FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MOSS PARK ELEMENTARY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Irma Moss

SAC Chair: Mary Middleton

Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 11/12/2012

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)
					2007-2008 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading:66% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math :60% Learning Gains Reading: 68% Learning Gains Math: 66% Math Proficiency: 83% Reading Proficiency: 87% Science Proficiency: 61% Writing Proficiency: 79% 2008-2009 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading:76% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math :66% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 72%

Position	Name	Degrees/Certifications	Years as Admin	Years at School	Performance Record
Principal	Irma Moss	Degrees: Ed. Sp. Educational Leadership Master's in Education Bachelor of Arts Certifications: Elem. Ed (1-6) Science (6-12) English (5-9) Bible (7-12) Middle Grades Endorsement School Principal (K-12)	5	22	Math Proficiency: 85% Reading Proficiency: 87% Science Proficiency: 63% Writing Proficiency: 89% 2009-2010 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math : 62% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 64% Math Proficiency: 88% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 67% Writing Proficiency: 88% 2010-2011 School Grade A AYP not met (97% met) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 72% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 75% Math Proficiency: 91% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 69% Writing Proficiency: 87% 2011-2012 School Grade A AYP not met (% met) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 72% Math Proficiency: 74% Reading Proficiency: 78% Science Proficiency: 63% Writing Proficiency: 87%
Assis Principal	Alecha Worley	Educational Leadership Master's in Education-Educational Leadership Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Certifications: Elem. Ed (1-6) ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed School Principal (K-12)	3	1	2009-2010 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math : 62% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 64% Math Proficiency: 88% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 67% Writing Proficiency: 88% 2010-2011 School Grade A AYP not met (97% met) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 72% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 75% Math Proficiency: 91% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 69% Writing Proficiency: 87% 2011-2012 School Grade A Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 72% Math Proficiency: 74% Reading Proficiency: 78% Science Proficiency: 63% Writing Proficiency: 87%
		Educational			2009-2010 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math : 62% Learning Gains Reading: 73%

| Assis Principal | Ida Arias Seijo | Leadership

Master's in Education-Educational Leadership

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education

Certifications: Elem. Ed (1-6)

Secondary Mathematics (K-9)

ESOL Endorsed

School Principal (K-12) | 3 | 4.5 | Learning Gains Math: 64%

Math Proficiency: 88%
Reading Proficiency: 90%
Science Proficiency: 67%
Writing Proficiency: 88%

2010-2011 School Grade A
AYP not met (97% met)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 72%

Learning Gains Reading: 73%
Learning Gains Math: 75%

Math Proficiency: 91%
Reading Proficiency: 90%
Science Proficiency: 69%
Writing Proficiency: 87%

2011-2012 School Grade A

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61%

Learning Gains Reading: 79%
Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 74%
Reading Proficiency: 78%
Science Proficiency: 63%
Writing Proficiency: 87% |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Christy McCloe	Bachelor of English Education Master's in Reading (K-12)	4	7	2008-2009 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 76% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math :66% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 72% Math Proficiency: 85% Reading Proficiency: 87% Science Proficiency: 63% Writing Proficiency: 89% 2009-2010 School Grade A AYP Met (100%) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math :62% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 64% Math Proficiency: 88% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 67% Writing Proficiency: 88% 2010-2011 School Grade A AYP not met (97% met) Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Math Lowest Learning Gains Reading : 72% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 75% Math Proficiency: 91% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 69% Writing Proficiency: 87%

| | CRT | Staci Robinson | Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education

Master's in Elementary Education

Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels) | 4 | 7 | |

Row 1 (top, continued):

2011-2012 School Grade A

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61%

Learning Gains Reading: 79%
Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 74%
Reading Proficiency: 78%
Science Proficiency: 63%
Writing Proficiency: 87%

Row 2 — CRT, Staci Robinson, Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education / Master's in Elementary Education / Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels), 4, 7:

2008-2009 School Grade A
AYP Met (100%)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 76%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 66%

Learning Gains Reading: 79%
Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 85%
Reading Proficiency: 87%
Science Proficiency: 63%
Writing Proficiency: 89%
2009-2010 School Grade A
AYP Met (100%)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 62%

Learning Gains Reading: 73%
Learning Gains Math: 64%

Math Proficiency: 88%
Reading Proficiency: 90%
Science Proficiency: 67%
Writing Proficiency: 88%

2010-2011 School Grade A
AYP not met (97% met)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71%
Math Lowest Learning Gains Reading : 72%

Learning Gains Reading: 73%
Learning Gains Math: 75%

Math Proficiency: 91%
Reading Proficiency: 905
Science Proficiency: 69%
Writing Proficiency: 87%

2011-2012 School Grade A

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61%

Learning Gains Reading: 79%
Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 74%
Reading Proficiency: 78%
Science Proficiency: 63%
Writing Proficiency: 87%

Row 3 (bottom):

2008-2009 School Grade A
AYP Met (100%)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 76%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 66%

Learning Gains Reading: 79%
Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 85%
Reading Proficiency: 87%
Science Proficiency: 63%
Writing Proficiency: 89%

2009-2010 School Grade A
AYP Met (100%)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 62%
Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 62%

Learning Gains Reading: 73%
Learning Gains Math: 64%

| Instructional Support | Corey Johns | Bachelor of Science in Elemementary Education

Certification: Elem. Ed (K-6)

ESOL Endorsed | 4 | | Math Proficiency: 88% Reading Proficiency: 90% Science Proficiency: 67% Writing Proficiency: 88%

2010-2011 School Grade A AYP not met (97% met)

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Math Lowest Learning Gains Reading : 72%

Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 75%

Math Proficiency: 91% Reading Proficiency: 905 Science Proficiency: 69% Writing Proficiency: 87%

2011-2012 School Grade A

Lowest 25% Learning Gains Reading: 77% Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math: 61%

Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 72%

Math Proficiency: 74% Reading Proficiency: 78% Science Proficiency: 63% Writing Proficiency: 87% |

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. All teachers hired at Moss Park Elementary School are highly qualified by their certification and degree.	Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. Teachers work in teams to facilitate planning and provide support.

A specific member of the Resource Team is assigned to work with each grade level team to provide ongoing support and assistance. (GPS Grade Level Person for Support)

Ongoing professional learning and professional learning teams with the principal also serve as support for teachers. | Principal

Classroom Teachers

Resource Team | Ongoing | |

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
2 teachers (2.8%)

9 Out-of-Field ESOL teachers (12.3%) | *Professional Development workshops on Marzano's framework, discussing Design Questions 1,2, 5, 6, 7 & 8 *Professional Learning Communities to develop learning goals/scales for content areas *PDS online-Marzano Teacher Evaluation Resources for Educators *Gifted courses for Endorsement *ESOL courses for Endorsement |

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
73	4.1%(3)	34.2%(25)	43.8%(32)	17.8%(13)	42.5%(31)	100.0%(73)	19.2%(14)	5.5%(4)	61.6%(45)

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
Staci Robinson, Christy McCloe	Lindsay Moll	Instructional Coach (Staci Robinson) and Reading Coach (Christy McCloe) and grade level contact teacher with support for progress monitoring and use of best practices	Coaching Informal Observations Team Planning Beginning Teacher Portfolio
Staci Robinson, Christy McCloe & Jillian Potter	Carolyn Bonadonna	Instructional Coach (Staci Robinson) and Reading Coach (Christy McCloe) and grade level contact teacher with support for progress monitoring and use of best practices	Coaching Informal Observations Team Planning Beginning Teacher Portfolio
Staci Robinson, Christy McCloe	Alexander Mercado	Instructional Coach (Staci Robinson) and Reading Coach (Christy McCloe) and grade level contact teacher with support for progress monitoring and use of best practices	Coaching Informal Observations Team Planning Beginning Teacher Portfolio
Staci Robinson, Joe Ann Lys	Kim Charles	Instructional Coach (Staci Robinson) and Reading Coach (Christy McCloe) and grade level contact teacher with support for progress monitoring and use of best practices	Coaching Informal Observations Team Planning Beginning Teacher Portfolio

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Irma Moss, Principal
Martine Bilodeau, School Psychologist
Staci Robinson, Curriculum Resource Teacher
Penny Lowe, Staffing Specialist/RtI Coach
Christy McCloe, Reading Coach
Corey Johns, Instructional Support
Ida Seijo-Arias, Curriculum Compliance Teacher/Assistant Principal
Alecha Worley, Assistant Principal
One teacher per grade level (K-5)

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?

Moss Park Elementary's Schools RtI Leadership Team functions as follows:

Step 1: Teachers implement Tier I instruction and differentiate for Tier 2 and Tier 3. Within the first grading period initial performance data is gathered for all students in reading and math.

Step 2: After implementing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions noting minimal progress for 4 weeks, the classroom teacher notifies the grade level RtI contact of concern with a child's progress.

Step 3: The RtI grade level contact coordinates and RtI meeting with the RtI Leadership Team.

Step 4: The classroom teacher implements interventions as identified during the intial RtI team meeting and progress monitors weekly for at least 4 weeks.

Step 5: The classroom teacher coordinates with the RtI Leadership Team for a follow-up RtI meeting. The RtI Leadership Team uses the RtI Problem Solving Process:
• Identify the problem
• Why is the problem occurring? (RIOT by ICEL)
• What are we going to do about it?
• Implement the intervention
• Analyze the effectiveness of the intervention

Step 6: Interventions continue to be implemented and learning is monitored weekly. Continue to hold follow-up RtI meetings with school-wide team every 4 weeks until student learning is evidenced with consistent data.

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

The role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development of the School Improvement Plan is to provide input utilizing data from the 2011 FCAT scores to develop our annual objectives and needs statements.

The role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan is to monitor progress of the outlined objectives and provide instructional support to teachers in the areas of best instructional practices, interventions, RtI, data-analysis and on-going progress monitoring.

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.

All instructional staff have data notebooks with the following information:
• RtI process information
• Student and School Data
• Behavior Plans/Positive Reinforcement System (RIOT by ICEL)
• Individualized Progress Monitoring Plans
• Progress Monitoring Data
Various assessment tools are used such as: FAIR, progress monitoring, EduSoft, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, formative/summative assessments, and writing prompts.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All instructional staff were trained on the RtI process during the 2009-2010 school year. Additional training was provided via school psychologist to coach teachers in the RtI process. Additionally, since 2009 any new teacher hired at Moss Park Elementary is trained by Penny Lowe, RtI Coach/Staffing Specialist. She is in charge of scheduling our RtI meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

For the 2012-2013 school year, the staffing coordinator and school psychologist will implement quarterly meetings for teachers to attend in regard to MTSS. At the quarterly meetings the staffing coordinator will provide each grade level a case study in which to learn the RtI process more in depth and teachers can learn more about the RtI process that relates to their grade level.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Irma Moss, Principal
Christy McCloe, Reading Coach
Corey Johns, Instructional Support
Alecha Worley, Assistant Principal
One teacher per grade level (K-5)

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

The LLT works to maintain the relevance and rigor of our Reading Instruction using Houghton Mifflin curriculum and following NGSSS. Teachers will implement research based reading strategies to ensure students are making appropriate learning gains. Also, teachers will be incorporating Marzano's high yield strategies, thinking maps, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge in their instruction. During professional learning committees, teachers will focus on how to implement Marzano's high yield strategies in reading and across the content areas. Professional learning will also include disaggregated data from the content areas to determine which of the six components of reading the child needs extra support with. Teachers in grades K-5 will have additional training on the Write Traits program to increase writing achievement across the content areas. Writing will be infused with the science and math curriculum in the form of journals, interactive notebooks, and other informal assessments. The Reading Instruction includes Tier 2 and Tier 2 interventions. The LLT also develops the Reading Progress Monitoring Plan and supports the classroom teachers in implementation of protocol as well as progress monitoring. Our kindergarten and first grade students will be focusing on oral language and phonics/phonemic awareness. In grades 2-3 the student is working on increasing fluency and comprehension using non-fiction text that is appropriate for the student's reading level. For students in grades 4-5 we are focusing on literary analysis and reference/research through non-fiction and fiction text.

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

The LLT will focus on implementing FAIR progress monitoring tools K-5, provide teachers with data analysis interpretation and how that data impacts the instructional design of lessons. The LLT will also facilitate the RtI process for each grade level.

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.

N/A

*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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	On the 2013 FCAT Reading test, 81% of our students will maintain a level 3 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 25.4% (134) of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 FCAT Reading.	By July 2013, 28% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1 Students struggle with interpreting graphical information and referencing information from multiple sources.	1.A.1 Students in third, fourth and fifth will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	1.A.1Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	1.A.1 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Informal/Formal Classroom Observation Marzano's Academic Scale Marzano's High-Yield Stragies	1.A.1 Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT
2	1A.2 .Students lack of academic focus and motivation	1A.2.Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting	1A.2. Classroom Teachers in Grades 3-5 CRT Curriculum Resource Teacher Destination College Committee Principal	1A.2.Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	1A.2.Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT
3	1.A.3 Students have limited exposure to testing and content vocabulary.	1.A.3 Students in third, fourth and fifth grade will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	1.A.3 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	1.A.3 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	1.A.3 Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT
4					

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	On the 2013 FCAT Reading test, 34% of our students will maintain a level 4 or above. The majority of students scoring at level 4 or above are in fifth grade. There is a decrease in the number of students who scored level 4 or above from third grade to fourth grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2011, 50.7% (267) of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading.	By July 2012, 54% of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Insufficient enrichment instruction for level 4-5 students	2A.1. Increase rigor of high achieving students by ability grouping during enrichment time in order to provide more challenging instruction	2A.1. Enrichment Teachers	2A.1. Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Lesson Plans Marzano's Academic Scale Marzano's High-Yield Strategies	2A.1.Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT

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

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

N/A		N/A

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Our school experienced a 6% increase in the number of students making learning gains in reading from 2011-2012. (73% in 2011 and 79% in 2011)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 79% (405) of all students taking the FCAT Reading test made learning gains.	By July 2012, 82% of all students taking the FCAT Reading test made learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited time to provide intensive instruction for students who are significantly below grade level	Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by ability grouping during enrichment in order to increase instructional time Provide opportunities for before school tutoring Reduce the number of students in the lower reading groups Provide additional personnel to working with students during reading block	Classroom Teachers Reading Coach CRT	Informal/Formal Classroom Observation Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Lesson Plans	Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT
2	Students lack of academic focus and motivation	Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting	Classroom Teachers Resource Team Curriculum Resource Teacher Destination College Committee Principal	CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT
	3A.1. Limited time to provide intensive instruction for students who are significantly below grade level	3A.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by ability grouping during	3A.1. Classroom Teachers Reading Coach CRT	3A.1. Informal/Formal Classroom Observation Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings	3A.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR

				Lesson Plans	STAR Reading
3		enrichment in order to increase instructional time Provide opportunities for before school tutoring Reduce the number of students in the lower reading groups Provide additional personnel to working with students during reading block			FCAT
4	3A.2. Students lack of academic focus and motivation	3A.2. Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting	3A.2. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Curriculum Resource Teacher Destination College Committee Principal	3A.2. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	3A.2.Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Our school experienced a 6% increase of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading from 2011-2012. (71% in 2011 and 77% in 2012)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 77% (101) of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT Reading test made learning gains.	By July 2013, 80% of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT Reading test will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Limited time to provide intensive instruction for students who are significantly below grade level	4A.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by ability grouping during enrichment in order to increase instructional time Provide opportunities for before school tutoring Reduce the number of students in the lower reading groups Provide additional personnel to working with students during reading block	4A.1. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Principal	4A.1. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Lesson Plans	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT
2	4A.2. Students lack of academic focus and motivation	4A.2. Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting	4A.2. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Curriculum Resource Teacher Destination College Committee Principal	4A.2. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	4A.2. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Our school will reduce the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on FCAT Reading by 50% over the next six years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81	83	84	86	88	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	On the 2012 Reading FCAT our subgroups by ethnicity are demonstrating the following progress...
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The below stats shows students in that subgroup scoring a level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading test. White: 86% Black: 70% Hispanic: 63% Asian: 93% American Indian:N/A	By 2013, we will increase the amount of students scoring a level 3 or above for each subgroup. White: 88% Black: 83% Hispanic: 72% Asian: 98% American Indian:N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Our Hispanic student population in grades 3-5 are showing the least progress in scoring a 3 or above on the FCAT Reading test. Our Hispanic students have limited exposure to testing and content vocabulary.	5B.1. Monitor intervention strategies used for these struggling students, inc rease paraprofessional support for ESOL/ESE students, and extra MTSS personnel during the reading block and intervention groups.	5B.1. Principal Classroom Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher ESOL Compliance Teacher Resource Team	5B.1. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	5B.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FAIR STAR Reading FCAT Reading CELLA
2	Our African American student population showed a 10% decrease from 2011 FCAT Reading to 2012 FCAT Reading. Our African American students struggle with interpreting graphical information and referencing information from multiple sources.	Students in third, fourth and fifth will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	Principal Classroom Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher Reading Teacher	Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Informal/Formal Classroom Observation Marzano's Academic Scale Marzano's High-Yield Strategies	Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT
3	Our Asian student population showed a 4% decrease from 2011 FCAT Reading to 2012 FCAT Reading. Our Asian students struggle with interpreting graphical information and referencing information from multiple sources.	Students in third, fourth and fifth will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	Principal Classroom Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher Reading Teacher	Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Informal/Formal Classroom Observation Marzano's Academic Scale Marzano's High-Yield Strategies	Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 48% (35) ELL students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of ELL students scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Reading are the fifth grade ELL students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 48% (35) ELL students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Reading FCAT test, we will decrease the number of ELL students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Reading test by 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	5C.1. ELL students have limited exposure to testing and content vocabulary	5C.1. Students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	5C.1. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	5C.1..Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis	5C.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft

			Principal	Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	FCAT CELLA
2	5C.2 Teachers needing a deeper understanding of how to modify the curriculum to make instruction comprehensible	5C.2 Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities	5C.2 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Principal	5C.2 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	5C.2 Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA

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:	On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 54% (22) SWD students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of SWD scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Reading are in third.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 54% (22) SWD students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Reading FCAT test, we will decrease the number of SWD students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Reading test by 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	5D.2 Teachers needing a deeper understanding of how to modify their ESE students' class work per their IEP to ensure the child is making progress in reading.	5D.2 Teachers will be provided with extra professional development regarding strategies for ESE students and ensuring modifications are taking place in the classroom per the students' IEP.	5D.2 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Principal	5D.2 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	5D.2 Progress Monitoring Data/RtI Data/Graphs Edusoft FCAT

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 30% (55) EDstudents in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of ED students scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Reading are the third grade ED students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Reading FCAT test 30% (55) ED in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Reading FCAT test, we will decrease the number of ED students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Reading test by 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	5E.2 Lack of parental support in the home due to economic hardships, single parent homes; thus, a lack of resources	5E.2. Provide ED students with additional time on computers with academic based programs (ie. Envision, Accelerated	5E.2 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	5E.2 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis	5E.2 Progress Monitoring Data/RtI Data/Graphs

	(ie. books, computers, internet, etc).	Reader, curriculum based programs)	Principal	Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	Edusoft FCAT

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
Content Based Instruction (Lesson Study)	Grades K-5	Resource Team	Grades K-5	September 2012-March 2013	Scheduled in Advance Progress Monitoring Data Meetings	Principal
Reading Instructional Strategies	Grades K-5	Resource Team	Grades K-5	September 2012-March 2013	Scheduled in Advance RtI Meetings Progress Monitoring Data Meetings	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Cars & Stars Intervention	Direct Explicit Instruction Program for Lowest Performers	School Budget and SAI Funds	$11,825.00
		Subtotal: $11,825.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Accelerated Reader	1025 Site Licenses, Reading Comprehension	School Budget	$6,850.59
		Subtotal: $6,850.59	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Planning Content Based Instruction	Books for Lesson Study	School Budget	$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: $18,675.59	

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	On the 2013 CELLA test, 76% of our students taking the CELLA test will maintain a level 3 or above.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

In June 2012, 72.8%% (118/162) of all students taking the CELLA test were proficient in Listening/Speaking.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. ELL students struggle with a lack of academic language	1.1. Students will receive additional instructional support with an ESOL paraprofessional	1.1. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher ESOL Paraprofessional	1.1. Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	1.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA
2	1.2. ELL students have a lack of parental support at home due to the parents inability to understand the English language themselves.	1.2. Invite parents to science/math /writing nights to educate parents on content areas. Parents attend Parent University night to learn about our school programs.	1.2. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Parental Support	1.2. Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	1.2. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA
3	1.3 Some ELL students are weak in speaking their own native language and therefore cannot transfer the academic language	1.3. Students will receive additional instructional support with an ESOL paraprofessional. Student practices listening speaking skills in enrichment/reading class.	1.3 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Parental Support	1.3 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	1.3 Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	On the 2013 CELLA test, 57% of our students taking the CELLA test will be proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

In June 2012, 54% (88/162) of all students taking the CELLA test were proficient in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. ELL students have limited exposure to testing and content vocabulary	2.1. Students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will receive additional instruction in reference and research.	2.1. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	2.1.Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis	2.1.Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft

| | | | | Informal/Formal Classroom Observation | FCAT |
| | | | | | CELLA |

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	On the 2013 CELLA test, 56% of our students taking the CELLA test will be proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
In June 2012, 53% (85/162) of all students taking the CELLA test were proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.2. Teachers needing a deeper understanding of how to modify the curriculum to make instruction comprehensible	2.2. Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities	2.2. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	2.2.Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	2.2. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA
2	2.3. ELL students have a lack of prior knowledge and going through the process of adaption due to cultural differences	2.3. Students will be exposed to print rich environments, expand vocabulary skills through use of dictionaries/thesaurus, and practicing writing daily through the content areas.	2.3. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	2.3 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	2.3.Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The percent of students scoring at level 3 or above in mathematics increased by 5 percentage points from 24.9% in 2011 to 29.8% in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 29.8% (157) of all students taking the FCAT Math test scored a level 3.	By July 2013, 33% of all students taking the FCAT Math test will score a level 3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A.1. Students making it through the day without a clear academic focus.</td>
<td>1A.1. Implement Destination College as a way to assist students with organization and goal setting.</td>
<td>1A.1. Classroom Teachers in Grades 3-5.

Resource Team

Principal</td>
<td>1A.1. Binder checks

CWT Data</td>
<td>1A.1. Progress Monitoring Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1A.2. Students lacking prerequisite skills to attain grade level proficiency.</td>
<td>1A.2. Provide Tier 2/3 Interventions during school day, differentiate for math instruction, reduce the number of students in lower math groups, provide additional personnel to work with students during math block.</td>
<td>1A.2. Classroom Teachers

Resource Team

Principal</td>
<td>1A.2. Progress Monitoring Data

CWT Data

RtI Meetings</td>
<td>1A.2. Benchmark Assessments

CWT Observation Instruments</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The majority of students scoring at levels 4 and 5 are in fourth grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 42% (221) students taking the FCAT math test scored a level 4 or 5.	By 2013, 45% of students taking the FCAT math test will score a level 4 or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Insufficient enrichment instruction for level 4-5 students	2A.1. Increase rigor of high achieving students by ability grouping during enrichment time in order to provide more challenging instruction	2A.1. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Gifted Teacher Principal	2A.1. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Lesson Plans	2A.1. Progress Monitoring Data

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains on the FCAT Math test decreased by 3 percentage points from 75% in 2011 to 72% in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 72%(378) of all students taking the FCAT Math	In June 2013, 75% of all students taking the FCAT Math test

	test made learning gains.		will make learning gains.		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td align="center">Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3A.1. Limited time to provide intensive instruction for students who are significantly below grade level</td>
<td>3A.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day

Increase rigor by ability grouping during enrichment in order to increase instructional time

Reduce the number of students in the lower reading groups

Provide additional personnel to working with students during reading block</td>
<td>3A.1. Classroom Teachers

Resource Team

Principal</td>
<td>3A.1. CWT Data

Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings

Lesson Plans</td>
<td>3A.1. Progress Monitoring Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3A.2. Students lack of academic focus and motivation</td>
<td>3A.2. Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting</td>
<td>3A.2. Classroom Teachers

Resource Team

Curriculum Resource Teacher

Destination College Committee

Principal</td>
<td>3A.2. CWT Data

Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings

Binder Checks

Lesson Plans</td>
<td>3A.2. Progress Monitoring Data</td>
</tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Mathematics test.	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Mathematics test.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25%	

	making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The percentage of our lowest 25% of students making learning gains decreased by 11 percentage points from 72% in 2011 to 61% in 2012.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 61%(80) of our lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT Math test made learning gains.	By July 2013, 64% of all students taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Limited time to provide intensive instruction for students who are significantly below grade level	4A.1. Provide Tier 2/3 interventions during the school day Increase rigor by ability grouping during enrichment in order to increase instructional time Reduce the number of students in the lower math groups Provide additional personnel to working with students during math block	4A.1. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Principal	4A.1. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Lesson Plans	4A.1. Progress Monitoring Data
2	4A.2. Students lack of academic focus and motivation	4A.2. Implement Destination College to help students with organization and goal setting	4A.2. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Curriculum Resource Teacher Destination College Committee Principal	4A.2. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	4A.2. Progress Monitoring Data

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our school will reduce the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on FCAT Math by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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:	On the 2012 Math FCAT our subgroups by ethnicity are demonstrating the following progress...

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	The below stats shows students in that subgroup scoring satisfactory (level 3 or above)on the FCAT Mathematics test. White: 83% Black: 65% Hispanic: 59% Asian: 90% American Indian:N/A	By 2013, we will increase the amount of students scoring a level 3 or above for each subgroup. White: 88% Black: 73% Hispanic: 72% Asian: 92% American Indian:N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The below stats shows students in that subgroup scoring satisfactory (level 3 or above)on the FCAT Mathematics test. White: 83% Black: 65% Hispanic: 59% Asian: 90% American Indian:N/A	5B.1. Monitor intervention strategies used for these struggling students, increase paraprofessional support for ESOL/ESE students, and extra MTSS personnel during the reading block and intervention groups.	5B.1. Principal Classroom Teacher Curriculum Resource Teacher ESOL Compliance Teacher Resource Team	5B.1. CWT Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Meetings Binder Checks Lesson Plans	5B.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft Star Math FCAT
2	White, Black, and Asian, students lacking prerequisite skills to attain grade level proficiency.	Provide Tier 2/3 Interventions during school day, differentiate for math instruction, reduce the number of students in lower math groups, provide additional personnel to work with students during math block.	Classroom Teachers Resource Team Principal	Progress Monitoring Data CWT Data RtI Meetings	Benchmark Assessments CWT Observation Instruments

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:	On the 2012 Math FCAT test 42% ELL students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of ELL students scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Reading are the fifth grade ELL students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Math FCAT test 42% (38) ELL students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Math FCAT test, we will decrease the number of ELL students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Math test by 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	5C.1. ELL students have limited exposure to testing and content vocabulary	5C.1. Students in third, fourth, and fifth grade will receive additional instruction in reference and research. In addition, students will receive extra support in number sense, geometry and measurement, and algebraic expressions.	5C.1. Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Principal	5C.1..Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	5C.1. Progress Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT CELLA
	5D.2 Teachers needing a	5C.2 Teachers will be	5C.2 Classroom	5C.2 Progress Monitoring	5C.2 Progress

2	deeper understanding of how to modify the curriculum to make instruction comprehensible	provided with professional learning opportunities	Teacher Reading Teacher Principal	Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	Monitoring Data Edusoft FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	On the 2012 Math FCAT test 57% (24) SWD students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of SWD scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Math are in fifth grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Math FCAT test 57% (24) SWD students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Math FCAT test, we will decrease the number of SWD students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Math test by 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	5D.2 Teachers needing a deeper understanding of how to modify their ESE students' class work per their IEP to ensure the child is making progress in mathematics.	5D.2 Teachers will be provided with extra professional development regarding strategies for ESE students and ensuring modifications are taking place in the classroom per the students' IEP.	5D.2 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher Principal	5D.2 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	Evaluation Tool 5D.2 Progress Monitoring Data/RtI Data/Graphs Edusoft FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	On the 2012 Mathematics FCAT test 43% (82) ED students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test. The majority of ED students scoring below a level 3 on FCAT Reading are the third grade ED students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Math FCAT test 43% (82) ED in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the test.	On the 2013 Math FCAT test, we will decrease the number of ED students scoring below a level 3 on the FCAT Math test by 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	5E.2 Lack of parental support in the home due to economic hardships, single parent homes; thus, a lack of resources	5E.2. Provide ED students with additional time on computers with academic based programs (ie. Envision, Accelerated	5E.2 Classroom Teacher Reading Teacher	5E.2 Progress Monitoring Data Curriculum & Data Analysis	5E.2 Progress Monitoring Data/RtI Data/Graphs

	(ie. books, computers, internet, etc).	Reader, curriculum based programs)	Principal	Informal/Formal Classroom Observation	Edusoft FCAT

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Planning Sessions	K-5	Team Leader CRT Math Lead Teacher	K-5 Teachers	September 2012-May 2013, 2nd Wed. of the month	CWT Data Progress Monitoring Tests Lesson Plans	Principal

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
Facilitate presentation of content	11 Promethean Boards	Donation	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The percent of students scoring at level 3 or above in science decreased by 8 percentage points from 69% in 2011 to 61% in 2012.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 46% (82)of all students taking the FCAT Science test scored at a level 3.	By July 2013, 49% of all students taking the FCAT Science test will score at level 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	1.A.1 Students not having the prerequisite skills to attain grade level proficiency.	1.A 1. Increase rigor in science instruction using a variety of instructional strategies including hands-on experiments, technology and writing	1.A 1. Classroom Teachers Resource Team Principal	1.A. 1Progress Monitoring Data CWT Data RtI Meetings	1.A. 1 Benchmark Assessments CWT Observation Instruments

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:	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The majority of our students scored above a level 3 on FCAT science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 16 out of 179 (9%) of students scored at level 4 on FCAT science. In June 2012, 10 out of 179 (6%) of students scored at level 5 on FCAT science.	By July 2013, 12% of our students will score at level 4. By July 2012, 12% of our students will score at level 5 or above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.A 1. Lack of foundation in science concepts.	2.A 1.Teach science curriculum through various instructional	2.A 1. Principal	2.A.1. CWT Data Lesson Plans	2.A.1. Progress Monitoring Tests

		strategies including hands-on experiments			

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:	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Planning Sessions	5th grade	5th grade GPS Science Team Lead CRT	5th grade teachers	September 2012-May 2013, 2nd Wed. of the month	CWT Data Progress Monitoring Tests Lesson Plans	Principal

---

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No data	No data	No data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Facilitate presentation of content	11 Smart Boards	Donation	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Planning Time	Second Wednesday of the Month	School Budget	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoring at level 3 or higher on FCAT writing remained the same from 87% in 2011 to 87% in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 87% (145) of all students taking the FCAT writing test scored at level 3 or higher.	By July 2013, 90% of all students taking the FCAT writing test will score at level 3 or higher.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.A.1.Teachers are not trained in a consistent writing program for grades 3-5.	1.A.1 Teachers will be given planning time to create writing binders. Teachers will have the opportunity to plan and review writing benchmarks.	1.A.1. Classroom Teachers Principal	1.A.1. Progress Monitoring Prompts CWT Data Lesson Plans Student Work	1.A.1. Progress Monitoring Prompts
2	1.2. Students not familiar with 4th grade FCAT writing expectations.	1.2. Provide daily writing instruction Conference with students at least 4-6 times a year to discuss their writing Use Thinking Maps to facilitate writing and organization Use writing across the curriculum Differentiate writing instruction to meet the needs of students	1.2. Classroom Teachers Principal	1.3. Progress Monitoring Prompts CWT Data Lesson Plans Student Work	1.2. Progress Monitoring Prompts

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.	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the

Writing Goal #1b:	FCAT Science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Science test.	At Moss Park Elementary all of our students took the FCAT Science test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Writing PLC	K-5	Melissa Forney	K-5 Teachers	October 2012	CWT Data	Principal
Fourth Grade Planning Sessions	4th grade	4th grade GPS Writing Team Lead CRT	4th grade teachers	September 2012-May 2013, 2nd Wed. of the month	CWT Data Progress Monitoring Tests Lesson Plans	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

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:	Moss Park Elementary needs to decrease the number of students with unexcused absences of more than 10 days and increase the average daily attendance rate. At the end of every grading period we will provide positive recognition to students with perfect attendance.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Moss Park's average daily attendance was 96% (1116). 702 students were reported to have at least 1 excused absence and 809 students were reported to have at least 1 unexcused absence.	Our goal is to have an average daily attendance of 98% or higher and to reduce the number of students with unexcused absences by 5% to 768.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
By June 2012, 219 students had more than 10 absences.	By June 2013, the number of students with 10 or more absences will be reduced by 10% to 197.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
By June 2012,85 students were tardy 10 times or more.	By June 2013, the number of students with 10 or more tardies will be reduced by 10% to 77.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parents who do not get their child to school or who take extended vacations without regard to academic impact.	1.1. Provide opportunities for parent training opportunities Increase parent awareness of academic impact of absences Conduct attendance meetings with parents consistently starting at 5 days of unexcused absences.	1.1. Guidance Counselor Classroom Teachers Social Worker Principal	1.1. Monitor attendance rates weekly/monthly Awareness through newsletter and school-wide phone messages	1.1. Attendance reports
2	1.2 Parents dropping their children off after 8:45am	1.2 Rotate members of the leadership team and social worker to talk with families about dropping children off between 8:15-8:40	Guidance Counselor Classroom Teachers Social Worker Principal	1.2 Decrease in the number of tardy students by monitoring weekly/monthly	1.2 Parents dropping their children off after 8:45am

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	2% of our students received either in-school or out-of-school suspensions last year. We would like to continue working towards reducing that number even more.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
By June 2012, 8 in-school suspensions were served.	By July 2013, Moss Park will decrease the number of In-School Suspensions by 50% to 4.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
By June 2012, 8 students (less than 1% of our student population) received in-school suspensions as a consequence for their behavior.	By July 2012, Moss Park will decrease the number of In-School Suspensions by 50% to 4.

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
By June 2012, 13 out-of school suspensions were served.	By July 2013, our goal is to have less than 13 out-of school suspensions served.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
By June 2012, 13 students (less than 1% of student population) received out-of school suspensions as a consequence for their behavior.	By July 2013, our goal is to have less than 13 students receive out-of school suspensions as a consequence.

	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 coming to school with inappropriate learned behaviors such as physical aggression to resolve conflict	1.1. Implement our School-Wide Behavior Plan Implement Tier 2 and 3 interventions as appropriate as we work through the RtI process Implement Discipline Plans as needed for K-5 students	1.1. Classroom Teachers Behavior Coach Behavior Analyst RtI Leadership Team Principal	1.1. Monthly monitoring of in/out suspension rates Ongoing monitoring of Tier and 3 interventions Ongoing RtI Meetings	1.1. Suspension Rates Behavior plans RtI Plans

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC-Book Study A Handbook for Classroom Management That Works by Marzano, et.al	K-5	Penny Lowe	School-Wide	October 2012-April 2013	After-school support group	Principal Assistant Principal Behavior Specialist Guidance Counselor

Suspension Budget:

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	At Moss Park Elementary we have a high parent involvement that attend various events in the daytime and evening. Specifically, we have parents who serve on ongoing committees like School Advisory Council, Parent Leadership Council, and Parent Teacher Association.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
During the 2011-2012 school year 87% (876) of parents were involved in at least one school activity.	During the 2011-2012 school year, parent participation in at least one school activity will increase by 3% as evidenced by sign-in sheets and PTA, SAC, PLC memberships.

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.Parents' limited time	1.1. Combine events as much as possible Advertise the event(s) by posting on school website, flyers, School Messenger, and school calendar Offer Parent University Night	1.1. Principal PTA Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review Sign-In Sheets after each event to monitor progress Parent Survey	1.1. Sign-In Sheets School Effectiveness Survey

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	For the 2012-2013 Moss Park Elementary will embed STEM into our K-5 classrooms using problem-based learning. In addition, we will have a STEM night to include students, teachers, and the community while fostering an interactive experience with science, technology, engineering and mathematics concepts.

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. Teachers not having an understanding of STEM, the requirements or the difference between culturally embedded, intentionally structured or in name only depth of knowledge regarding STEM	1.1. Provide teachers with and understanding of STEM through PLC'S and monthly team meetings. Attend Professional Development regarding STEM concepts.	Principal Classroom Teachers	Meeting with teachers during PLC's Discussing lesson planning with teachers	Lesson plans CWT Data Student writing samples State and District assessment data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Grade Level Planning Sessions	K-5	Team Leader	K-5 Teacher	September 2012-May 2013, 2nd Wed. of the month	CWT Data Progress Monitoring Tests Lesson Plans	Principal

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

National Elementary Honor Society Goal:

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:	
1. National Elementary Honor Society Goal National Elementary Honor Society Goal #1:	At Moss Park Elementary we inducted 41 students (22%) of fifth graders into the National Elementary Honor Society.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
In October 2012, 22% (41) of fifth grade students were inducted in to the National Elementary Honor Society.	By October 2013, we will increase our number of students to inducted into the National Elementary Honor Society by 25%(46).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students will increase their academic knowledge of reading, math, and science concepts.	Students will participate in STEM activities integrated with reading.	Principal Classroom Teacher NEHS Sponsors	Classroom Assessments State and District Assessments	Report Card Progress Report
2					

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Budget:

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

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

End of National Elementary Honor Society Goal(s)

Destination College Goal:

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:	
1. Destination College Goal Destination College Goal #1:	Destination College will be implemented in K-5 classroom at Moss Park for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, we will increase college and career awareness through the implementation of Destination College and school wide activities throughout the school year.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
In 2012, Destination College will be fully implemented by a team of trained teachers.	In 2013, Destination College will be fully implemented by a team of trained teachers in kindergarten through five.

	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 lack prerequisite skills necessary for organization, self-advocacy, and responsibility.	1.1. Implement an on-line course and complete the tasks, assessments, and implementation of half of the Destination College strategies for all teachers in grades 3-5.	1.1. Classroom Teachers 3-5 Principal CRT	1.1. End of the year on-line course	1.1. End of the year on-line course
2	1.2. Students lack prerequisite skills necessary for organization, self-advocacy, and responsibility.	1.2 Provide lessons on self-advocacy to students in third through fifth grade.	Classroom Teachers 3-5 Principal CRT	End of the year on-line course	End of the year on-line course

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Destination College Goal(s)

Fine Arts Enrollment Goal:

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:	
1. Fine Arts Enrollment Goal Fine Arts Enrollment Goal #1:	Moss Park Elementary will maintain high fine arts enrollment percentage.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
At Moss Park Elementary 100% of our students in K-5 participate in a fine arts program (ie, grade level performance, after school program, theater performing arts, vocal performing arts, instrumental performing arts)	By 3013 we will maintain 100% of our students in K-5 participating in a fine arts program (ie, grade level performance, after school program, theater performing arts, vocal performing arts, instrumental performing arts)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students not able to attend before or after	Maintain our orchestra class and after school	Classroom Teacher	Enrollment Reports	Enrollment Reports

1	school program due to lack of financial support or lack of transportation.	programs, but offer funding.	Principal

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Budget:

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

End of Fine Arts Enrollment Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Cars & Stars Intervention	Direct Explicit Instruction Program for Lowest Performers	School Budget and SAI Funds	$11,825.00
CELLA	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Mathematics	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Science	No data	No data	No data	$0.00
Attendance	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $11,825.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Accelerated Reader	1025 Site Licenses, Reading Comprehension	School Budget	$6,850.59
CELLA	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Mathematics	Facilitate presentation of content	11 Promethean Boards	Donation	$0.00
Science	Facilitate presentation of content	11 Smart Boards	Donation	$0.00
Attendance	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $6,850.59

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Planning Content Based Instruction	Books for Lesson Study	School Budget	$0.00
CELLA	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Mathematics	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Science	Planning Time	Second Wednesday of the Month	School Budget	$0.00
Attendance	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
Science	No data	No data	No data	$0.00
Attendance	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	No data	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $18,675.59

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Orange School District
MOSS PARK ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	91%	87%	69%	337	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	73%	75%			148	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?	71% (YES)	72% (YES)			143	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					628	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Orange School District
MOSS PARK ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	88%	88%	67%	333	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	73%	64%			137	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	62% (YES)			124	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					594	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested