

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: CAPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Shanna M. Flecha

SAC Chair: Obed Morales

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

*Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Shanna M. Flecha	BA Elementary Education MA-Administration and Supervision Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL K-12 Ed. Leadership K-12	3	9	Cape Elementary A+ School Met AYP
Assis Principal	Dwayne E. Blazina	BA Elementary Education, MA Administration and Supervision Elementary Education K-6 Music K-12 Ed. Leadership K-12	1	1	Cape Elementary A+ School

### 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	Dianne Johnson	BS Elem. Ed. MA- Educational Leadership Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	13	9	Cape Elementary A+ School Met AYP

### 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	Regular teacher meetings with principal and assistant principal	Principal, Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	Professional Development is aligned with school goals.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	Professional Learning Community Meetings once per month focused on staff development in the areas of reading, math, writing, science, and instructional strategies.	Principal Assistant Principal District Support Personnel	Ongoing	
4	Faculty Meetings twice per month focused on staff development in the areas of reading, math, writing, science, and instructional strategies.	Principal Assistant Principal District Support Personnel	Ongoing	
5	Site Based Mentoring from a Peer Teacher	Principal Assistant Principal Peer Teacher	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
Teachers out of field = 1	All staff members are currently enrolled/participating in the identified professional development (e.g. advanced coursework, pursuing the appropriate certification exam, or participating in State/District approved programs).

### Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	4.1%(2)	10.2%(5)	40.8%(20)	46.9%(23)	14.3%(7)	100.0%(49)	14.3%(7)	10.2%(5)	87.8%(43)

### 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
Debra Horn	Marie Molczyk	Grade Level Chair, Leadership Team, and Clinical Ed. Leadership	Observation and mentee's instruction and providing feedback.
Jennifer Anderson	Pamela Kotovsky	Grade Level Chair, Leadership Team, and Clinical Ed. Leadership	Observation of mentee's instruction and providing feedback.
Lisa Hunt	Michael Genslinger	Grade Level Chair, Leadership Team, and Clinical Ed. Leadership	Observation of mentee's instruction and providing feedback.

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

#### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RTI Team at Cape Elementary consists of the following members:

- Shanna Flecha, Principal
- Dwayne Blazina, Assistant Principal
- Dianne Johnson, Reading Resource Teacher
- Clinton Garlick, Learning Resource Teacher
- Julie Ingraham, Speech Pathologist
- Dr. Barbara Kozma, Staffing Specialist
- Erin Dalla Costa, Social Worker
- Micky Nagy, School Nurse
- Ann Milaski, School Psychologist

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

The RTI team at Cape Elementary meets on a weekly, monthly, or as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

Classroom teachers:

- \* Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a RTI folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, SAT10 or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing.
- \* Attend RTI Team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling.
- \* Implement interventions designed by RTI Team for students in Tier 2 & 3.
- \* Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity.

Reading Coach:

- \* Attend RTI Team meetings
- \* Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- \* Administer screenings
- \* Collect school-wide data for team to use in identifying at-risk students.

Speech Pathologist:

- \* Attend some RTI team meetings
- \* Completes Communication Skills screening when required
- \* Assists with Tier 2 & 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact

\* Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral and when making eligibility decisions.

Principal/Assistant Principal:

- \* Facilitate implementation of RTI in building
- \* Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- \* Assign paraprofessionals to support RTI implementation when possible
- \* Attend RTI Team meetings to be active in the RTI process
- \* Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Staffing Specialist:

- \* Consult with RTI Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- \* Incorporate RTI data when making eligibility decisions

Social Worker:

- \* Attend RTI Team meetings when requested
- \* Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with RTI Team

School Nurse:

- \* Attend RTI Team meetings when requested

Psychologist

- \* Attend RTI Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 and on all Tier 3 students
- \* Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- \* Review and interpret progress monitoring data
- \* Collaborate with RTI Team on effective instruction and specific interventions
- \* Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility decisions.

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

Consult with RTI Team regarding Tier 3 interventions

Incorporate RTI data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ADS)

Consult with RTI Team

Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

Attend RTI Team meetings when requested

Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with RTI Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

Attend all RTI Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork

Conduct language screenings and assessments

Provide EL interventions at all tiers

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

The RTI Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

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.

Cape Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training plan for faculty and staff. School based MTSS contacts and administrators have been identified and are provided on-going staff development training regarding the MTSS problem-solving process throughout the school year in the areas of problem identification, instructional best practices, curriculum supports, data analysis, implementation of supplemental and intensive interventions, and behavior management techniques. Additionally, district personnel provide coaching and modeling to assist schools with strategies that are designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs within a multi-tiered system of student supports.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The Lee County School District has hired District level support personnel to sustain the implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process for all students within schools. They provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs within a multi-tiered system of student supports. These personnel are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, curriculum resources, behavior management techniques, research based practices, and problem-solving processes to support the academic and behavioral needs of students within a multi-tiered student support system.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Cape Elementary's Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following teachers: Shanna Flecha, Dwayne Blazina, Shannon Barone, Chelle Maconi, Lisa Hunt, Debbie Leith, Debra Horn, Jennifer Anderson, Amy Galbreath, Clint Garlick, Dianne Johnson

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

The team will meet on a monthly basis and track school-wide data. Plans will be implemented on how to address students' needs based on the data.

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

As a team, we will continue to monitor student progress and design a plan to best meet the needs of our lowest 25% and those students who were non-proficient in reading on FCAT

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:				
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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	This will be an area of focus for us at our school.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
In 2011-2012 the percentage of students scoring Level 4,5,and 6 on FAA Reading was 36%.	In 2012-2013 the percentage of students scoring Level 4,5,and 6 on FAA Reading will increase from 36% (3) to 39% (4).				
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	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Grade level data will be reviewed at PLC meetings to monitor progress being made by all students.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	Common grade level assessments will be tracked to ensure that all students are making adequate progress.	Common Assessments
2	FAA students who continue to struggle with Reading	Unique Curriculum	Reading Coach Teachers	Unique Curriculum Assessments will be tracked to ensure that all students are making adequate progress.	Unique Curriculum Assessments

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:	
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	Our lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading is an area of focus for us at our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading was 73%.	In 2012-2013 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading will increase from 73% (44) to 76% (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	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	FAIR Assessments will be used to monitor student progress. Teachers will form differentiated instructional groups based on these results.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FAIR Data will be reviewed to ensure students are making adequate progress. Teachers will form differentiated instructional groups based on these results.	FAIR Assessments
2	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Grade level data will be reviewed at PLC meetings to monitor progress being made by all students.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	Common grade level assessments will be tracked to ensure that all students are making	Common Assessments

				adequate progress.	
3	Students need additional instructional time	Extended Day for Reading	Administration Teachers	Common grade level assessments, AR goals, Star, and Rally Tests monitored to ensure students are making progress.	Common Assessments

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 # In 2012-2013, the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading will increase from 80% (295) to 83% (306). 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:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	When reviewing the FCAT Reading data, we noted that the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring a level 3 or higher in reading did not increase from the previous year and we did not meet the AMO target for the subgroup. This subgroup is a focus for us at our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading was 72% (151).	In 2012-2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT will increase from 72% (151) to 77% (162).

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	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	FAIR Assessments will be used to monitor student progress.  Teachers will form differentiated instructional groups based on these results.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FAIR Data will be reviewed to ensure students are making adequate progress.	FAIR Assessments
2	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Grade level data will be reviewed at PLC meetings to monitor progress being made by all students.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	Common grade level assessments will be tracked to ensure that all students are making adequate progress.	Common Assessments

3	Students need additional instructional time	Extended Day for Reading	Administration Teachers	Common grade level assessments, AR goals, Star, and RALLY Tests monitored to ensure students are making progress.	Common Assessments
---	---	--------------------------	-------------------------	---	--------------------

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	All	Florida DOE	Shanna Flecha Dwayne Blazina Dianne Johnson Clint Garlick	Monthly	Common Core Leadership Team	Administration
Compass Learning	All	Betsy Adkins Carrie Gonzalez	Teachers	Quarterly	Monitoring and review of reports Lesson Plans and Classroom Walk-throughs	Teachers Reading Specialist Administration
Data Analysis	All	Administration	Teachers	Quarterly	Monthly PLC Meetings	Administration
Common Core Strategies	All	Debbie Horn Suzanne Cimeno Amy Galbreath	Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson Plans and Classroom Walk-throughs	Administration
Common Core	All	Team Leaders	Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson Plans and Classroom Walk-throughs	Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning	All	Administration	Teachers	Bi-Weekly	Classroom Walk-throughs	Administration
Book Study	All	Administration	All Staff	Bi-Weekly	Discussion of Guided Questions	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Performance Based Grouping	SRA Reading Mastery	Textbook Allocation	\$356.31
Extended Day Program	Florida Test Ready FCAT Blast-Off	School Improvement Funds	\$2,576.14
			Subtotal: \$2,932.45
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide SmartBoard and CPS Training	Equipment and On-Line Resources		\$0.00
Odyssey	Software and District Training Materials		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core	Common Core Standards	Title II	\$1,026.00
Data Analysis	Mid-Year Common Assessments Data	Title II	\$1,026.00

Book Study	How to Teach Thinking Skills with the Common Core Teach Like a Champion	Title II	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$2,852.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$5,784.45</b>

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.		English Language Acquisition for our ELL students continues to be a focus for us at our school.			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
In 2011-2012, 44% (12) students scored proficient in listening/speaking. In 2012-2013, we will improve to 47% (13) as measured on the CELLA Report.					
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	ELL learners need additional support and strategies as they learn to acquire the English language	Place students with ESOL Endorsed teachers who will implement SIOP strategies.	Administration	Progress monitoring via ELL process, FAIR, assessments, and classwork	FAIR Reports, STAR Reports, Pinnacle, and CELLA Assessment.

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		English Language Acquisition for our ELL students continues to be a focus for us at our school.			
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
In 2011-2012, 37% (10) students scored proficient in reading. In 2012-2013, we will improve to 40% (11) as measured on the CELLA Report.					
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
	ELL learners need additional support and strategies as they learn to acquire the English	Place students with ESOL Endorsed teachers who will implement SIOP	Administration ESOL Administrator, ELL	Progress monitoring via ELL process, FAIR, assessments, and classwork	FAIR Reports, STAR Reports, Pinnacle, and CELLA

1	language	strategies. Increase support for the classroom teacher utilizing an ELL paraprofessional. Rosetta Stone	Paraprofessional	Assessment.
---	----------	---	------------------	-------------

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	English Language Acquisition for our ELL students continues to be a focus for us at our school.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2011-2012, 22% (6) students scored proficient in writing. In 2012-2013, we will improve to 25% (7) as measured on the CELLA Report.

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	ELL learners need additional support and strategies as they learn to acquire the English language	Place students with ESOL Endorsed teachers who will implement SIOP strategies.  Increase support for the classroom teacher utilizing an ELL paraprofessional.  Rosetta Stone	Administration  ESOL Administrator, ELL Paraprofessional	Progress monitoring via the ELL process, FAIR assessments, and classroom work	Pinnacle and Lesson PLans

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
English Language Acquisition for Monolinguals	Rosetta Stone		\$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

English Language Acquisition	Dictionaries	\$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:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
In 2011-2012 the percentage of students scoring Level 4,5,and 6 on FAA Math was 36%.			In 2012-2013 the percentage of students scoring Level 4,5,and 6 on FAA Math will increase from 36% (3) to 39% (4).		
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	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Power standards will be tracked and reviewed at weekly/monthly PLC Meetings.	Administration Teachers	Review common assessments to ensure that students are making adequate progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data
2	FAA students who continue to struggle with Math	Unique Curriculum	Reading Coach Teachers	Review of Unique Curriculum Assessments to ensure students are making adequate progress.	Unique Curriculum Assessments

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:					
---	--	--	--	--	--

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:

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:				
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	When reviewing FCAT Math data, we noted that the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math declined. This is an area of focus for us at our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Math was 72%.	In 2012-2013 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Math will increase from 72% (43) to 75% (45).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the lowest 25% not making adequate learning gains	Power standards will be tracked and reviewed at weekly/monthly PLC Meetings.	Administration Teachers	Review common assessments to ensure that students are making adequate progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data
2	Students need additional instructional time	Extended Day for Math	Administration	Review common assessments to ensure students are making progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom 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 # In 2012-2013, the percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 77% (284) to 83% (306). 5A :
--	--

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	82%	83%	85%	87%	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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	When reviewing FCAT Math data, we noted that the percentage of Black students and White students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math declined from the previous year and we did not meet the AMO target for either subgroup. These two subgroups will be a focus for us at our school.
---	---

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

In 2011-2012, the percentage of Black students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math was 45% (9). In 2011-2012, the percentage of White students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math was 82% (205).	In 2012-2013, the percentage of Black students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 45% (9) to 73% (15). In 2012-2013, the percentage of White students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 82% (205) to 88% (220).
--	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Black students subgroup and White students subgroup not making adequate learning gains	Power standards will be tracked and reviewed at weekly/monthly PLC Meetings.	Administration Teachers	Review common assessments to ensure that students are making adequate progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data
2	Students need additional instructional time	Extended Day for Math	Administration	Review common assessments to ensure students are making progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	
---	--

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making	When reviewing the FCAT&FAA Math data, we noted that
---	--

satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	the percentage of SWD students scoring level 3 or higher declined from the previous year and we did not meet the AMO target for the subgroup. This subgroup will be a focus for us at our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, the percentage of SWD students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT&FAA Math was 60% (56).	In 2012-2013, the percentage of SWD students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT&FAA Math will increase from 60% (56) to 72% (67).

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 with Disabilities SWD subgroup not making adequate learning gains	Power standards will be tracked and reviewed at weekly/monthly PLC Meetings.	Administration Teachers	Review common assessments to ensure that students are making adequate progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data
2	FAA students who continue to struggle with Math	Unique Curriculum	Reading Coach Teachers	Review of unique Curriculum Assessments to ensure students are making adequate progress.	Unique Curriculum Assessments

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:	When reviewing FCAT Math data, we noted that the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher in math declined from the previous year and we did not meet the AMO target for the subgroup. This subgroup will be a focus for us at our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math was 67% (141).	In 2012-2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT Math will increase from 67% (141) to 78% (164).

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	Economically Disadvantaged students subgroup not making adequate learning gains	Power standards will be tracked and reviewed at weekly/monthly PLC Meetings.	Administration Teachers	Review common assessments to ensure that students are making adequate progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data
2	Students need additional instructional time	Extended Day for Math	Administration	Review common assessments to ensure students are making progress.	District Common Assessments Classroom data

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 Participants	Target Dates (e.g.,	
--	--	--	-----------------	---------------------	--

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis	All	Administration	Teachers	Quarterly	Monthly PLC Meetings	Administration
Common Core	All	Team Leaders	Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson Plans and Classroom Walk-throughs	Administration
Book Study	All	Administration	All Staff	Bi-Weekly	Discussion of Guided Questions	Administration
Compass Learning	All	Betsy Adkins Carrie Gonzalez	Teachers	Quarterly	Monitoring and review of reports Lesson Plans and Classroom Walk-throughs	Teachers Reading Specialist Administration
Common Core Strategies	All	Debbie Horn Suzanne Cimeno Amy Galbreath	Teachers	Quarterly	Lesson PLans and Classrooms Walk-throughs	Administration
Kagan Coopertaive Learning	All	Administration	Teachers	Bi-Weekly	Classroom Walk-throughs	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Extended Day	FCAT Blast-Off	School Improvement Funds	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide SmartBoard and CPS Training	Equipment and On-Line Resources		\$0.00
Odyssey	Software and District Training Materials		\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core	Common Core Standards	Title II	\$1,026.00
Data Analysis	Mid-Year Common Assessments Data	Title II	\$1,026.00
Book Study	How to teach Skills with the Common Core Teach Like a Champion	Title II	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$2,052.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,052.00

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:				
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:				
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.		Science continues to be an area of focus for our school.			
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011-2012 the percentage of fifth grade students meeting high standards in Science on the FCAT was 71%(88) and the percentage of fifth grade students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in Science on the FCAT was 25% (31).		In 2012-2013 the percentage of students scoring at or above achievement levels 4 and 5 in Science on the FCAT will increase from 25%(31) to 28%(42).			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Fifth grade students will take a pre/post test for each strand to determine areas of focus.	Administration Teachers	Assessment data will be reviewed in PLC meetings in order to drive instruction.	Pre/Post tests based on standards
2	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Fifth grade students will use daily science fluency checks.	Teachers Administration	Assessment data will be reviewed in PLC meetings in order to drive instruction.	Daily fluency assessments
3	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	Fifth grade students will use Odyssey Software and Brain Pop as well as Bill Nye materials to address science standards	Teachers Administration	Assessment data will be reviewed in PLC meetings in order to drive instruction	Odyssey and Brain POP 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 science.  
  
Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis	5	Amy Galbreath and Admin.	5th grade	Fall Winter and Spring	Common assessments, lesson plans and walk throughs	Admin and 5th grade teachers.

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

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students meeting high standards in Writing was 89%. Writing will continue to be an area of focus for our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, the percentage of fourth grade students scoring 3.0 or above on FCAT Writes was 89%(117) and the percentage of fourth grade students scoring 3.5 or above on FCAT Writes was 62% (54).	In 2012-2013 we will increase the percentage of students scoring 3.5 or above from 62% (54) to 65% (57).

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	All students will be given common writing prompts. Students will track data. All results will be closely monitored during monthly PLC's.	Administration Teachers	Writing data will be reviewed to ensure that all students are making adequate progress towards meeting our objective.	Monthly common writing prompts FCAT Writes
2	Students need additional instruction time	Fourth grade students needing additional coaching will meet with the principal weekly for additional writing support.	Principal	Student writing data will be reviewed to ensure that all students are making adequate progress towards meeting our objective.	Monthly common writing prompts FCAT Writes

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rubric Training on new standards	3rd and 4th Grade Language Arts	Admin and PLC Leader	Third and Fourth Grade Teachers	Monthly	Lesson plans, walk throughs and monthly data of common assessments	Admin., Teachers, and Students

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve Writing Competency	Kathryn Robinson Just Write Expository	Textbook Allocation	\$1,144.25
			Subtotal: \$1,144.25
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

## 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:				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

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

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas

in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement		Parent Involvement continues to be a high priority at Cape Elementary. We were very fortunate to receive the Five Star School Award and the Golden School Award last year.			
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
In 2011-2012, the number of volunteer hours our school recorded was 3,014 (4.12 hrs per student).			In 2012-2013, we will increase the number of volunteer hours 3% from 3,014 (4.12 hrs per student) to 3,104 (4.25 hrs per student).		
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	Increase Parent Involvement	Increase parent involvement through the implementation of the Watch Dogs (Dads of Great Students) program this year.	Administration	We will monitor the program hours during the year.	Parent/Volunteer Evaluations and Watch Dogs surveys.
2	Increase Community and Business Partnerships	Build community partnerships with local churches and businesses by inviting them into the school to help support education at Cape Elementary.	Administration	We will monitor the program hours during the year.	Volunteer Evaluations

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
School-Based Volunteer Training	K-5	Dwayne Blazina	School Staff	Yearly	Classroom and Building Walk-throughs	Administration

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
<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>			

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

## STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)



## Additional Goal(s)

### Writing Goal for 4.0 or above 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. Writing Goal for 4.0 or above Goal Writing Goal for 4.0 or above Goal #1:			Writing will continue to be an area of focus for our school.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
In 2011-2012 the percentage of fourth grade students scoring 4.0 or above on FCAT Writes was 37%(32).			In 2012-2013 the percentage of fourth grade students scoring 4.0 or above on FCAT Writes will increase from 37% (32) to 40% (35).		
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	Targeted Instruction based on student needs	All students will be given common writing prompts. Students will track data. All results will be closely monitored during monthly PLC's.	Administration Teachers	Writing data will be reviewed to ensure that all students are making adequate progress towards meeting our objective.	Monthly common writing prompts FCAT Writes
2	Students need additional instructional time	Fourth grade students needing additional coaching will meet with the principal weekly for additional writing support.	Principal	Student writing data will be reviewed to ensure that all students are making adequate progress towards meeting our objective.	Monthly common writing prompts. FCAT Writes

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

End of Writing Goal for 4.0 or above Goal(s)

## Additional Goal 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. Additional Goal Goal			Anti-Bullying Awareness		
Additional Goal Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
In 2011-2012, we had 0 founded bullying incidents at our school.			In 2012-2013, our goal is to remain at 0 founded bullying incidents.		
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		Anti-Bullying Awareness and Training	Administration Teachers	Monitor and Review	Bullying Incidents Report
2		Bully Safe Training with 3rd-5th Grade Students	Administration Teachers	Monitor and Review	Bully Incidents Report

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

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

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

Anti-Bullying Awareness	All	Administration	Teachers	Fall Semester	Reports of Incidents and Discussions	Administration
-------------------------	-----	----------------	----------	---------------	--------------------------------------	----------------

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 Additional Goal Goal(s)*

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Performance Based Grouping	SRA Reading Mastery	Textbook Allocation	\$356.31
Reading	Extended Day Program	Florida Test Ready FCAT Blast-Off	School Improvement Funds	\$2,576.14
Mathematics	Extended Day	FCAT Blast-Off	School Improvement Funds	\$0.00
Writing	Improve Writing Competency	Kathryn Robinson Just Write Expository	Textbook Allocation	\$1,144.25
				Subtotal: \$4,076.70
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide SmartBoard and CPS Training	Equipment and On-Line Resources		\$0.00
Reading	Odyssey	Software and District Training Materials		\$0.00
CELLA	English Language Acquisition for Monolinguals	Rosetta Stone		\$0.00
Mathematics	Provide SmartBoard and CPS Training	Equipment and On-Line Resources		\$0.00
Mathematics	Odyssey	Software and District Training Materials		\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Common Core	Common Core Standards	Title II	\$1,026.00
Reading	Data Analysis	Mid-Year Common Assessments Data	Title II	\$1,026.00
Reading	Book Study	How to Teach Thinking Skills with the Common Core Teach Like a Champion	Title II	\$800.00
Mathematics	Common Core	Common Core Standards	Title II	\$1,026.00
Mathematics	Data Analysis	Mid-Year Common Assessments Data	Title II	\$1,026.00
Mathematics	Book Study	How to teach Skills with the Common Core Teach Like a Champion	Title II	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$4,904.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	English Language Acquisition	Dictionaries		\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$8,980.70

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Salaries and Materials for Extended Day Program	\$3,923.87

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

The SAC will:  
Review data and approve the SIP for 2013  
Determine expenditures for SIP dollars  
Meet four times a year to review school's progress toward meeting yearly goals  
Provide in-put on school initiatives and activities

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District CAPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	93%	91%	72%	349	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	78%	71%			149	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?	81% (YES)	91% (YES)			172	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					670	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District CAPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	86%	90%	69%	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	72%	66%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	65% (YES)	65% (YES)			130	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					601	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested