FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MILL CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Susan E. Cavinee

SAC Chair: Katherine Kelley & Stephanie Belz

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/24/2012

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	Susan E. Cavinee	M.S., Elementary Ed., School Principal	6	10	2007-08 Mill Creek E.S.; Grade-A; AYP-No, 92% criteria met; 2008-09 Mill Creek E.S., Grade-A; AYP-No, 95% criteria met; 2009-10 Mill Creek E.S., Grade-C; AYP-No, 77% criteria met, 2010-2011 School Grade "B", AYP-No,87% criteria met
Assis Principal	Pauline M. Waggoner	M.Ed, Educational Leadership, Certifications: Elementary Ed., Ed. Leadership, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum, Math 5-9, Endorsements: ESOL and Gifted	1	1	9 years as a teacher at Ventura E.S.: school grades ranged from B-C; AYP-No; 5 years as a teacher and dean at Neptune M.S.: school grade 2011-2012: B; AYP-No; 2010-2011 grade: A; AYP-No; 2009-2010 grade: A; AYP-No

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 and Writing	Becky Brashears	Masters degree, Certification: Elementary Education, ESOL Endorsement,Reading Endorsement	10	10	2001-02: Grade C; AYP-No 2003-04: Grade B; AYP-No, 87% criteria met 2004-05: Grade B; AYP-No, 90% criteria met 2005-06: Grade C; AYP-No, 87% criteria met 2006-07:Grade A; AYP-No, 97% criteria met 2007-08: Grade A; AYP-No, 92% criteria met 2008-09: Grade A; AYP-No, 95% criteria met; 2009-10: Grade-C; AYP-No, 77% criteria met, 2010-11 Grade "B", AYP-No, 87% criteria met 2011 12 Grade "A",
Math and Science	Jacqueline Acosta	Bachelor's degree, Certification: Elementary Ed., ESOL Endorsement	7	3	2005-06: Grade C; AYP-No, 87% criteria met 2006-07:Grade A; AYP-No, 97% criteria met 2007-08: Grade A; AYP-No, 92% criteria met 2008-09: Grade A; AYP-No, 95% criteria met; 2009-10: Grade-C; AYP-No, 77% criteria met 2010-11 Grade "B", AYP-No, 87% criteria met 2011-12 Grade "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	Local recruiting: District and local area job fairs	District staff, Principal, Assistant Principal	June, 2012	
2	Continued professional development	Principal, Asst. Principal, Coaches	2012-2013	
3	Instructional Planning meetings	Principal, Assistant Principal, coaches, Guidance Counselor, Other Lead Personnel	Weekly throughout 2012-2013 school year	
4	Professional Learning Communities	Principal, Assistant Principal, coaches, Guidance Counselor, Other Lead Personnel	Monthly throughout 2012-2013 school year	
5	New teacher mentoring program Currently we do no have any new teachers	Co-mentoring coordinator	Monthly throughout 2012-2013 school year	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
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
60	0.0%(0)	18.3%(11)	63.3%(38)	18.3%(11)	8.3%(5)	90.0%(54)	1.7%(1)	0.0%(0)	93.3%(56)

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
	We do not have any new teachers		

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

Mill Creek Elementary provides services to ensure students requiring extended learning opportunities are assisted through after-school tutoring and or summer school. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through iii, Rti and paraprofessionals working with them. Reading and Math Coaches lead and evaluate school core academic 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 provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for monitoring assessment and implementation.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Not applicable

Title I, Part D

Not applicable

Title II

Mill Creek Elementary will use the District's supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
• training and substitute release time for Professional Development in the areas of common core standards, math, guided reading and writing.

Title III

Mill Creek ELL population, should funds become available, for the 2012-13 school year are:
• Tutorial Programs
• Parent Outreach Activities
• Professional Development on Best Practices for ESOL and Content Area Teachers.
• Software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading

Title X- Homeless

Mill Creek Elementary will coordinate with the District Homeless Social Worker to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Mill Creek Elementary will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation. SAI funds will be used to provide extended learning opportunities for Level 1 and 2 math students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Mill Creek Elementary offers a non-violence program to students through the Stop Bullying Now! campaign and the school's Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program. In addition, counseling services will be provided as needed.

Nutrition Programs

Mill Creek Elementary has universal free breakfast for all students and participates in the Federal School Lunch Program.

Housing Programs

Not applicable

Head Start

Not applicable

Adult Education

Not applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not applicable

Job Training

Not applicable

Other

Not applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Susan Cavinee: Principal, Pauline Waggoner, Assistant Principal, Joan Malotka: Guidance Counselor, Rebecca Brashears: Literacy Coach, Jacqueline Acosta: Math and Science Coach, Myrna Olmo: School Psychologist

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

The RtI team will meet twice monthly to review school-wide academic data and behavior data. The team will identify students needing additional support. The team will plan, implement and modify interventions, discuss the progress of each student,

review data provided by the teacher and commercially made assessments

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 RtI Leadership Team met with the principal to help develop the information for the School Improvement Plan. The RtI team will share the RtI process with School Advisory Council members during our fall SAC meeting. The team will provide data on Tier 1, 2 & 3 for SIP documentation. The team will also share the same data with the teachers at the Instructional Planning (IP) meetings, PLC meetings, faculty meetings and/or grade level meetings. The team will provide support to the teachers as needed. We believe the continued implementation of teaching strategies learned through Learning Focused Solutions (LFS), Common Core Standards training and Guided Reading will assist the students in the RtI process.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data will include: spring 2012 FAIR, FCAT, and formative assessments, summer 2012 SAT 10 assessment data and Fall 2012 FAIR assessment data. Data may also be acquired from our district's Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN).
Midyear data will include: FAIR assessment and progress monitoring results.
End of year data will include: FAIR, FCAT and progress monitoring assessments.
This data will be discussed at RtI team meetings as well as at Instructional Planning, PLC and team meetings throughout the year.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided to the teachers during Instructional Planning (IP) meetings, Professional Learning Communities, faculty meetings, and/or team meetings throughout the school year. Teachers will also be asked/encouraged to attend district offered professional development. The RtI team will evaluate if additional professional development is needed as the RtI process progresses throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Becky Brashears, Brandy Gabriel, Lisa Bonacci, Julie Zollo-Barra, Stephanie Belz, Sandra Vargas-Gutierrez, Amanda Bramhall, Jennifer Mehlenbacher, Holly Plaza, Lindsey Farber, Sabrena Watson

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

The team will be headed by the literacy coach and meetings will be held during PLC Wednesdays. The role of the team will focus on promoting reading and writing, analyzing data and providing teacher training, strengthening interventions, and increasing parent involvement through Family Literacy Nights.

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

The team's initiatives will be Guided Reading, implementation of strategies to meet Common Core standards, and continuing LFS strategies for grades K-5.

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.

No Pre-K programs are offered at Mill Creek Elementary for the 2012-2013 school year.

*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.

Not applicable

*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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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 percentage of students in grades 3, 4 & 5 scoring at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT reading test was 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The students scoring at Level 3 on the FCAT reading test is as follows: Grade 3 - 20% (26 students) Grade 4 - 34% (48 students) Grade 5 - 26% (36 students)	With NGSSS and Common Core Standards instruction, 70% of the students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or above on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking foundational reading skills.	Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach daily beyond the 90-minute reading block.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	FAIR Results, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	On the 2013 Alternative Assessment, 6 students or more will score a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Alternative Assessment for reading, 6 students will score a level 4 or higher.	On the 2013 Alternative Assessment, at least 6 students will score a level 4 or higher

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	Having a learning disability.	Teach strategies to assist in reading skills and comprehension.	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs from administration and district resource personnel.	Alternative 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 percent of students in Grades 3, 4, and 5 scoring at Level 4 and 5 for 2012 was 28% (114 students).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
The students scoring a Level 4 or 5 was as follows: Grade 3: 25% (33 students) Grade 4: 28% (39 students) Grade 5: 29% (41 students)	With NGSSS and Common Core Standards instruction, 70% of the students in grades 3-5 will score at level 3 or above on the reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Identified in Goal #1.	Identified in Goal #1.	Identified in Goal #1.	Identified in Goal #1.	Identified in Goal #1.

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:	On the 2013 Alternative Assessment for reading, 6 students will score a level 7 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
On the 2012 Alternative Assessment for reading, 5 students will score a level 7 or above.	On the 2013 Alternative Assessment for reading, 6 students will score a level 7 or above.

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	Having a learning disability. .	Teach strategies to assist in reading skills and comprehension	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs from administration and district resource personnel.	Alternative 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:	Based on the 2012 FCAT results, 74% of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading, a 12 percentage point increase over the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
74% of the students tested made gains in the reading portion of the FCAT.	Our goal for 2013 is for 75% of the students in grades 3-5 to make learning gains on the reading portion of the FCAT.

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

	Students lacking foundational reading skills.	Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction daily beyond the 90-minute reading block as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	FAIR Results, FCAT
1					

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:	Information on learning gains was not available for input in this section.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Information on learning gains was not available for input in this section.	Information on projected learning gains was not available for input in this section.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Having a learning disability.</td><td>Teach strategies to assist in reading skills and comprehension</td><td>Classroom teacher</td><td>Classroom walkthroughs from administration and district resource personnel.</td><td>Alternative 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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	On the 2012 FCAT reading test, 76% of the lowest quartile made learning gains. This represents an increase of 11 percentage points from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% of the students representing the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading.	For 2013, it is expected that 85% of the students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Students lacking foundation reading skills.</td><td>Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach daily beyond the 90-minute reading block.</td><td>Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers</td><td>Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs</td><td>FAIR results, FCAT assessment,</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Transition from the NGSSS to the Common Core Standards</td><td>Provide professional development for teachers, ESOL assistants, and others working with the lowest 25%tile students.</td><td>Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, District personnel</td><td>Classroom walkthroughs, observations,</td><td>FAIR results, FCAT assessment,</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The 2012 FCAT reading test scores indicate that 74% of the students made satisfactory progress in reading, which is a 12 percentage point increase from 2011. Students in all but one subgroup made learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percent of students in each subgroup and their learning gains or losses in reading in 2012 are as follows: White - 76% (from 75% in 2011) Black - 70% (from 75% in 2011) Hispanic - 74% (from 60% in 2011) ED - 76% (from 63% in 2011) ELL - 73% (from 61% in 2011)	The expectation for 2013 FCAT is that 70% of the students in each subgroup will make learning gains on the FCAT reading test.

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 foundation reading skills.	Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach daily beyond the 90-minute reading block.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	FAIR results, FCAT assessment,
2	Transition from NGSSS to the Common Core Standards	Provide professional development for teachers, ESOL assistants, and paraprofessionals that work with students.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, District personnel	Classroom walkthroughs, observations	FAIR results, fCAT 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 2012 FCAT reading test scores indicate that 73% of our ELL students made learning gains in reading, which is a 12 percentage point increase from 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 FCAT reading assessment indicates that 73% of ELL students made adequate progress/learning gains in reading.	The percentage of ELL students expected to make learning gains on the FCAT reading test in 2013 is 75%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students Lacking foundation reading skills in the English language	Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach daily beyond the 90-minute reading block. ESOL assistant will provide assistance	Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers, ESOL assistants	Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, Observation	FAIR results, FCAT assessment, CELLA results

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:	Not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable	Not applicable

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	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

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 percentage of economically disadvantaged students who made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading test is 76%, which represents an increase of 13 percentage points over the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 76% of the economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the reading portion of the FCAT.	For 2013, the goal is for 80% of the economically disadvantaged students to make learning gains on the FCAT reading test.

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 foundation reading skills.	Students identified will receive triple 'i' instruction as designed by the teacher and the literacy coach daily beyond the 90-minute reading block.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	FAIR results, FCAT 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
Common Core Standards, Guided Reading	K-5	Literacy Coach, District Personnel	Kindergarten through 5th Grade teachers	Throughout school year; Sept. 2012 - June 2013 Instructional Planning Meetings, PLC monthly meetings	Discussions at IP Meetings, Classroom walkthroughs, Observations	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach

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:	On the 2013 CELLA listening/speaking assessment, 75% of the students will score in the profecient range.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
Fourteen, (74%), of students scored proficient on the CELLA listening/speaking assessment 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
1	Lack of proficiency in the English Language	Provide assistance to ELL students	ESOL assistants	Results of CELLA testing	CELLA

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:	On the 2013 CELLA reading assessment, 50% of the students will socre in the proficient range.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Eight students (44%) scored in the proficient range on the CELLA reading assessment.

	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	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	On the 2013 CELLA writing assessment, 65% of the students will score proficient.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Twelve students, (63%) scored proficient on the CELLA writing assessment.

	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	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.	Same as goal #1.

CELLA Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The 2012 FCAT Math results indicate 46% (189)of the students are at grade level or above. This is a 14 percentage point decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The FCAT Math test results indicate the percentage of students achieving a Level 3 are as follows for each grade level: Grade 3 27% (35 students) Grade 4 26% (37 students) Grade 5 26% (37 students)	The expected outcome of the 2013 FCAT Math assessment is for 70% of the students to score level 3 or above, indicating grade level proficiency.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of basic math computation skills</td><td>Students identified will attend after-school tutoring; Math/Science coach providing additional interventions during school day; small group instruction with classroom teacher; increased rigor in daily lessons</td><td>Math/science coach, Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal, Math Coach</td><td>Formative benchmark assessments, report card, CWTs, pre/post tests</td><td>Formative benchmark assessments, progress monitoring and FCAT Math test results, classroom assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Teachers with weak subject knowledge, lacking confidence in how to teach to high standards</td><td>Provide teachers with ongoing training in Common Core strategies,modeling of rigorous lessons, and guidance in Marzano best practices</td><td>Math Coach, Asst. Principal</td><td>CWTs, Workshop feedback, formative assessments,</td><td>Formative benchmark testing, FCAT Math test results</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 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:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The 2012 FCAT Math results indicate 19% (80) of the students achieved a Level 3 or 4. This is a percentage point decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students who scored a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math in 2012 are as follows: 3rd Grade - 19% (25 students) 4th Grade - 22% (31 students) 5th Grade - 17% (24 students)	Identified in Goal #1

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Identified in Goal #1	Identified in Goal #1	Identified in Goal #1	Identified in Goal #1	Identified in Goal #1

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Math assessment, 69% of students made learning gains, which is an 18 percentage point increase from 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 FCAT Math assessment indicates that 69% of the	The 2013 FCAT Math assessment results will demonstrate

	students in grades 3-5 made learning gains.		that 80% of the students tested will make learning gains.	

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	Large number of students below grade level in math.	Increase differentiated instruction, after-school tutoring, Math/Science coach interventions.	Classroom teachers, math coach	Progress monitoring, CWTs, lesson plans	Formative benchmark assessments, FCAT

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Based on the 2012 FCAT Math results, 73% of the students made learning gains, which is an increase of 22 percentage points over the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The results of the 2012 FCAT Math assessment indicate that 73% of the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 made learning gains.	The expected outcome of the 2013 FCAT Math assessment will have 80% of the students in the lowest quartile making learning gains.

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	Teachers not familiar with teaching new math series	Provide training in differentiated instruction, after school tutoring, work with math/science coach and math centers	Teachers,Math Coach, principal, assistant principal	CWTs, Student Progress Reports, pre/post tests	Formative benchmark testing, FCAT test results, pre/post tests

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The 2012 FCAT math assessment indicates that the percent of students making learning gains improved in every subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The percent of students in each subgroup who made adequate progress/learning) gains in math in 2012 are as follows: White - 76% (from 57% in 2011) Black - 59% (from 57% in 2011) Hispanic - 67% (from 48% in 2011) ED - 68% (from 50% in 2011) ELL - 67% (from 51% in 2011)	It is expected that 80% of all subgroups will make adequate progress/learning gains on the 2013 Math FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Closing the achievement gap for the Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD subgroups.	School wide math focus time is scheduled; after-school remediation program, during school hours work with math/science coach	Teacher,math/science coach, Principal, Asst. Principal, Math coach	Review of data from formative assessments, pre/post tests	Formative benchmark assessments, post test, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The 2012 FCAT math assessment indicates that 67% of ELL students made adequate progress/learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 2012 FCAT math assessment indicates that 67% of ELL students made adequate progress/learning gains in mathematics.	The expecation for 2013 is that 80% of ELL will score at or above grade level as measured by the FCAT math assessment.

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
	High number of English Language Learners	Extended learning sessions in math	Teachers,Tutors, Math Coach	CWTs, student Progress Reports, pre- and post-	Formative benchmark tests,

| 1 | | instruction during the school day and after-school | | test | FCAT math test results |

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:	Not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable	Not applicable

	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	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

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 percentage of economically disadvantaged students who made adequate progress/learning gains on the 2012 FCAT math assessment is 68%. This represents an 18 percentage point gain from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 68% of the ED students in grades 3-5 made adequate progress/learning gains in the math portion of the FCAT.	For 2013, the goal is for 80% of the ED students tested to make adequate progress/learning gains.

	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	High percentage of economically disadvantaged students.	Differentiated instruction in math and extended learning opportunities during and after school hours.	Teacher, math coach, Principal, Assistant Principal,	CWTs, pre- and post-test, progress reports, report cards,	Formative benchmark assessment, FCAT math test results

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Training in Common Core math strategies	Grades K-5	Math Coach	Classroom teachers who teach math in Grades K-5	Throughout school year; Sept. 2012 - June 2013 Instructional Planning Meetings, PLC monthly meetings	Formative assessments progress; Discussions at IP Meetings; Classroom walkthroughs; Observations	Principal, Asst. Principal, Math Coach
Development of Marzano Best Practices	Grades K-5	Math Coach, Principal, Asst. Principal	all instructors	PLC meetings, Instructional Planning meetings	CWTs, formative tests, report cards	Principal, Asst. Principal, Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The 2012 FCAT Science results indicate that 48% of the students in Grade 5 scored a level 3 or above. This is a 3 percentage point decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30%(42 students) scored at Level 3.	The expected outcome of the 2013 FCAT Science test is for 55% of the 5th Grade students to score level 3 or above on the Science FCAT.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Fifth grade science	Weekly Instructional	Math and	Formative	Formative

| | 1 | teachers lacking an understanding of the Science NGSSS. | Planning meetings addressing the science standards; PLCs; utilization of the Science Lab for hands-on experimentation; integration of ThinkCentral Science lessons via SmartBoards | Science Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal | assessments, CWT | benchmark testing, FCAT |

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The 2012 FCAT Science test indicates that 17% of the students scored at levels 4 and 5. This result is unchanged from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 17% at Level 4 or 5 is comprised of 17 students.	The expected outcome of the 2013 FCAT Science test is for 25% of the students in grade 5 to score at level 4 or 5.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Fifth Grade teachers lacking an understanding of the NGSSS Science</td><td>PLCs and weekly Instructional Planning meetings, utilization of the Science Lab for hands-on experimentation.</td><td>Math and Science coach and Principal, Assistant Principal</td><td>Formative assessments and CWT</td><td>Formative benchmark test results, FCAT</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 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:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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
Provide training in alignment of instruction with NGSSS	K-5	Principal and Asst. Principal; Math/Science Coach	all teachers	weekly IP meetings	CWTs, lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal

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

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:	On the 2012 FCAT Writing assessment, 52% of the students are at or above level 3.5 and 34% scored a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% of the students scored a Level 3.5 or above and 34% scored a level 4 or above.	For 2013, our goal is for 90% of the students tested to score at level 4 or above on the writing portion of the FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	New teachers responsible for fourth grade writing instruction who have not had writing training.	Provide writing training through ongoing lesson modeling and peer coaching.	Teacher, Literacy coach, writing consultant	Monitoring of formative writing data, CWTs, observations,	Osceola Writes, FCAT Writes, student classroom writing samples
2	English Language Learners	ESOL paraprofessionals will provide assistance with English language acquistion.	Teacher, ESOL paraprofessional and administration	Monitoring of formative writing data, CWTs,	Osceola Writes, FCAT Writes, classroom samples of writing

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Provide writing training through instructional meetings, formal and informal trainings	Kindergarten through 5th grade. Focus on 4th grade.	Writing consultant, Literacy Coach, peer modeling	All teachers	August 2012 through May 2013.	Classroom walkthroughs, observations, student samples,	Literacy coach, principal and assistant principal

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:	Mill Creek Elementary maintained a 96% daily average attendance for the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

96%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
The number of students with excessive absences(10 or more unexcused) is 65.	42 students which represents a 20% decrease.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more unexcused) is not available at this time.	_____ students which represents a ___% decrease.

	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 and parents do not place priority on attending school regularly.	Communication and informational parent meetings, proactive measures by teachers contacting the parents, providing incentives to students with perfect attendance. Recognize students in assemblies	Teacher,Principal and Asst. Principal, district truancy officer, district attendance/social services personnel	Teachers closely monitoring, District monthly average daily attendance reports	Attendance records, Annual average daily attendance

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
During Instructional Planning meetings attendance will be addressed as needed.	Kindergarten through 5th grade.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Data Entry Clerk, RtI Coordinator	RtI team will review attendance of students in RtI	October 2012 - April 2013	Electronic call from MCE to parent for absences, Letter from MCE upon 5 unexcused absences, Meeting with administrator data entry clerk and district attendance personnel	Data entry person Disrict attendance/socialservices personnel

Attendance Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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:	Mill Creek Elementary will decrease the number of out-of-school suspensions during the 2011-12 school year by 15 days.
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
37	40
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
37	40
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
39	15
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
17	12

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	Not consistently implementing a discipline plan for every classroom and schoolwide.	Implementing the PBS program. Train teachers on Positive Behavior Support Plan, communicate with parents, communication	PBS team, Principal, Asst. Principal, Guidance Counselor, PBS Leader and	Data of in-school and out of school suspensions	ODMS/discipline repots

		between guidance counselor, student and parents.	committee members			

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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*	Mill Creek Elementry's parent and community members' involvement is extensive, we logged 8300 volunteer hours for the 2011-2012 school year.

unduplicated.

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
A minimum of 60% of families are involved in a positvie way in the school more than once during the year.	We will increase the parent involvement by 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	Parent work schedules	Provide activities at multiple times and days of the week.	OASIS Coordinator,Principal, Assistant Principal,	OASIS coordinator and leadership will monitor parental involvement records	Sign-in sheets, minutes from meetigns
2	lack of effective communication, economic issues, lack of parent motivation	Increase awareness of school events and organizations (PTO SAC etc.) Keep school website updated offer more parent training on curriculum and technology resources	Teachers, employees, volunteers Principal and assistant principal	Teachers, employees, volunteers will be in charge of specific groups and monitor for effectiveness	Parent involvement data including the climate survey
3	economic issues,	Increaes awareness of parent rersource centers available and provide free or low cost activities at the school.	OASIS coordinator, teachers, guidance counselor, administration	Request parent sign-out sheets from the parenting centers, monitor number of families that attend events	sing-out sheets, parent involvement records,
4	lack of parent motivation	Include student performances in family events, invitations to students recognition activities	faculty and staff, administration	sign-in sheets,	parent involvement data

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/24/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Osceola School District
MILL CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	60%	94%	60%	286	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	66%	51%			117	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?	65% (YES)	51% (YES)			116	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					519	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Osceola School District
MILL CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	65%	67%	85%	45%	262	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	61%	52%			113	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?	53% (YES)	49% (NO)			102	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					477	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested