

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CORAL REEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Mrs. Christina Guerra

SAC Chair: Mrs. Martha Vera-Llano

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: PENDING

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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

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)
		Certifications/Endorsements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master of Science degree in Educational Leadership • Bachelor of 			School Grade '12: A High Standards Rdg. '12: 77 High Standards Math '12: 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '12: 77 Lrng Gains-Math '12: 81 Gains -Rdg-25% '12: 75 Gains-Math-25% '12: 66 School Grade '11: C AYP '11 :N High Standards Rdg. '11: 53 High Standards Math '11: 66 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '11: 52 Lrng Gains-Math '11: 60 Gains -Rdg-25% '11: 47 Gains-Math-25% '11: 76

Principal	CHRISTINA GUERRA	Science degree in Management Information Systems • Certifications: Computer Science Grades K-12 Mathematics grades 5-9 Educational Leadership (all levels)	1	14	School Grade '10: CAYP '10 :N High Standards Rdg. '10: 53 High Standards Math '10: 64 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '10: 58 Lrng Gains-Math '10: 51 Gains -Rdg-25% '10: 67 Gains-Math-25% '10: 61 School Grade '09: C AYP '09: N High Standards Rdg. '09: 54 High Standards Math '09: 62 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '09: 59 Lrng Gains-Math '09: 67 Gains -Rdg-25% '09: 66 Gains-Math-25% '09: 80 School Grade '08: D AYP '08 : N High Standards Rdg. '08: 57 High Standards Math '08: 49 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '08: 59 Lrng Gains-Math '08: 47 Gains -Rdg-25% '08: 54 Gains-Math-25% '08: 56
Assis Principal	RACHEL PIERRE-LOUIS	2012 Certifications/Endorsements: • Bachelor in Arts Degree INT'L BUSINESS • Teaching Certification ELEM . EDUCATION Grades 1-6 • Master of Science Degree in ED. LEADERSHIP	4	9	School Grade '12: A High Standards Rdg. '12: 77 High Standards Math '12: 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '12: 77 Lrng Gains-Math '12: 81 Gains -Rdg-25% '12: 75 Gains-Math-25% '12: 66 School Grade '11: A AYP '11:N High Standards Rdg. '11:91 High Standards Math '11: 90 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '11: 71 Lrng Gains-Math '11: 73 Gains -Rdg-25% '11: 58 Gains-Math-25% '11: 56 School Grade '10: A AYP '10:N High Standards Rdg. '10:89 High Standards Math '10: 83 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '10: 77 Lrng Gains-Math '10: 58 Gains -Rdg-25% '10: 61 Gains-Math-25% '10: 53 School Grade '09: A AYP '09: N High Standards Rdg. '09: 90 High Standards Math '09: 85 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '09: 74 Lrng Gains-Math '09: 74 Gains -Rdg-25% '09: 70 Gains-Math-25% '09: 57 School Grade '08: A AYP '08 : N High Standards Rdg. '08: 64 High Standards Math '08: 68 Lrng Gains-Rdg. '08: 62 Lrng Gains-Math '08: 65 Gains -Rdg-25% '08: 54 Gains-Math-25% '08: 69

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.

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)

No data submitted

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Every effort is made to retain every highly qualified teacher by ensuring they are provided with all necessary tools/resources needed to feel successful with our students.	Administration	Ongoing through June 2013	
2	3. Administration, Support Staff, and Leadership Team will provide support to new, inexperienced teachers on a regular basis.	Administration	Ongoing through June 2013	
3	4. Principal and Assistant Principal will provide opportunities for data review and administrative feedback following classrooms observations with all teachers on a regular basis.	Administration	Ongoing through June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Four teachers are currently updating their certification to achieve Highly Qualified status. Seven are teaching out-of-field and have waivers on file.	Professional Development towards appropriate certification is being monitored by administration.

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
54	1.9%(1)	13.0%(7)	42.6%(23)	42.6%(23)	42.6%(23)	79.6%(43)	13.0%(7)	3.7%(2)	61.1%(33)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Jacqueline Martinez-Perez	Christian Roman- SPED Teacher	Mrs. Perez is an experienced Special Education teacher.	Mrs. Perez will provide mentoring, support, collaboration opportunities, and guided reflection activities to Mr. Roman.
Elena Regalado	Jacqueline Roman-Kindergarten	Mrs. Regalado is an experienced Kindergarten Teacher.	Mrs. Regalado will provide mentoring, support, collaboration opportunities, and guided reflection activities to Mrs. Roman.

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)

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

1. MTSS/RtI leadership is vital, therefore, in building our team we have considered the following:

- Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources: Principal and Assistant Principal
- Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students: Select General Education Teachers
- Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time: Grade level chairpersons (K-5)

2. The school's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:

- Reading: Reading Liaisons
- Math: Instructional Math Liaison
- Science: Instructional Science Liaison
- Behavior Specialists
- Special education personnel
- School guidance counselor
- School psychologist
- School social worker
- Member of advisory group: EESAC members
- Community stakeholders: Dade Partner Businesses

3. MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

- The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
- The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
- The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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

The following steps will be considered by the school's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring. The Leadership Team will:

1. Use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress at least three times per year by addressing the following important questions:
 - What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
 - How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
 - How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention, problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
 - How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (Enrichment opportunities).
2. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
3. Hold regular team meetings. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.
5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
8. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives.

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

- In order to implement the RtI process, the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team at Coral Reef Elementary will:
1. Monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
 2. Monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
 3. Provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
 - adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
 - adjust the delivery of behavior management system
 - adjust the allocation of school-based resources
 - drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
 - create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
2. Managed data will include:

Academic

 - FAIR assessment (Broad Screening, Progress Monitoring, Targeted Diagnostic Indicators, Broad Diagnostic Indicators, Ongoing Progress Monitoring Tools, Phonics Screening Inventory
 - Oral Reading Fluency Measures
 - Voyager Checkpoints
 - Voyager Benchmark Assessments
 - Baseline Benchmark Assessments
 - Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports
 - Interim assessments
 - State/Local Math and Science assessments
 - FCAT
 - Student grades
 - School site specific assessments

Behavior

 - Student Case Management System
 - Detentions
 - Suspensions/expulsions
 - Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
 - Office referrals per day per month
 - Team climate surveys
 - Attendance
 - Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

1. Training for all administrators in the MTSS/RtI problem solving, at Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (SST), using the Tier Problem Solving Worksheet, Tier 2 Problem Solving Worksheet, and Tier 3 Problem Solving Worksheet and Intervention Plan
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RtI principles and procedures

3. Providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS/RTI
4. among school service personnel through feeder patterns.
feeder patterns

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The principal will promote the LLT as an integral part of the school literacy reform to promote a culture of reading by including representation from all curricular areas on the LLT, selecting team members who are skilled and committed to improving literacy and offering professional growth opportunities for team members.

The selected Literacy Leadership Team will work towards supporting capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. This team will strive to impact student learning positively by transferring teacher learning into the classroom. It consists of:

- Ms. Guerra, Principal
- Ms. Pierre-Louis, Assistant Principal
- Ms. Bienes, Bilingual Chairperson & Reading Liaison
- Ms. Blanco, SPED Teacher & Reading Liaison
- Ms. Pastrana, 5th Grade Teacher & Science Liaison
- Ms. Barbato, 5th Grade Teacher & Mathematics Liaison
- Ms. Castel, SPED Teacher & Professional Development Liaison
- Ms. Martinez-Perez, SPED Chairperson
- Ms. K.Valdes, Technology Chairperson
- Ms. Sirota, Student Services Chairperson

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

In order to create a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning, develop a school wide organizational model that supports literacy instruction in all classes and encourage the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement. The Coral Reef Elementary Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to:

- Review/discuss pertinent data to make teaching decisions regarding the utilization of resources based on data analysis that indicates the needs of students
- Provide time for collegial discussion and dialogue about improving instruction
- Interprets the needs of teachers through data analysis
- Stay current on educational trends and developments

- Plan to model quality instructional practices at meetings
- Provide opportunities for staff to attend and actively participate in professional development and other learning opportunities
- The team will consider student assessment data, classroom observational data, and the professional development listed on the teachers IPEGS Goal Setting form, and School Improvement Plan, when planning professional development for the school

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

This 2012-2013 school year, the LLT will focus on:

- Cultivating the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by implementing balanced Literacy for students to read and write across the curriculum
 - Creating a school-wide focus on literacy and reading achievement by establishing model classrooms; conferencing with Literacy Team, teachers and administrators; and providing professional development.
 - Provide opportunities for members of the Literacy Team to share their expertise in reading instruction, assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions.
 - Ensure the Reading Coach works with the Reading Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP.
 - Encourage teachers to engage in higher order thinking and discussion using a variety of formats and texts
- The principal will use instructional data in collaboration with the Literacy Team ensuring teacher and student needs are being met.

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 19% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 2 percentage points to 21 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (86)	21% (94)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary.	1.1. Emphasize reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching which help students determine the meaning of words by using context clues. Instruction will provide students with opportunities to read in all content areas, with increased emphasis on cross-content reading Reading teachers will use concept maps to introduce and reinforce concepts such as multiple meaning of words, synonyms and antonyms, and roots and affixes derived from Greek and Latin to determine the meanings of unfamiliar words. Students will maintain word banks and vocabulary notebooks to use in their writing.	1.1. LLT	1a.1. Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The LLT will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	1a.1. Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, and computer assisted reports from Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) indicate that 14% of students scored at levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading FAA
--	---

	at 14%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (2)	14% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1b.1. The percentage of students maintaining Level 4, 5, 6 or moving to Levels 7, 8 or 9 on the 2013 FAA is affected by their inabilities to decode text.	1b.1. Teachers will increase use of picture walks to assist students in making predictions of a reading selection. Students will have continuous review/ practice when learning reading concepts and will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	1b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	1b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	1b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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:	Reading Goal #2a: The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 57% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of achieving levels 4 and 5 proficiency by 1 percentage point to 58%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (254)	58% (259)

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	2a.1. The area which showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 2, Reading Application.	2a.1. Use project based learning to provide additional opportunities for students to analyze stated vs. implied main ideas. Increase use of Reading Plus as a computer-based silent reading intervention to practice Reading application skills.	2.1. Administrators, and LLT	2.1. Following the FCIM model, the LLT will conduct ongoing classroom assessments/observations focusing on students' ability to complete assignments focusing on analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas.	2.1. Formative: Student work samples utilizing rubrics, mini-assessments, District Interim Assessments and Reading Plus Reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment indicate that 86% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 at 86%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (12)	86% (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	2b.1. The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading on the FAA is affected by students' lack of reading fluency.	2b.1. Teachers will introduce vocabulary to students with pictures and print. Pictures should be faded for long term comprehension and retention. Teachers will provide students with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	2b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	2b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	2b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 78% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the number of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (221)	83% (235)

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	3a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for students making learning gains was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary.	3a.1. A school wide schedule will be implemented for the computer labs in order to optimize usage of technology and increase the frequency of SuccessMaker usage to increase proficiency.	3a.1. Administrators, and LLT	3a.1. Review SuccessMaker reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.	3a.1. Formative: SuccessMaker reports, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Reading Assessment indicate that 60% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (6)	70% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3b.1. Students lack the ability to remain engaged and make choices to demonstrate understanding.	3b.1. Teachers will give students the opportunity to make choices using concrete objects, real pictures and symbols paired with words. Students will respond to questions or tasks by, eye gaze, vocalizations, pointing and assistive technology.	3b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	3b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	3b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 75% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (53)	80% (57)

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	4a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test for students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains was Reporting Category 1 - Vocabulary.	4a.1. Implementing tutoring during school hours 5 times per week utilizing Voyager and/or SuccessMaker.	4a.1. Administrators, and LLT	4a.1. Review bi-weekly Voyager Checkpoint logs and SuccessMaker data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	4a.1. Formative: Voyager Checkpoint logs and SuccessMaker reports, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

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 #					
	<p>The baseline data from FCAT 2.0 2010-2011 indicates that 83% of students scored at level 3 and above. Our goal is to reduce the percentage of students not scoring at level 3 or above by 50% by the year 2015-2016.</p>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78	80	82	84	86	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that students in the Black, Hispanics and Asians subgroups have not made satisfactory progress in reading Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of Black, Hispanic and Asian students making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 48%(30) Hispanic: 76%(142) Asian: 76%(15)	Black: 55%(34) Hispanic: 80%(150) Asian: 85%(17)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. As noted on the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the Black, Hispanic and Asian subgroups failed to meet the expected AMO 2 targets. Students in these subgroup need remediation in Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary	5B.1. Utilize available data to identify tier 2 and 3 students for appropriate interventions within the first week of the 2012-2013 school year and monitor student progress monthly.	5B.1. Administrators, MTSS/RtI Team and LLT	5B.1. MTSS/RtI Team and LLT will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.	5B.1. Formative: FAIR, School-site assessment data, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 47% of students in the ELL subgroup have made satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress by 11 percentage points to 58% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

47%(13)		58%(16)			
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	5C.1. As noted on the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the ELL subgroup has failed to meet the expected AMO 2 targets. Students in the ELL subgroup need remediation in Reporting Category 1, Vocabulary.	5C.1. Utilize available data to identify tier 2 and 3 students for appropriate interventions using ESOL strategies and monitor student progress monthly.	5C.1. Administrators, MTSS/RtI Team and LLT	5C.1. MTSS/RtI Team and LLT will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data from prescribed intervention assessments.	5C.1. Formative: FAIR, School-site assessment data, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 41% of students in the SWD subgroup have made satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress by 12 percentage points to 53% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(23)	53%(30)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. As noted on the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the SWD subgroup failed to meet the expected AMO 2 targets. Students in the SWD subgroup have limited decoding skills, which hinders reading fluency and comprehension.	5D.1. The SPED Team will identify/target students based on academic ability and place them in appropriate resource/inclusion model to address the needs of all learners (phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, oral language, vocabulary, and comprehension).	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5D.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet with SPED teachers weekly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of SPED programs.	5D.1. Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 58% of students in the ED subgroup have made satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of ED students making satisfactory progress by 6 percentage points to 64% .
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
58%(92)			64%(101)		
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	5E.1. As noted on the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the ED subgroup failed to meet the expected AMO 2 targets. Students in the ED subgroup have limited decoding skills, which hinders reading fluency and comprehension.	5E.1. The Literacy Leadership Team identifies students based on academic ability and places them in appropriate intervention program to address phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, oral language, vocabulary, and comprehension.	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team	5E.1. MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet with SPED teachers weekly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of SPED programs.	5E.1. Formative: FAIR, District and School-site assessment data, intervention assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 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
Vocabulary-Analyzing Words in Text	K-5	Reading Liaisons	Teachers Grade K-5	November 14, 2012	Evidenced in teacher lesson plans Student application of strategies in reading assignments and review of formative assessments	Literacy Leadership Team
Identifying Topics and Themes Within and Across Texts.	K-5	Reading Liaisons	Teachers Grade K-5	November 14, 2012	Evidenced in teacher lesson plans Student application of strategies in reading assignments and review of formative assessments	Literacy Leadership Team

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
Accelerated Reader Vocabulary Component	Web Based Program	Book Fair Fundraising	\$1,800.00
			Subtotal: \$1,800.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Train the Trainer	Model School Conference-Orlando, FL	PTA Fundraisers	\$1,536.00
			Subtotal: \$1,536.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,336.00

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.		Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 56% of students were proficient in Oral Skills (listening and speaking).			
CELLA Goal #1:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient in Oral Skills by 2 percentage points to 58% on the CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
56% (39)					
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	1.1. ELL students are exposed to minimal rich and meaningful oral language activities.	1.1. Teachers will provide Meaningful Language Practice by encouraging ELL students to speak in class as much as possible and structuring conversations around books and subjects that build vocabulary.	1.1. Administration and ESOL Teacher	1.1. Monitoring lesson plans Walkthroughs	1.1. Formative: FAIR, School-site assessment data Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 40% of students were proficient in Reading.
CELLA Goal #2:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient in Reading by 2 percentage points to 42% on the CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

40% (28)

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	2.1. Students lack the ability to understand reading passages, including passages that present academic information.	2.1. Teachers will vary the complexity of assignments Differentiated Instruction (DI) to meet students' varying readiness levels, learning preferences, and interests.	2.1. Administration and ESOL Teacher	2.1. Monitoring lesson plans Walkthroughs	2.1. Formative: FAIR, School-site assessment data Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA Assessment

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 46% of students were proficient in Writing. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient in Writing by 2 percentage points to 48% on the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

46% (32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Students lack the ability to identify errors in grammar, mechanics and word choice.	3.1. Teachers will provide students with opportunities to practice Process Writing through teacher conferences and peer editing in order to master skills related to English grammar, sentence structure and word choice.	3.1. Administration and ESOL Teacher.	3.1. Monitoring lesson plans Walkthroughs	3.1. Formative: FAIR, School-site assessment data Summative: Results from the 2013 CELLA Assessment

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After School Tutoring	Small Group Intervention	Title III Grant	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00

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: \$2,500.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 23% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 1 percentage point to 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (102)	24% (107)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the areas of greatest difficulty by grade level were: Grade 3: Number: Fractions Grade 4: Number: Operations & Problems Grade 5: Number: Based Ten & Fractions	1a.1. Increase opportunities for students to model equivalent representations of given numbers using manipulatives. Increase the use of writing in mathematics to help students communicate their understanding of difficult concepts, reinforcing skills and allowing for correction of misconceptions. Furthermore, engage students in activities using technology (such as SuccessMaker, Gizmos, Riverdeep or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of numbers.	1a.1. Administrators, Math Liaison	1a.1. Results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed by department/grade level chairs to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed. District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC and adjustments to strategies made as	1a.1. Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) indicate that 20% of students scored at levels 4, 5 and 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency at 20 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (3)	20% (3)

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	1b.1. The percentage of students scoring at levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Math FAA is impacted by insufficient use of classroom manipulatives and materials, such as counters.	1b.1. Teachers will provide students with multiple opportunities to learn concepts using manipulatives, visuals, number lines and assistive technology. The students will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	1b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	1b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	1b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 54% of students achieved level 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain level 4 & 5 student proficiency at 54 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (241)	54% (241)

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	2a.1. According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the areas of greatest difficulty by grade level were: Grade 3: Number: Fractions Grade 4: Number: Operations & Problems Grade 5: Number: Based Ten & Fractions	2a.1. Students will be provided with opportunities for mathematical exploration and the development of understanding of number and operations. Students will participate in enrichment activities through the Math Club and SECME.	2a.1. Administrators, Math Liaison	2a.1. Results of biweekly assessments will be reviewed by department/grade level chairs to ensure progress. Adjustments to curriculum focus will be made as needed. District Interim Data reports will be reviewed by EESAC and adjustments to strategies made as	2a.1 Formative: Biweekly assessments and District Interim Data reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Assessment indicate that 80% of students scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students at or above Level 7 at 80 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

80% (12)			80% (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	2b.1. Students lack long term retention of math concepts learned.	2b.1. Teachers will help students review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency and tools for measurement.	2b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	2b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	2b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 82% of students made learning gains in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students making learning gains in mathematics by 5 percentage points to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (234)	87% (248)

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	3a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Math Test was Reporting Category 1, Number and Operations.	3a.1. Provide students the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals	3a.1. Administrators, Math Liaison	3a.1. Teacher/Leadership Team Data Chats Hands-on and timed math fact activities listed in lesson plans.	3a.1. Formative: Informal Assessments, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 test

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 50 % of students made learning gains in mathematics . Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 60%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

50% (5)			60% (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	3b.1. Students lack the ability to demonstrate mastery of math concepts.	3b.1. Teachers will provide students with continuous repetition/practice when learning math concepts. The students will be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA).	3b.1. SPED Chairperson, Administration	3b.1. Monitoring of Teacher Lesson Plans Ongoing Walkthroughs	3b.1. Formative: Student participation Summative: Results from the 2013 FAA Test

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 66% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics by 5 percentage points to 71%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(45)	71%(48)

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	4a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category 1, Number and Operations.	4a.1. Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and multiplication and related division facts, and fluency with multi-digit addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division of whole numbers, as well as addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals.	4a.1. Leadership Team	4a.1. Evidence of journals written by students reflecting about the math they learned and interactive "Word Walls" created by teacher and students.	4a.1. Formative: Informal Assessments, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # The baseline data from FCAT 2.0 2010-2011 indicates that 83% of students scored at level 3 and above. Our goal is to reduce the percentage of non-proficient students by 50% by the year 2016-2017.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	76	78	81	83	85	
--	----	----	----	----	----	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that students in the Black and Asians subgroups have not made satisfactory progress in mathematics Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of Black and Asian students making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 43%(27) Asian: 88% (18)	Black: 57%(35) Asian: 93%(19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Students in the Black subgroup lack a deep understanding of concepts in Reporting Category 1, Number and Operations.	5B.1. Students will receive additional practice with Number and Operations during differentiated instruction and the use of SuccessMaker before and during school hours.	5B.1. Leadership Team	5B.1. SuccessMaker reports and evidence of small group instruction during administrator walkthroughs.	5B.1. Formative: Informal Assessments, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 43% of students in the SWD subgroup have made satisfactory progress in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress by 11 percentage points to 54% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43%(25)	54% (31)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Students have not mastered pre-requisite math skills in Reporting Category 1, Numbers and Operations, and have difficulty grasping meanings of numbers to create strategies for solving problems and responding to practical situations .	5D.1. Foster the use of meanings of numbers to create strategies for solving problems and responding to practical situations through the use of models, place-value, and properties of operations. Demonstrate these mathematical situations through the use of Gizmos.	5D.1. Leadership Team	5D.1. Review Gizmos Reports. Evidence of focus in teacher lesson plans.	5D.1. Formative: Informal Assessments, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 57% of students in the ED subgroup have made satisfactory progress in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of ED students making satisfactory progress by 5 percentage points to 62% .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%(90)	62%(98)

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	5E.1 As noted on the results from the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test, the E.D. subgroup failed to meet the expected AMO target. Limited access to Research-based tutorial software offered online by the district constitutes a barrier.	5E.1 Engage students before and during school in activities to use technology (i.e. GoMath, Gizmos and SuccessMaker) that include visual stimulus to help students develop conceptual understanding of number patterns and extend their knowledge of properties of numbers and operations.	5E.1 Leadership Team	5E.1 Review Gizmos Reports. Evidence of focus in teacher lesson plans	5E.1 Formative: Mini-assessments and tutorial software reports Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 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
Gizmos-Using virtual Math manipulatives	Grades 4-5	Mathematics Liaison/Media Specialist	Grades 4-5 Teachers	October 17, 2012	Grade level planning sessions/Reports from Computer Assisted Program	Administrators/ Mathematics Liaison
SuccessMaker	Grades 4-5	Mathematics Liaison/Media Specialist	Grades 4-5 Teachers	September 6, 2012	Intervention Schedule/Reports from SuccessMaker	Administrators/ Mathematics Liaison
Using Data to Improve Instruction	Grades K-5	Mathematics Liaison	Grades K-5 Teachers	November 6, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administrators

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
Interactive Technology	Smart Board	PTA	\$11,188.88
			Subtotal: \$11,188.88
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Using Data to Improve Instruction	Model Schools Conference, Orlando, FL	PTA	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$12,188.88

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 33% of 5th Grade students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) The goal for the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment is to increase 5th Grade students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) by 3 percentage points to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34%(50)33% (48)	36% (52)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 Science FCAT 2.0 is Category 1: The Nature of Science. Students need more opportunities to practice with the scientific process.	1a.1. Increase opportunities for authentic hands-on science experiences with emphasis on observation and the development of testable hypotheses. Students will participate in quarterly Science Camps using experiments, science games and GIZMOs in different modes to increase opportunities to apply concepts in a variety of scenarios.	1a.1. Administrators, Science Liaison	1a.1. Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate.	1a.1. Formative: School based assessment and District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment
--	---

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	indicate that 29% of 5th Grade students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) The goal for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment is to increase 5th Grade students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) by 2 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(43)	31%(45)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. The area of most difficulty was Reporting Category 1: The Nature of Science Students need additional opportunities for inquiry- based and independent investigations.	2.1. Students in Grade 5 will be given opportunities to pursue independent projects and participate in a school-wide science fair in preparation for the District Elementary Science Fair. From the beginning of the school year, support will be provided for students to propose, develop and present independent investigations. Teachers will monitor progress toward completion of projects on a biweekly schedule.	2.1. Science Liaison	2.1 Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by the administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as appropriate.	2.1. Formative: School based assessment and District Baseline and Interim assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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
Gizmos-Targeting Scientific Thinking	Grades 4-5	District Science trainer	Grades 4-5 Teachers	December 5, 2012	Grade level planning sessions/Reports from Computer Assisted Program (CAP)	Administrators/ Science Liaison
Integrating literacy in the science classroom	Grades 3-5	Science Liaison/Media Specialist	Grades 3-5 Teachers	October 26, 2012	Evidence of literacy in Science Lessons	Administrators/ Science Liaison
Science Camps	Grade 3-5	Science Liaison	Grade 3-5	November 6, 2012	Administrators/ Science Liaison	Administrators/ Science Liaison

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Fair	Ribbons & Awards	EESAC	\$729.00
			Subtotal: \$729.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Robotics Club	Robots & Materials	EESAC	\$900.00
			Subtotal: \$900.00
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: \$1,629.00

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.	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 90% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0
--	--

Writing Goal #1a:	and higher). Our goal is to increase the number of students achieving at or above proficiency by 1 percentage point to 91%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (131)	91%(133)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT was the reluctance of students to revise and refine the draft for use of ideas and content, logical organization, voice (e.g., formal or informal), point of view, and word choice.	1a.1. During reading and writing instruction teachers will provide students opportunities for revising/editing via teacher conferencing, or peer editing by: - Evaluating a draft for the use of ideas and content - Rearranging words, Sentences & paragraphs - Creating clarity by using combination sentence structures to improve sentence fluency - Substituting active verbs for common verbs - Revising specific words for general words - Circling spelling approximations to correct - Using appropriate grabbers and endings - Deleting repetitive text	1a.1. Reading/Writing Liaison, Assistant Principal	1a.1. Classroom walkthroughs On-going monitoring of monthly writing samples generated in 4th grade classrooms.	1a.1. Formative: Students' scores on monthly writing assessment, pre and mid-year District Writing Assessments Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Creating Interest When Revising and Refining the Draft	K-5	Reading/Writing Liaison	K-5 Teachers	October 26, 2012	Monitoring of student writing portfolios, Classroom Walkthroughs	Reading/Writing Liaison
Using Exemplar Papers to Model Effective Writing Strategies	K-5	Reading/Writing Liaison	K-5 Teachers	October 26, 2012	Monitoring of student writing portfolios, Classroom Walkthroughs	Reading/Writing Liaison

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide teachers with CD of Exemplar Papers	CDs	PTA	\$20.00
			Subtotal: \$20.00
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
Writing FCAT 2.0	Substitute Coverage- District PD	EESAC	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$220.00

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:	The attendance rate during the 2011-2012 school year was 97.56%. Ninety-two students had excessive absences and 127 students had excessive tardies. Our goal for this year is to maintain or improve the attendance rate and to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), by 5 students and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 6 students.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97.56%(822)	97.56%(822)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
92	87
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
127	121

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	1.1. The attendance rate is generally affected by student illnesses (i.e. stomach flu, lice). Students who tend to be tardy usually lack an effective morning routine.	1.1. Identify students who appear to be developing a pattern of non-attendance due to frequent illnesses and provide parents with information for KidCare Insurance program. Collaborate with the Food & Nutrition manager to increase student participation in the school's free breakfast program.	1.1. Administration, Cafeteria Manager and Counselor	1.1. Monitoring the implementation of health education/prevention strategies throughout the school. Monitoring student participation in the school's free breakfast program.	1.1. 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
					Monitor	

PD by Alliance for a Healthier Generation	K-5	School Counselor/Physical Education Teachers	School-wide	October 3, 2012	implementation of policies and systems recommended by Alliance for Healthier Generation	Administration and Counselor
---	-----	--	-------------	-----------------	---	------------------------------

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives and rewards for students	Attendance Certificates and celebrations	EESAC	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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
Wellness	Sub Coverage for two PE teachers	PTA	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$800.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	<p>In 2011-2012, the Total Number of In-School Suspensions was 1. Our goal is to maintain this number.</p> <p>The Total Number of Students Suspended In-School was 1. Our goal is to maintain this number.</p> <p>The Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions was 20. Our goal is to decrease Out-of-School Suspensions to 18.</p> <p>The Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School was 12. Our goal is to decrease this number to 11.</p> <p>The Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions was 8. Our goal is to decrease Out-of-School Suspensions to 7.</p> <p>The Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School was 6. Our goal is to decrease this number to 5.</p>
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
20	18
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
12	11

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. There is a need to provide more opportunities to recognize students for positive behaviors in order to reduce both in-school and out-of-school suspensions.	1.1. Utilize the Code of Conduct by providing incentives for compliance through the SPOT Success Recognition Program. A school-wide plan addressing alternatives to suspension will be implemented to reduce suspension in-school and out-of-school.	1.1. Administration, Behavior Intervention Specialist and Counselor	1.1. Monitor SPOT Success reports by grade level and monitor COGNOS reports on student suspension rate.	1.1. Participation Log for students recognized with SPOT Success. Suspension rate 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
SPOT Success K-5	K-5 Teachers	Administration	School-wide	October 3, 2012	Monitor monthly SPOT Success Report	Leadership Team
Alternatives to Suspension Strategies	K-5	Behavior Intervention Specialist, Counselor	K-5 Teachers	October 3, 2012	Suspension Reports	Leadership Team

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parents will receive the Student Code of Conduct and an overview of the policies	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct	EESAC	\$50.00
			Subtotal: \$50.00
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: \$50.00

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:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents participating in school-wide activities.			
<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:			
70% (576 parents)		75% (631 parents)			
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	1.1. Lack of participation in school wide activities by parents of students living out-of area (School of Choice Transfer).	1.1. Mentor parents of students living outside school boundaries encouraging participation in school events.	1.1. Administration/ Teachers/PTA board	1.1. Review sign-in sheets to determine number of parents attending school events.	1.1. Sign-in sheets

		Use Connect Ed and classroom incentives to inform stakeholders of upcoming events.		
--	--	--	--	--

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 Portal/Using Technology to Enhance Reading & Math Skills at Home	K-5	Parent Academy	Parents	October 12, 2012	Monitoring Sign-in sheets to determine the number of parents attending.	Administration/ Teachers
Encouraging Parental Involvement	K-5	Principal	Teachers K-5	September 5, 2012	Reviewing Sign-In sheets from various events	Leadership Team

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
End-of-Year Parent Volunteer Breakfast	Certificates and Awards	PTA	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
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
Parents will learn how to enforce use of Computer based programs at home	Printing of handouts to access Computer based programs	PTA	\$50.00
			Subtotal: \$50.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$250.00

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:	Based on the 2011-2012 Mathematics FCAT 2.0, the percentage of students at or above proficiency levels 3, 4, and 5 was 77%. Additionally, based on the 2011-2012 Science FCAT 2.0, the percentage of students achieving proficiency levels 3, 4, and 5 was 62%. The goal for 2012-2013 is to stimulate students' interest in STEM to ensure they develop the integrative thinking, problem solving and communication skills necessary to succeed.				
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	1.1. Students need additional opportunities for project-based learning integrating mathematics, science, and technology skills.	1.1. Recruiting high performing students to participate in after-school clubs and activities such as Robotics and Math and Science Club.	1.1. Mathematics and Science Liaisons	1.1. Monitor participation of students in the Robotics Team and Math & Science Club.	1.1. Formative: In-house and district-wide competitions Summative: Students' performance in school-wide, district and state competitions.

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
Integrating Project-Based Learning and Technology	All grade levels and subjects	Math and Science Liaisons, Technology Chairperson Teachers	Grade K-5	October 26, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Administrators

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Materials for Math and Science Club	Materials necessary for labs and experiments PTA \$250.00	Materials necessary for labs and experiments PTA	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
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: \$250.00

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
CELLA	After School Tutoring	Small Group Intervention	Title III Grant	\$2,500.00
Science	Science Fair	Ribbons & Awards	EESAC	\$729.00
Writing	Provide teachers with CD of Exemplar Papers	CDs	PTA	\$20.00
Attendance	Incentives and rewards for students	Attendance Certificates and celebrations	EESAC	\$600.00
Suspension	Parents will receive the Student Code of Conduct and an overview of the policies	Printing of the Student Code of Conduct	EESAC	\$50.00
Parent Involvement	End-of-Year Parent Volunteer Breakfast	Certificates and Awards	PTA	\$200.00
STEM	Materials for Math and Science Club	Materials necessary for labs and experiments PTA \$250.00	Materials necessary for labs and experiments PTA	\$250.00
				Subtotal: \$4,349.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Accelerated Reader Vocabulary Component	Web Based Program	Book Fair Fundraising	\$1,800.00
Mathematics	Interactive Technology	Smart Board	PTA	\$11,188.88
Science	Robotics Club	Robots & Materials	EESAC	\$900.00
				Subtotal: \$13,888.88
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Train the Trainer	Model School Conference-Orlando, FL	PTA Fundraisers	\$1,536.00
Mathematics	Using Data to Improve Instruction	Model Schools Conference, Orlando, FL	PTA	\$1,000.00
Writing	Writing FCAT 2.0	Substitute Coverage-District PD	EESAC	\$200.00
Attendance	Wellness	Sub Coverage for two PE teachers	PTA	\$200.00
Parent Involvement	Parents will learn how to enforce use of Computer based programs at home	Printing of handouts to access Computer based programs	PTA	\$50.00
				Subtotal: \$2,986.00
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: \$21,223.88

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.

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
The EESAC is fundamental in facilitating the development, approval, implementation and monitoring of the SIP. We estimate EESAC funds to approximate \$4,040 based on our student enrollment of 841 students. The funds will be utilized to: • School wide student recognition programs \$1,200.00 • Robotics Club \$900.00 • Odyssey of The Mind \$963.00 • Science Fair \$729.00 • FCAT supplemental materials \$ 413.00	\$4,205.00

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

The regular meetings of the council will be held at least four times a year. In the event a special meeting is needed, the principal, chairperson, and a majority of the council members at a meeting may establish special meetings or additional meetings as needed.

1. Review the School Improvement Plan.
2. Review data.
3. Discuss effectiveness of strategies being implemented.

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

Dade School District CORAL REEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	90%	89%	75%	343	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	74%	77%			151	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?	59% (YES)	71% (YES)			130	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					624	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District CORAL REEF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	83%	93%	65%	330	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	77%	58%			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?	61% (YES)	53% (YES)			114	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					579	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested