	72%	65%			137	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?	63% (YES)	64% (YES)			127	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					613	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested