

# 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: MYAKKA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Manatee

Principal: Roy E. Shaw

SAC Chair: Michelle Wilcox

Superintendent: Tim McGonegal

Date of School Board Approval: 9/30/2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

## 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	Roy E. Shaw	Certified School Principal (All Levels) MA - Educational Leadership USF ESOL Endorsed	5	16	2006-A Grade AYP: No 2007-A Grade AYP: No 2008-A Grade AYP: No 2009-A Grade AYP: No 2010-B Grade AYP: No 2011-C Grade AYP: No 2012-C Grade AYP: No

### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted				

### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	All teachers are screened by Human Resources and only direct qualified are interviewed/hired. All highly qualified documentation is recorded and check by Human Resources staff of the District. A district team participates in Teach-In, a recruitment fair that attracts and screens national applicants. Teachers complete the Gallop Teacher Perceiver Survey in addition to meeting rigorous standards of at least a 2.5 college GPA. They are required to complete 300 hours of ESOL training. Contact the school if you would like more information regarding the professional qualifications of the faculty or staff at the school.	Principal	On-going	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

### Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
20	0.0%(0)	10.0%(2)	60.0%(12)	30.0%(6)	40.0%(8)	90.0%(18)	10.0%(2)	10.0%(2)	95.0%(19)

### 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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal - Roy Shaw  
Facilitator - Matt Carlson  
Recorder - Dr. Krista Cournoyer  
Data Manager - Matt Carlson  
School Psychologist - Krista Cournoyer  
School Social Worker - Debbie Hage  
ESE Specialist - Bob Hunt  
ESE Teacher - Cheryl Mathis  
Speech/Language Pathologist - Kristen Shipani  
Guidance Counselor - Matt Carlson

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 MTSS Leadership Team functions for the sole purpose of improving and maximizing student achievement; the team will meet weekly to discuss and review student needs at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels and monthly meetings with teams to discuss individual classroom data and interventions. Through the analysis of the data collected through assessments and progress monitoring, an individual instructional plan will be developed or modified that will include, but not be limited to, instructional strategies, the use of research-based materials, and appropriate future assessments or diagnostic tools to bring about increased achievement for that student.

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 state of Florida and the county of Manatee, in Bradenton, Florida has proclaimed Response To Intervention an initiative to be introduced, developed and in use at every school in the near future. Myakka City Elementary School has an assigned team of staff members that service the students and teachers at Myakka City Elementary school. As training continues, the entire staff will be trained on the Response to Intervention Model and be required to implement it.

Roy Shaw, Principal: Provides the direction for the use of the data collected that will drive decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI with fidelity by assessing the RtI skill levels of the staff, providing the support necessary for on-going staff development, reviewing documentation of and the effectiveness of interventions and teaching strategies being applied, and seeing that appropriate communications between the parents and school are taking place

School Psychologist, Krista Cournoyer: Participates in the analysis and interpretation of data, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention and documentation, provides technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.

Guidance Counselor, Matt Carlson: Gathers data from teachers, creates graphs, guides and monitors the RtI process, supports data collection, investigates other factors such as behavior and attendance, assists with staff development, assists with data interpretation, provides additional testing information, suggests strategies and modifications in present instruction delivery.

Other MTSS/RtI Team members will serve as case managers for various grade levels and assist teachers in fidelity of interventions and collection of data for progress monitoring.

All MTSS/RtI team members are there to assist teachers in the RtI process. The RtI team is a group that supports the teachers in their process of various classroom interventions and 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.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Performance Matters, benchmark assessments, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR).

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Performance Matters, benchmark assessments, Accelerated Reader (AR), FAIR, and on-going student/teacher data chats.

Midyear: FAIR, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), benchmark assessments

Frequency of Data Chats (Principal/Teacher Meetings): Three times a year for FAIR and benchmark assessments, weekly as necessary through RtI.

Frequency of Data Chats (Teacher/Student Meetings): Three times a year for FAIR and benchmark assessments, weekly as necessary through RtI and AR.

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, PMRN, Performance Matters, STAR

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All staff has recieved training on the components the Response to Intervention Model and has begun to implement components into their practice.

The Data Study Team will meet with each team once a month to monitor progress on implementation of RtI. This meeting will also be a time to answer questions that anyone has regarding RtI. The Data Study Team will continue to analyze classroom data and offer support for collection of data and implementation of classroom interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of Roy Shaw, Principal; Matt Carlson, Guidance Counselor; and team members Kathy Kersey, Lauren Harvey, Amy Mizel, Chirstine Keen, Maureen Geary, Ka Cline, and Linda Taylor.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will be focused on the effective implementation of the guided reading program at each grade level. This will be accomplished by examining current reading data and monitoring the progress of the guided reading program in monthly meetings. The LLT will also discuss topics such as effective instructional strategies, engaging practices such as Kagan, higher order thinking strategies with a focus to increase student academic achievement.

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

The major literacy initiative for the 2012-2013 school year at Myakka City Elementary is the effective implementation of our guided reading program. The purpose of guided reading is to meet the varying instructional needs of all students. Within the 90-minute reading block, this initiative will follow the whole group, on-grade level instruction and will be used to differentiate for the needs of our students since it is designed to help individual students learn how to process a variety of increasingly challenging texts with understanding and fluency. The small groups allow for interactions among readers that benefit them all. The teacher selects and introduces texts to readers, sometimes supports them while reading the text, engages the readers in discussion, and performs a mini-lesson after the reading. At times, after reading a text, the teacher extends the meaning of the text through writing, text analysis, as well as other learning activities or collaborative structures. The lesson may also include work with words based on the specific needs of the small group. The on-going reading data will be used by the classroom teachers as they continually assess their flexible small guided reading groups and apply the gradual release model.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

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

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

### Postsecondary Transition

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The percentage of students who achieve proficiency in reading will increase to 75% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% of all students	75% of all students

#### 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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 52% scored at level 3 or above in reading.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern. Overall, average grade level reading scores remained the same from 2009 FCAT scores.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The percentage of students who achieve above proficiency in reading will increase to 30% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7%	30%

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Grade level and strand data indicate that Reading Application, Literary Analysis, and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern. Overall, average grade level reading scores remained the same from 2009 FCAT scores.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction.</li> <li>Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals.</li> <li>Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction.</li> <li>Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2.</li> <li>Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries.</li> <li>AR Enterprise</li> <li>Reading Clubs</li> <li>Vocabulary Walls</li> </ol>	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, Monthly walk-thru's STAR Testing for vocabulary evaluation

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percentage of students who achieve above proficiency in reading will increase to 30% BY 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% of all students	30% of all students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 7% scored at level 4 or above in reading.</p> <p>Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern. Overall, average grade level reading scores remained the same from 2009 FCAT scores.</p> <p>Funding for AR Award Program.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction.</li> <li>Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals.</li> <li>Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction.</li> <li>Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2.</li> <li>Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries.</li> <li>AR Enterprise</li> <li>Reading Clubs</li> <li>Vocabulary Walls</li> </ol>	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks



			students not making adequate progress.	
--	--	--	--	--

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:	The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase to 70% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% of all students	70% of all students

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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 62% of all students made a learning gain.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

	7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.
--	---	---

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:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase to 60% by 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% of lower quartile made learning gains.	60% of lower quartile group 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	Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 38% of the lower quartile made learning gains.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal,	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

	related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.
--	--	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	All ethnic student subgroups will make adequate yearly progress in reading.
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	Based on the disaggregated data from the 2011 FCAT Reading Assessment, 62% scored at level 3 or above in reading.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

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:	ELL students will make adequate yearly progress in reading.
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	Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 62% scored at level 3 or above in reading.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

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:	Students with disabilities will make adequate yearly progress in reading.
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
	Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 52% scored at level 3 or above in reading.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

1	Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.
---	--	--	---

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:	Economically disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% of economically disadvantaged students are making adequate yearly progress.	80% of economically disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress.

**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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment, 49% scored at level 3 or above in reading.  Grade level and strand data indicate that Comparisons and Cause/Effect, and Reference and Research were the main areas of concern.	1. Utilize Scott Foresman reading series and classroom libraries for reading instruction. 2. Use district strategic objectives strategies to develop personal goals. 3. Use media center books to increase classroom libraries and enhance classroom instruction. 4. Increase classroom libraries, targeting K-2. 5. Use school planning time for workshops related to classroom libraries. 6. AR Enterprise 7. Reading Clubs 8. Vocabulary Walls	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Reading Committee	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Reading SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percent of students scoring at or above grade level and/or making learning gains and/or making adequate yearly progress. Quarterly results from reading assessments (FAIR, DRA, and reading tests) will be reviewed by data team members (Principal, school counselor, and classroom teachers) within a week of the end of each quarter. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not making adequate progress.	FCAT, FAIR, AR Enterprise, STAR Benchmarks

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						

Reading Budget:

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

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  
CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  
CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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
			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 percentage of students who achieve proficiency in math will increase to 80% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% of students are achieving proficiency in mathematics.	80% of students will achieve proficiency in mathematics.

### 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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessments, 48% scored level 3 or above in math. Grade level and strand data indicate that basic math skills operations and problems are the main areas of concern. Overall, average grade level math scores decreased from 2011 FCAT scores.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a common math vocabulary to be used by all teachers.</li> <li>2. Utilize County Road maps in planning instruction.</li> <li>3. Students will utilize Character to the Core strategies to develop personal goals.</li> <li>4. Weekly walk-through's by the principal.</li> <li>5. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters.</li> <li>6. Start incorporating on time material from Go-Math series into curriculum.</li> <li>7. Develop problem-solving skills through Math Superstars Program.</li> </ol>	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Math Committee Classroom Teacher	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Math SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.	FCAT, Benchmarks, Quarterly Exams Beginning, Middle, and End of year assessments from current Math series.

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percentage of students who achieve above proficiency in math will increase to 40% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% of all students are achieving above proficiency in mathematics.	40% of all students will achieve above proficiency in mathematics.

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 disaggregated data from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessments, 20% scored level 4 or above in math. Grade level and strand data indicate that basic math skills operation and problems are the main areas of concern. Overall, percentage of students scoring above proficiency decrease from 2011	1. Develop a common math vocabulary to be used by all teachers. 2. Utilize County Road maps in planning instruction. 3. Students will utilize Character to the Core strategies to develop personal goals. 4. Weekly walk-through's by the principal. 5. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters. 6. Start incorporating on time material from Go-Math series into curriculum. 7. Develop problem-solving skills through Math Superstars Program.	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Math Committee Classroom Teacher	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Math SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.	FCAT, Benchmarks, Quarterly Exams Beginning, Middle, and End of year assessments from current math series.

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 in mathematics will increase to 90% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% of students made learning gains in mathematics.	90% of all students will make learning gains in mathematics.

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 disaggregated data from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessments, 60% scored level 3 or above in math. Grade level and strand data indicate that basic math skills operation and problems are the main areas of concern. Overall, percentage of students making learning gains increased from 2011.	1. Develop a common math vocabulary to be used by all teachers. 2. Utilize County Road maps in planning instruction. 3. Students will utilize Character to the Core strategies to develop personal goals. 4. Weekly walk-through's by the principal. 5. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters. 6. Start incorporating on time material from Go-Math series into curriculum. 7. Develop problem-solving skills through Math Superstars Program.	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Math Committee Classroom Teacher	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Math SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.	FCAT, Benchmarks, Quarterly Exams, Beginning, Middle, and End of year assessments from current math series.

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:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics will increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% of the lowest 25% are making learning gains in mathematics.	90% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessments, 79% made learning gains. This was an increase from 50% in last year's FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	1. Develop a common math vocabulary to be used by all teachers. 2. Utilize County Road maps in planning instruction. 3. Students will utilize Character to the Core strategies to develop personal goals. 4. Weekly walk-through's by the principal. 5. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters. 6. Start incorporating on time material from Go-Math series into curriculum. 7. Develop problem-solving skills through Math Superstars Program.	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Math Committee, Classroom teacher	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Math SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.	FCAT, Benchmarks, Quarterly Exams, Beginning, Middle, and End of year assessments from current math series.

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 :	<input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:		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 subgroup:

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:		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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Economically disadvantaged students who make adequate yearly progress in mathematics will increase to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% of economically disadvantaged students made adequate yearly progress in mathematics.	70% of economically disadvantaged students will make adequate yearly progress in mathematics.

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 disaggregated data from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Assessments, 57% of economically disadvantaged students made adequate yearly progress in mathematics. Grade level and strand data indicate that Measurement, Geometry and Spatial Sense, and Data Analysis are the main areas of concern. Overall, average grade level math scores decreased from 2011 FCAT scores.	1. Develop a common math vocabulary to be used by all teachers. 2. Utilize County Road maps in planning instruction. 3. Students will utilize Character to the Core strategies to develop personal goals. 4. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal. 5. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters. 6. Start incorporating on time material from Go-Math series into curriculum. 7. Develop problem-solving skills through Math Superstars Program.	Principal, Team Leaders, Math Committee, Classroom Teacher	Data will be collected for all students in grades 3-5 from the Math SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.	FCAT, Benchmarks, Quarterly Exams, Beginning, Middle, and End of the year assessments from current math series.

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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.  Science Goal # 1a:		The percentage of students who achieve proficiency in science will increase to 65% by 2013.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
49% of students achieved proficiency in science (22 students)		65% of students will achieve proficiency in science (29 students).			
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
	Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment, 49% scored at level 3 or above in science.  Grade level and strand data indicate that all strands are the areas of concern, with the exception of Earth and Space Science. Overall, average grade level science scores increase 9% from 2011 FCAT scores.	1. Provide opportunities for laboratory experiments. 2. Utilize technology as a means of research and exploration. 3. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal. 4. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters 5. Provide instruction in science in first and second quarters using New National	Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Classroom Teachers	Data will be collected for all students in grade 5 from the Science SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Results from district mastery assessment test and Scott Foresman assessments will be reviewed by the principal, team leaders, and classroom teachers to determine which students need	FCAT, District Mastery Assessment test, National Geographic assessments, Benchmarks for 5th Grade

1	<p>Geographic Program.</p> <p>6. Integrate reading, math, and science instruction.</p> <p>7. Emphasize the use of activity based instruction to teach scientific concepts.</p> <p>8. Align all grade level lessons with Science Road Maps.</p> <p>9. Provide field trips to GWIZ and the Manatee Agriculture Museum to enrich Science Roadmap curriculum.</p> <p>10. Utilize community resource speakers through FPL education program in grades 3 – 5.</p> <p>11. Each 5th Grade class will adopt a KG class to demonstrate experiments.</p>	<p>intensive remediation prior to FCAT.</p> <p>School-wide Science Fair will be held in the spring. Grades 4 – 5 will be required to construct an individual project which will be graded. Grades 1 – 3 will design a classroom project and submit to the school Science Fair.</p>
---	---	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	The percentage of students who achieve above proficiency in science will increase to 35% (17) by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (11) of students achieve above proficiency in science.	35% (17) of students will achieve above proficiency in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment, 49% scored at level 3 or above in science. Grade level and strand data indicate that all strands are the areas of concern, with the exception of Earth and Space Science. Overall, average grade level science scores increase 9% from 2011 FCAT scores.</p>	<p>1. Provide opportunities for laboratory experiments.</p> <p>2. Utilize technology as a means of research and exploration.</p> <p>3. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal.</p> <p>4. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters</p> <p>5. Provide instruction in science in first and second quarters using New National Geographic Program.</p> <p>6. Integrate reading, math, and science instruction.</p> <p>7. Emphasize the use of activity based instruction to teach scientific concepts.</p> <p>8. Align all grade level lessons with Science</p>	<p>Principal, School Counselor, Team Leaders, Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Data will be collected for all students in grade 5 from the Science SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Results from district mastery assessment test and Scott Foresman assessments will be reviewed by the principal, team leaders, and classroom teachers to determine which students need intensive remediation prior to FCAT. School-wide Science Fair will be held in the spring. Grades 4 – 5 will be required to construct an individual project which will be graded. Grades 1 – 3 will design a classroom</p>	<p>FCAT, District Mastery Assessment test,  National Geographic assessments, Benchmarks for 5th Grade</p>



	<p>Road Maps.</p> <p>9. Provide field trips to GWIZ and the Manatee Agriculture Museum to enrich Science Roadmap curriculum.</p> <p>10. Utilize community resource speakers through FPL education program in grades 3 – 5.</p> <p>11. Each 5th Grade class will adopt a KG class to demonstrate experiments.</p>		<p>project an submit to the school Science Fair.</p>
--	--	--	--

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

<p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.</p> <p>Science Goal #2a:</p>	<p>The percentage of students who achieve above proficiency in science will increase to 22% (13 students)by 2013.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>7% of studentns achieve above proficiency in science (4 students).</p>	<p>22% of students will achieve above proficiency in science (13 students).</p>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Based on the disaggregated data from the 2011 FCAT Science Assessment, 40% scored at level 3 or above in science.</p> <p>Grade level and strand data indicate that all strands are the areas of concern, with the exception of Earth and Space Science. Overall, average grade level science scores decreased 17% from 2010 FCAT scores.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide opportunities for laboratory experiments.</li> <li>2. Utilize technology as a means of research and exploration.</li> <li>3. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal.</li> <li>4. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters</li> <li>5. Modified Wednesdays used for professional development and planning for differentiated instruction and data analysis.</li> <li>6. Provide instruction in science in first and second quarters using New National Geographic Program.</li> <li>7. Integrate reading, math, and science instruction.</li> <li>8. Emphasize the use of activity based instruction to teach scientific concepts.</li> <li>9. Align all grade level lessons with Science Road Maps.</li> <li>10. Provide field trips</li> </ol>	<p>Principial School Counselor, Team Leaders Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Data will be collected for all students in grade 5 from the Science SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. Results from district mastery assessment test and National Geographic assessments will be reviewed by the principal, team leaders, and classroom teachers to determine which students need intensive remediation prior to FCAT. School-wide Science Fair will be held in the spring. Grades 4 – 5 will be required to construct an individual project which will be graded. Grades 1 – 3 will design a classroom project an submit to the school Science Fair.</p>	<p>FCAT, District Mastery Assessment test, National Geographic assessments, Benchmarks for 5th Grade</p>

	to GWIZ and the Manatee Agriculture Museum to enrich Science Roadmap curriculum. 11. Utilize community resource speakers through FPL education program in grades 3 – 5. 12. Each 5th Grade class will adopt a KG class to demonstrate 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:				
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
No Data Submitted						

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:	The percentage of students who achieve adequate yearly progress in writing will increase to 80% by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% of students achieved adequate yearly progress in writing (29 students).	80% of students will achieve adequate yearly progress in writing (36 students).

### 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 disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, 66% scored level 3 or above in writing. Overall, average writing scores decreased 13 percent from 2011 FCAT scores.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide writing rubric training to new staff members or teaching new grade level.</li> <li>2. Provide opportunities for teachers to share best practices in monthly staff meetings.</li> <li>3. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal.</li> <li>4. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters.</li> <li>5. Fourth grade emphasis on a 45 minute writing block daily.</li> <li>6. Provide school-wide Writes outside of District Writes months</li> </ol>	Principal, School Counselor,  Team Leaders, Classroom Teachers	<p>Data will be collected for all students in grade 4 from the Writing SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. This data will also be reviewed at quarterly staff meetings.</p> <p>Results school-wide for each grade level from county/district and Myakka Writes will be recorded and reviewed by the principal, team leaders, and classroom teachers in order to track writing performance.</p>	FCAT, District Writes, Myakka Writes

	<p>to practice prompt writing and review quarterly data of writing scores.</p> <p>7. Each grade level will practice writing skills during pre-school assigned areas and be monitored bimonthly.</p> <p>8. Word walls and example prompts will be displayed during pre-school assigned areas.</p> <p>9. One/Two days a week Bellwork will include writing per class per grade level.</p>		<p>Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.</p>
--	---	--	--

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

<p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</p> <p>Writing Goal #1b:</p>	<p>The percentage of students who achieve 4 or higher on FCAT will increase to 30% by 2013.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>14% of students achieved 4 or higher in FCAT writing (6 students).</p>	<p>30% of students will achieve a level 4 or higher on FCAT Writing (14 students).</p>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>Based on the disaggregated data from the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment, 66% scored level 3 or above in writing. Overall, average writing scores decreased 13 percent from 2011 FCAT scores.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide writing rubric training to new staff members or teaching new grade level.</li> <li>2. Provide opportunities for teachers to share best practices in monthly staff meetings.</li> <li>3. Weekly walk-throughs by the principal.</li> <li>4. Progress will be monitored using Performance Matters.</li> <li>5. Fourth grade emphasis on a 45 minute writing block daily.</li> <li>6. Provide school-wide Writes outside of District Writes months to practice prompt writing and review quarterly data of writing scores.</li> <li>7. Each grade level will practice writing skills during pre-school assigned areas and be monitored bimonthly.</li> <li>8. Word walls and example prompts will be displayed during pre-school assigned areas.</li> </ol>	<p>Principal, School Counselor,  Team Leaders, Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Data will be collected for all students in grade 4 from the Writing SSS portion of the FCAT in order to track the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level. This data will also be reviewed at quarterly staff meetings.</p> <p>Results school-wide for each grade level from county/district and Myakka Writes will be recorded and reviewed by the principal, team leaders, and classroom teachers in order to track writing performance.</p> <p>Instructional strategies will be modified for those students not meeting adequate progress.</p>	<p>FCAT, District Writes, Myakka Writes</p>

	9. One/Two days a week Bellwork will include writing per class per grade level.		
--	---	--	--

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

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

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

Writing Budget:

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

*End of Writing Goals*

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal # 1:	

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	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
<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 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				

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement  Parent Involvement Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	



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						

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

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## 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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

# 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

Manatee School District MYAKKA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	62%	60%	79%	40%	241	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	57%	51%			108	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	50% (YES)			100	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					449	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Manatee School District MYAKKA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	73%	70%	68%	57%	268	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	68%	55%			123	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	37% (NO)			104	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					495	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested