FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Ms. Melissa M. Mesa

SAC Chair: Ms. Yolanda West

Superintendent: Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Melissa M. Mesa	Degrees BA – Rutgers University MS – Barry University Certifications Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership	2	10	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C C B C AYP N/A Y N N Y High Standards Rdg. 36 49 71 66 84 High Standards Math 41 64 71 71 89 Lrng Gains –Rdg. 62 51 64 64 73 Lrng Gains – Math 69 62 61 63 75 Gains – Rdg.-25% 81 61 64 60 57 Gains – Math-25% 70 60 49 62 74
Assis Principal	Alicia Jones	Degrees BA – University of Florida MS – Nova Southeastern University Ed.D- Nova Southeastern University Certifications Elementary Education 1-6		1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade F C C B C AYP N Y N N Y High Standards Rdg. 31 49 71 66 67 High Standards Math 29 64 71 71 68 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 60 51 64 64 62 Lrng Gains-Math 49 62 61 63 64 Gains-Rdg-25% 64 61 64 60 58 Gains-Math-25% 56 60 49 62 64

		Educational Leadership Reading Endorsement			

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	Yolanda West	Degrees BA-The Union Institute Certifications Elementary Education (K-6) Gifted Endorsement	2	1	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C C B C AYP N/A Y N N Y High Standards Rdg. 36 49 71 66 67 High Standards Math 41 64 71 71 68 Lrng Gains –Rdg. 62 51 64 64 62 Lrng Gains – Math 69 62 61 63 64 Gains – Rdg.-25% 81 61 64 60 58 Gains – Math-25% 70 60 49 62 64
Math	Nicole Dorvily	Degrees BA-University of Miami MS – Nova Southeastern University Certifications: Middle School Mathematics Educational Leadership	3	4	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C D N/A N/A AYP N/A Y N N/A N/A High Standards Rdg. 36 49 38 N/A N/A High Standards Math 41 64 46 N/A N/A Lrng Gains-Rdg. 62 51 42 N/A N/A Lrng Gains-Math 69 62 58 N/A N/A Gains-Rdg-25% 81 61 53 N/A N/A
Science	Arlene Trotter	Degrees BA – Kean College of New Jersey MS – Nova Southeastern University Certifications Early Childhood Elementary Education(1-6) ESOL	2	12	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C C C B C AYP N/A Y N N Y High Standards Rdg. 36 49 71 66 67 High Standards Math 41 64 71 71 68 Lrng Gains –Rdg. 62 51 64 64 62 Lrng Gains – Math 69 62 61 63 64 Gains – Rdg.-25% 81 61 64 60 58 Gains – Math-25% 70 60 49 62 64
Reading	Claribel Garcia	Degrees MS - Florida International University. MS- Saint Thomas University BS- University of Milwaukee-Wisconsin. Certification-Elementary Education 1-6, Reading K-12, Educational Leadership, ESOL Endorsement		7	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade B A C A B AYP N/A High Standards Rdg. 45 64 66 64 68 High Standards Math 38 66 65 68 66 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64 63 67 69 65 Lrng Gains-Math 63 66 51 61 69 Gains-Rdg-25% 62 73 61 72 52 Gains-Math-25% 71 73 35 67 N/A
Mathematics	Lena Williams	Degrees BA-ENMU MS – Nova Southeastern University Ed.Sp – Nova Southeastern University Certifications: Mathematics 5-9 Mathematics 6-12 Ed Leadership k-12		4	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C D D N/A N/A AYP Y Y N N/A N/A High Standards Rdg. 41 37 19 N/A N/A High Standards Math 51 39 55 N/A N/A Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 53 37 N/A N/A Lrng Gains-Math 56 58 73 N/A N/A Gains-Rdg-25% 75 65 46 N/A N/A Gains-Math-25% 68 63 74 N/A N/A

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Solicit referrals from current employees.	Principal / Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	2. Collaborate with local universities to coordinate student teaching opportunities and observation hours.	Principal / Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Mentoring Program for novice teachers paired with and expert teacher	Principal / Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Provide job embedded professional development during faculty meetings, common planning and on teacher workdays.	Principal / Assistant Principal / Instructional Coaches	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
N/A	

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
34	17.6%(6)	26.5%(9)	38.2%(13)	17.6%(6)	50.0%(17)	88.2%(30)	2.9%(1)	2.9%(1)	35.3%(12)

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

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The district coordinate with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to secondary students. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Title CHESS (as appropriate); Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

ST2 schools are provided with the support form a Professional Development Curriculum Support Specialist which is funded from Title I, part A funds. ST2 is a state approved RtI model for elementary schools.

North County K-8 Center has one Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) class. The staff in this class assists pre-school children to make the transition into our elementary school program through the implementation of a Pre-School Transition Plan, also funded by the Title I Grant.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

North County K-8 Center provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Dropout Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• Training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• Training for add-on endorsement programs such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
Training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

• The Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.
• Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program assists with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students.
• The Homeless Liaison provides training for school registrars on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act – ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless – and are provided with entitlements
• Project Upstart provides a homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign throughout all the schools-each school is provided a video and curriculum manual and contest is sponsored by the homeless trust – a community organization.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

North County K-8 Center will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program addresses violence and drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, elementary counselors, and TRUST Specialists.
• Training and technical assistance for elementary, middle and senior high school teachers, administrators, counselors, TRUST Specialists, and Safe School Specialists is also a component of this program.
• The Safe School Specialists provide training and follow-up activities to all school staff in the areas of violence prevention, stress management and crisis management.
• TRUST Specialists focus on counseling students to solve problems related to drugs and alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation,

family violence, and other crises

Nutrition Programs

1. North County K-8 Center adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2. Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
3. The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Head Start programs are co-located in several Title I schools and/or communities. Joint activities, including professional development and transition processes are shared. Through affiliating agreements, the Summer VPK program is provided at Head Start sites.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

Health Connect in Our Schools
• Health Connect in Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based health care which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on school grounds.
• Teams are staffed by a School Social Worker, a Nurse and a full-time Health Aide.
• HCiOS services reduces or eliminates barriers to care, connects eligible students with health insurance and provides care for students who are not eligible for other services.
• HCiOS enhances the health education activities provided by the school and by the health department.
• HCiOS offers a trained health team that is qualified to perform the assigned duties related to a quality school health care program.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Melissa M. Mesa, Principal
Alicia Jones, Assistant Principal
Yolanda West, Reading Coach
Claribel Garcia, Reading Coach
Arlene Trotter, Science Lead Teacher
Theresa Angiolillo, Media Specialist
June Shreve, Counselor
Dr. Claudette Derrick, Counselor
Helene Cohen, Hourly Teacher

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 Leadership Team have the following roles/functions:
Melissa M. Mesa, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is properly implementing interventions, conducts assessment effectiveness of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Alicia Jones, Assistant Principal: Assists the principal with activities listed above.
Yolanda West, Reading Coach: Provides professional development and classroom follow-up on best practices for intermediate teachers, in Reading/LA, coordinates pull-out intervention activities, assists with benchmark assessments and progress

monitoring data, and provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.

Claribel Garcia, Reading Coach: Provides professional development and classroom follow-up for primary teachers, on best practices in Reading/LA, coordinates pull-out intervention activities, assists with benchmark assessments and progress monitoring data, and provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.

Arlene Trotter, Science Lead Teacher- Provides science professional development and spearheads curriculum planning/mapping in science. Also provides intervention to small groups of students in Science.

Theresa Angiolillo, Media Specialist- Oversees school-wide activities that promote literacy. Provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Science.

June Shreve, Counselor- Oversees school SPED Department to ensure the SWD subgroup population demonstrates continuous progress as delineated in their IEP while working toward achievement of goals based on the Sunshine State Standards. Also provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Mathematics.

Dr. Claudette Derrick, Counselor- Provides support in behavioral strategies that will minimize classroom distractions and increase student achievement.

Helene Cohen, Hourly Teacher- Provides PD and follow-up co-teaching to teachers in Reading/Language Arts. Provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.

The RtI team meets once per week to analyze summative data, progress monitoring data, benchmark assessment data, and makes instructional decisions based on this data as appropriate. Team members provide updates on each school initiative they oversee. All aspects of school operations are discussed including budgetary matters which may impact student achievement. Agendas and sign-in sheets are kept weekly.

The Leadership Team will:
1. Use the Tier 1 Problem Solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress at least three times per year by addressing the following areas:
• Curriculum based on standards
• Expected progress in core areas
• Monitoring common assessments
• Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions
• Enrichment opportunities
2. Gather and analyze data at all Tiers to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by group or individual student diagnostic and progress monitoring assessment.
3. Team meetings are held once per week. Use the four step problem solving process as the basis for goal setting, planning, and program evaluation during all team meetings that focus on increasing student achievement or behavioral success.
4. Gather ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) for all interventions and analyze that data using the Tier 2 problem solving process after each OPM.
5. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
6. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
7. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives.

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

The Leadership Team will:
• Monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
• Monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
• Provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.
• Consider data at the end of year for Tier 1 problem solving

---

MTSS Implementation

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

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

- Baseline Benchmark Assessments
- Success Maker Benchmark Assessments
- Success Maker Utilization and Progress Reports
- Interim assessments
- State/Local Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School site specific assessments

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Substitute days will be provided at the beginning of the school year for grade levels to participate in in-house professional development on RtI. Updates will be provided monthly during grade level meetings with administration. Schedules are also developed for ongoing classroom follow up to all RtI PD which is conducted by the Reading Coach and members of the RtI Leadership Team.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The plan to provide support will include:
1. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
2. Ongoing use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
3. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders.
4. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
5. Coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
6. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.
7. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Melissa M. Mesa, Principal
Alicia Jones, Assistant Principal
Yolanda West, Reading Coach
Claribel Garcia, Reading Coach
Theresa Angiolillo, Media Specialist
June Shreve, Counselor
Helene Cohen, Hourly Teacher

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

Melissa M. Mesa, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures proper implementation of reading/language arts intervention activities, ensures adequate professional development to support initiatives of the LLT, and communicates with parents regarding school-based LLT plans and activities.
Alicia Jones, Assistant Principal: Assists the principal with activities listed above.
Yolanda West, Reading Coach: Provides professional development and classroom follow-up on best practices for intermediate teachers, in Reading/LA, coordinates pull-out intervention activities, assists with benchmark assessments and progress monitoring data, and provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.
Claribel Garcia, Reading Coach: Provides professional development and classroom follow-up for primary teachers, on best practices in Reading/LA, coordinates pull-out intervention activities, assists with benchmark assessments and progress

monitoring data, and provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.

Theresa Angiolillo, Media Specialist- Oversees school-wide activities that promote literacy. Provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading.

June Shreve, Counselor- Oversees school SPED Department to ensure the SWD subgroup population demonstrates continuous progress as delineated in their IEP while working toward achievement of goals based on the Sunshine State Standards in Reading/LA. Provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading.

Helene Cohen, Hourly Teacher- Provides PD and follow-up co-teaching to teachers in Reading/Language Arts. Provides intervention to small groups of students in Reading and Writing.

The LLT team meets once per week to analyze summative data, progress monitoring data, benchmark assessment data, and makes instructional decisions based on this data as appropriate. Team members provide updates on all literacy-based initiatives and interventions. Professional development needs and outcomes are discussed. Follow-up classroom observation and co-teaching schedules are developed in order for teachers to have guided practice on new instructional skills acquired.

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

Major initiatives of the LLT are to analyze data and develop school programs/activities that assist with raising student achievement in reading/language arts (and related core subject areas). Examples include: Revamping the school's monthly benchmark assessment program to correlate with the NGSSS, providing PD to teachers, developing an intervention schedule in Reading and Writing, providing small group intervention activities for at-risk students, developing school-wide activities and initiatives to motivate reading at all grade levels.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/10/2012)

*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.

Title I Administration assists North County K-8 Center by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences, in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. In selected school communities, the Title I Program further provides assistance for preschool transition through the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program. HIPPY provides in-home training for parents to become more involved in the educational process of their three- and four-year old children. North County K-8 Center will establish or expand the "Welcome to Kindergarten" program to build partnership with local early education programs, including the in-school pre-kindergarten program. Through this joint venture, parents and children will gain familiarity with kindergarten as well as receive information relative to the matriculation of students at the school. The principal will also meet with the center directors of neighborhood centers.

*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.

Teachers attend weekly staff developments where the core concept is how to infuse reading strategies throughout every discipline. Strategies such as CRISS, the use of graphic organizers, understanding and generating Higher Order Questions are utilized in common planning sessions. Every teacher at North County is a teacher of reading and reading is at the core of everything that we do. All content area curriculum branches form a thorough foundation of the ability to read.

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 22% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3) Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 3 percentage points to 25 %.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (42)	25% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application in grades 3 and 5. Students lack the ability to use/apply a variety of strategies to comprehend grade level text. There is a lack of interactive reading strategies and limited accountable student talk.	1A.1. Increase rigorous reading opportunities related to the content, active reading strategies to scaffold understanding of complex text related to the topic through, pre reading strategies, during reading and after reading strategies. Utilize common planning to ensure that interactive reading/collaborative strategies are included in lesson plans. Implement the Coaching Cycle to model and monitor the use of interactive reading/collaborative strategies. Provide professional development on interactive reading/collaborative strategies that build student accountable talk on a monthly basis.	1A.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	1A.1. Review ongoing classroom assessments/observation focusing on the use of interactive reading strategies. Administrators and Coaches will review reading journals for the use of pre reading, during reading and after reading strategies (i.e. anchor charts, graphic organizers, student ability to utilize reading strategies). Administrators and coaches will attend common planning and professional development geared towards reading strategies.	1A.1. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, monthly assessments, and student work samples. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment
	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/	1A.2. Incorporate additional project based learning activities into the curriculum in order to provide students the opportunity to engage in	1A.2. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	1A.2. Review ongoing classroom assessments/observations focusing on the use of Data Analysis, Monthly Assessments and Interim Assessments	1A.2. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, monthly assessments, and student work

2	Research Process in grades 5 and 6. Students lack the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies needed to locate, interpret and organize information and to determine the validity and reliability of information within and across texts.	activities that involve the use of collecting, creating and interpreting charts and graphs. Use real-world documents such as how-to-articles, brochures, fliers, and websites to locate, interpret, synthesize, and organize information. Utilize the coaching cycle to support teachers with project based learning activities. Increase the effective use of interactive reading journals by providing students the opportunity to write in them daily. Utilize common planning to incorporate a variety of journal activities.		Administrators and coaches will monitor the effective use of Interactive Reading Journals.	samples. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment
3	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category I: Vocabulary for Grade 6. Students lack vocabulary and background knowledge that assists in reading comprehension due to their limited experiences.	1A.3. Increase evidence based vocabulary instruction and the effective use of interactive theme charts / word walls in all content areas. Utilize the coaching cycle to support the implementation of evidence based instruction. Follow a daily vocabulary routine during the introduction portion of whole group lessons. Increase the use of Discovery Learning to build background knowledge.	1A.3. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	1A.3. Reading Coaches and teachers will review classroom assessments, monthly assessments and Interim Assessments and adjust instruction as needed. Administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs and monitor Common Planning.	1A.3. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, monthly assessments, and student work samples. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 11% of students achieved a Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving at or above a Level 4 by 2 percentage points to 13%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (22)	13% (25)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, only 11% of the students scored Level 4 and 5. Students lack sufficient exposure to focused, rigorous instruction and high complexity questions.	2A.1. Use higher complexity questioning strategies to promote critical, independent, creative thinking, for a deeper understanding of the content. Promote and enhance the school wide Accelerated Reader to monitor, and track student progress. Incorporate writing rigorous reflections in Reading Response Journals. Utilize after-school Literature Club to further expose students to higher cognitive complexity thinking and performance. Teachers in grades 3-7 will participate in professional learning communities to strengthen knowledge of content and share instructional strategies.	2A.1. Administrative Team , Reading Coaches and Media Specialist	2A.1. Classroom observations of Higher Order Questioning and HOTS strategies utilized (anchor chart posting, students answering questions) Review of Accelerated Reader reports. Class and individual student tracking of AR goals. Common planning agendas and logs.	2A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments, monthly assessments, student work samples and Accelerated Reader Test. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
2	2A.2. Students lack significant exposure to higher order thinking strategies and collaborative strategies that promote active discussions and higher levels of cognitive demand.	2A.2. Increase and monitor activities to promote student accountability talk and active learning strategies, such as Think Pair Share, Socratic Discussions, use of response board and technology clickers to aid motivation for increased learning.	2A.2. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	2A.2. Review ongoing classroom assessments and observations focusing on the use of active strategies.	2A.2. Formative: Interim Assessments and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in	

reading.

Reading Goal #2b:

N/A

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 64% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (81)	69% (88)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the percent of students making learning gains increased by 13 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Reading assessment. Limited time and resources for students to utilize technology has hindered progress.	3A.1. Utilize technology (Successmaker) to differentiate instruction. Update computer lab schedules in order to optimize usage and fidelity of implementation of SuccessMaker. Increase learning time on task via the Master Schedule. Promote and enhance the school-wide SuccessMaker program to monitor and track student progress.	3A.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	3A.1. Review SuccessMaker reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.	3A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments, monthly assessments and Successmaker reports. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment
	3A.2. There are limited resources and time for interventionists and teachers to interpret data sufficiently in order to align materials and set an instructional focus for student groups.	3A.2. Provide interventions that address student deficiencies by developing goals, monitoring the consistent use of data to drive instruction and aligning instructional materials to students' deficiencies based on data (i.e., FAIR, Interim, STAR)	3A.2. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	3A.2. Review Monthly assessments, FAIR reports, and Interims to ensure progress in being made and adjust interventions as needed.	3A.2. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

	2		Allocate time for teachers and interventionists to collaborate on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss OPM data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Allocate time during data chats to meet the needs of teachers who are struggling to comprehend and interpret their FAIR data.				
	3	3A.3. Inconsistent implementation of Differentiated Instruction has hindered student progress.	3A.3. Provide differentiated instruction that is aligned to students' specific needs based on data (i.e., FAIR, Interims) Consistently monitor ongoing progress monitoring data and ensue the differentiated instruction is occurring on a daily basis and the quality of instruction at the teacher-led station is high level. Provide Differentiated Instruction professional development that is intensified (covers TLC data-driven instruction and the management of Independent Centers). Reading Coaches will provide coaching cycles related to Differentiated Instruction for teachers that are struggling.	3A.3. Administrative Team, Reading Coach and teachers.	3A.3. Review of ongoing progress monitoring data, classroom observation focused on Differentiated Instruction and review of student reading journals.	3A.3. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, student work samples, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 84% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 89%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (26)	89% (28)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 23 percentage points. Students require a structured and focused bell to bell instruction incorporating the gradual release of responsibility model.	4A.1. Complete lesson plans following the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (Introduction - I Do - We Do - They Do - You Do – Closure) format. Instructional delivery will incorporate all components of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model according to their lesson plans. Provide professional development and continued coaching support on the development on the Gradual Release Model and Explicit Instruction.	4A.1. Administrative Team Reading Coaches and teachers.	4A.1. Classroom observation focused on Explicit Instruction (Gradual Release of Responsibility Model) and review monthly assessments.	4A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment
2	4A.2. Students are in need of remediation and intervention. Students require a structured tutoring tool implemented with fidelity. Student participation in extended learning opportunities is limited.	4A.2. Implement a during-school Intervention Program and an after-school tutorial program, utilizing district provided materials. Maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) data. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system.	4A.2. Administrative Team Reading Coaches and teachers.	4A.2. Monitor the implementation of the intervention program, ongoing progress monitoring data and training of interventionists. After School tutorial attendance logs.	4A.2. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, student work samples, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Readin Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #
	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	36%	42%	48%	53%	59%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 36% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 36% (69)	Black: 40% (76)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Black: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the Black subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Student interventions lack structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5B.1. Utilize data to identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups, provide PD to interventionists and tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress and attendance logs on a bi-weekly basis. Implement and monitor interventions by tracking Ongoing Progress Monitoring results. Provide interventionists with coaching support to ensure interventions are consistent and structured.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team and Administrators	5B.1. Classroom observations and monitoring of interventions by Administrators and RtI Leadership Team. RtI Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5B.1. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	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
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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 12% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 13 percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% (3)	25% (7)

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Student interventions lack structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5D.1. Utilize data to identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups, provide PD to interventionists and tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress and attendance logs on a bi-weekly basis. Implement and monitor interventions by tracking Ongoing Progress Monitoring results. Provide interventionists with coaching support to ensure interventions are consistent and structured.	5D.1. RtI Leadership Team and Administrators	5D.1. Classroom observations and monitoring of interventions by Administrators and RtI Leadership Team. RtI Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5D.1. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 36% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 4 percentage points to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (62)	40% (73)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Student interventions lack structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5E.1. Utilize data to identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups, provide PD to interventionists and tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress and attendance logs on a bi-weekly basis. Implement and monitor interventions by tracking Ongoing Progress Monitoring results. Provide interventionists with coaching support to ensure interventions are consistent and structured.	5E.1. RtI Leadership Team and Administrators	5E.1. Classroom observations and monitoring of interventions by Administrators and RtI Leadership Team. RtI Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5E.1. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NGSSS Reading	Grades 3-7	Reading Coach	Grade 3-7 Teachers	September 2012 Grade level Meetings	Administration and Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach
School-wide/ Pre-planning Academy	Grades K-7	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Grade K-7 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach
FAIR Data Analysis	Grades K-7	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Grade K-7 Teachers	October 2012	Administration and Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach
RtI	Grades K-7	Reading Coach	Grade K-7 Teachers	October 2012 Grade level Meetings	Administration and Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach
					Administration and	

Reading Item Specifications Training	Grades 3-7	Hourly Reading/Writing Coach	Grade 3-7 Teachers	September 2012 Grade level Meetings	Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Hourly Reading/Writing Coach
Lesson Study	Grades K-7	Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Grade K-7 Teachers	October 2012 Ongoing	Administration and Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Goal 2	Literature Books	School Budget	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
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
Reading Goal 1, 2, and 3	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Goal 4	After School Tutoring	School Improvement Grant Fund	$32,000.00
Reading Goal 4 and 5	Interventions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$25,000.00
Reading Goal 1, 2, and 3	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$17,000.00
			Subtotal: $74,000.00
			Grand Total: $80,000.00

End of Reading Goa

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Listening/ Speaking assessment indicate that 46% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 48%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
46% (6)	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of the 2012 CELLA Listening/Speaking assessment, 46% of the students achieved proficiency. Students lack oral language proficiency in English and have limited vocabulary.	1.1. Disaggregate CELLA data and provide explicit instruction in the area of Listening/ Speaking for all ELL students. Include opportunities for daily oral language practice with scripts and visual aids. Explicitly teach vocabulary as a part of the daily lesson. Increase student accountability talk through the use of cooperative learning strategies and partner ELL students with non-ELL students during the collaborative activities.	1.1. Administrative Team Reading Coaches and teachers.	1.1. Monitor lesson plans and classroom observation focusing on the use ESOL strategies.	1.1. Formative: Imagine Learning Reports. Summative: 2013 CELLA Listening/ Speaking

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Reading assessment indicate that 31% of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 33%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
31% (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	2.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 CELLA Reading assessment, only 31% of the students achieved proficiency. Students need support reading in English and the use of technology (Imagine Learning) was inconsistent.	2.1. Disaggregate CELLA data and provide explicit instruction in the area of Reading for all ELL students. Increase usage of technology to differentiate instruction. (Imagine Learning)	2.1. Administrative Team Reading Coaches and teachers.	2.1. Classroom observation focusing on the use ESOL strategies and review Imagine Learning reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.	2.1. Formative: Imagine Learning Reports, student work samples, and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Reading

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	The results of the 2012 CELLA Writing assessment indicate that 31% of students achieved proficiency.

CELLA Goal #3:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 33%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

31% (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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 CELLA Writing assessment, only 31% of the students achieved proficiency. Students need support writing in English and explicit instruction focusing on the writing process.	Teachers disaggregate CELLA data and provide explicit teaching in the area of Writing for all ELL students. Create and utilize interactive word walls that include high frequency words, Tier II and academic vocabulary. Provide explicit instruction focusing on the writing process and provide multiple opportunities for editing and revision. Provide extensive corrective feedback and peer editing opportunities.	Administrative Team Reading Coaches and teachers.	Classroom observation focusing on the use ESOL strategies and ongoing writing samples.	Formative: Student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Writing

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3) Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 7 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (46)	31% (60)

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 1, Number: Base Ten and Fractions in grade 5. This deficiency is due to limited time being spent on the use of manipulatives in each classroom and inconsistent implementation of small group differentiated instruction.	1A.1. Engage students in hands-on and small group activities. Plan for and use manipulatives during instruction to draw connections to representational and abstract concepts. Model the use of manipulatives each time before students work with them individually or in small groups. Implement a Mathematics Lab guided by the Math Coach to ensure appropriate modeling and utilization of manipulatives.	1A.1. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers.	1A.1. Ongoing classroom assessments/observations focusing on students' use of manipulatives in the classroom and effective-use of small group instruction. Additionally, lesson plans will be reviewed to ascertain that manipulatives are being used on a weekly basis.	1A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 2, Expressions, Equations, and Statistics in grade 5. Students in grade 5 showed a decrease of 10 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. The deficiency is due to the lack of effective Higher Order Thinking Strategies incorporated into lesson delivery.	1A.2. Incorporate a variety of questioning strategies into lesson delivery. Include higher order questions (as well as the answers) in the lesson plans and require students to respond to them during instruction. Provide students with opportunities to use collaborative strategies during the "They Do" portion of the lesson. Use questioning techniques such as probing, wait-time and re-directing ensuring equitable opportunities to	1A.2. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	1A.2. Ongoing classroom assessments / observations focusing on the use of Higher Order Thinking Strategies. Review Monthly Assessments and Interim Assessments to ensure that progress is being made.	1A.2. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

		respond to questions. Require student accountable talk to justify correct answers and explain incorrect answers.			
3	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement in grade 5. Students in grade 3 showed an increase of 7 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Mathematics Test. Students require a structured and focused bell to bell instruction incorporating the gradual release of responsibility model.	1A.3. Complete lesson plans following the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (Introduction - I Do - We Do - They Do - You Do – Closure) format. Deliver instruction incorporating all components of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model according to lesson plans. Use flip charts to teach whole group lessons identifying each page as I Do, We Do, They Do or You Do. Provide professional and continued coaching support on the development on the Gradual Release Model and Explicit Instruction.	1A.3. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	1A.3. Ongoing classroom assessments/observation focusing on the explicit instruction incorporating all components of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.	1A.3. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 13% of students achieved a Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points to 16%.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	13% (26)	16% (31)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, only 13% of the students scored in levels 4 and 5. This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities.	2A.1. Provide students with enrichment opportunities. Continue and maintain an after school math club for students to be given opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities to maintain or increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences and apply learning to solve real-life problems.	2A.1. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	2A.1. Administrative Team will review the roster of students participating in the club and authentic work samples.	2A.1. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	2A.2. There are limited classroom opportunities for student accountable talk of representational and abstract concepts.	2A.2. Utilize common planning to ensure that interactive collaborative strategies are included in lesson plans. Require student accountable talk to justify correct answers and explain incorrect answers. Identify an interactive collaborative strategy on a monthly basis that will build student accountable talk. Implement the coaching cycle to model and monitor the use of interactive collaborative strategies.	2A.2. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	2A.2. Ongoing Classroom Observations and student work samples utilized during common planning.	2A.2. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	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
		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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 71% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (89)	76%(96)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>3A.1.
As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the percent of students making learning gains increased by 9 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Reading Test.

Limited time and resources for students to utilize technology has hindered progress of additional students.</td><td>3A.1.
Utilize technology to differentiate instruction. (Successmaker)

Update computer lab schedules in order to optimize usage and fidelity of implementation of SuccessMaker.</td><td>3A.1.
Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers</td><td>3A.1.
Review SuccessMaker reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.</td><td>3A.1.
Formative: Successmaker Reports

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>3A.2.
There is insufficient time available for students and teachers to set student and classroom-wide goals.</td><td>3A.2.
Use data to set goals, drive instruction and differentiate instruction. Set class-wide goals and post classroom data charts to display student progress following each assessment.

Hold individual data chats with students to set goals following each assessment.

Use current data to create flexible groups and provide differentiated instruction that is aligned to student's specific needs.</td><td>3A.2. .
Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers</td><td>3A.2.
Review data boards in classrooms and the process of student involvement in their data. Review data chat folders.</td><td>3A.2.
Formative: Data Binders and student data chat folders.

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 72% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (24)	77% (25)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>4A.1.
As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 12 percentage points as compared to the 2011 FCAT Reading Test.

Additional students are in need of remediation and intervention. Students require a structured tutoring tool implemented with fidelity.</td><td>4.1.
Provide students with necessary interventions as reflected by assessment data.

Plan with interventionists, reviewing the lessons, distributing the materials, modeling manipulative usage, reviewing skills calendar, and discussing issues pertaining to student progress.

Implement an after-school tutorial program 2 times per week for Math instruction.

Utilize data to identify and place students in appropriate tutoring</td><td>4.1.
Administrative Team and Math Coach</td><td>4A.1.
Review ongoing progress monitoring results to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.</td><td>4A.1.
Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

		groups, provide PD to tutors and monitor student progress and attendance logs on a bi-weekly basis.			

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	42%	48%	53%	58%	63%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 43% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 43% (61)	Black: 48% (63)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Black: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the Black subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math. Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5B.1. Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data. Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5B.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

			school year, provide PD to tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress monthly.	

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 15% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (4)	25% (7)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>5D.1.
As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math.

Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.</td><td>5D.1.
Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data.

Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress.</td><td>5D.1.
RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers.</td><td>5D.1.
RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.</td><td>5D.1.
Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

| | | Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system.

Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year, provide PD to tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress monthly. | | | |

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 41% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 6 percentage points to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (75)	47% (86)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5E.1. Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data. Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year, provide PD to tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress monthly.	5E.1. RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers	5E.1. RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5E.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3) Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 7 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (11)	31% (15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 1, Fractions, Ratios / Proportional Relationships and Statistics in grade 6.	1A.1. Incorporate reading and writing strategies into mathematics instruction. Utilize the Interactive Whiteboard to display text and model reading comprehension strategies while students follow along. Provide students with opportunities to write in their interactive journals on a daily basis. Include the use of structured graphic organizers (i.e. flip charts, Venn diagrams, foldables, webs, t-charts, etc) during instruction. Implement the coaching cycle to model and monitor the integration of reading and writing strategies in mathematics instruction.	1A.1. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	1A.1. Review ongoing classroom assessments and observations focusing on the incorporation of reading and writing strategies into mathematics instruction.	1A.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 2, Expressions and Equations in grade 6.	1A.2. Incorporate a variety of questioning strategies into lesson delivery. Include higher order questions (as well as the answers) in the lesson plans and require students to respond to them during instruction.	1A.2. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	1A.2. Ongoing classroom assessments / observations focusing on the use of Higher Order Thinking Strategies. Review Monthly Assessments and Interim Assessments to ensure	1A.2. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

				that progress is being made.	Mathematics Assessment
2	The deficiency is due to the lack of effective Higher Order Thinking Strategies incorporated into lesson delivery.	Provide students with opportunities to use collaborative strategies during the "They Do" portion of the lesson. Use questioning techniques such as probing, wait-time and re-directing ensuring equitable opportunities to respond to questions. Require student accountable talk to justify correct answers and explain incorrect answers.			
3	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment was Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement in grade 6. Students require a structured and focused bell to bell instruction incorporating the gradual release of responsibility model.	1A.3. Complete lesson plans following the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model (Introduction - I Do - We Do - They Do - You Do – Closure) format. Deliver instruction incorporating all components of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model according to lesson plans. Use flip charts to teach whole group lessons identifying each page as I Do, We Do, or You Do. Provide professional and continued coaching support on the development on the Gradual Release Model and Explicit Instruction.	1A.3. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	1A.3. Ongoing classroom assessments/observation focusing on the explicit instruction incorporating all components of the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.	1A.3. Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 13% of students achieved a Level 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points to 16%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (6)	16% (8)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2A.1.
As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, only 13% of the students scored in levels 4 and 5.

This deficiency is due to limited classroom opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities.</td><td>2A.1.
Provide necessary enrichment as reflected by assessment data and utilize technology to differentiate instruction.

Continue and maintain an after school math club for students to be given opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities to maintain or increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences and apply learning to solve real-life problems.</td><td>2A.1.
Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers</td><td>2A.1.
Administrative Team will review the roster of students participating in the club and authentic work samples.</td><td>2A.1.
Formative: Interim Assessments, student work samples and monthly assessments.

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 71% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (33)	76% (35)

<div align="center">

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, 71% of students made learning gains Limited time and resources for students to utilize technology has hindered progress of additional students.	3A.1. Utilize technology to differentiate instruction. (SuccessMaker) Update computer lab schedules in order to optimize usage and fidelity of implementation of SuccessMaker.	3A.1. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	3A.1. Review SuccessMaker reports to ensure students are making adequate progress.	3A.1. Formative: Successmaker Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

<div align="center">

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

</div>

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 72% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning

gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (33)	77% (36)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, 72% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Additional students are in need of remediation and intervention. Students require a structured tutoring tool implemented with fidelity.	.1. Provide students with necessary interventions as reflected by assessment data. Plan with interventionists, reviewing the lessons, distributing the materials, modeling manipulative usage, reviewing skills calendar, and discussing issues pertaining to student progress. Implement an after-school tutorial program 2 times per week for Math instruction. Utilize data to identify and place students in appropriate tutoring groups, provide PD to tutors and monitor student progress and attendance logs on a bi-weekly basis.	4.1. Administrative Team, Math Coach and teachers	4A.1. Review ongoing progress monitoring results to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	4A.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Middle School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	42%	48%	53%	58%	63%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 43% of students in the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

			Black: 43% (20)	Black: 48% (23)	

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Black: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the Black subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math. Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5B.1. Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data. Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year, provide PD to tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress monthly.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers.	5B.1. RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5B.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	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
No Data Submitted				

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 15% of students in the SWD subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 10 percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (4)	25% (7)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the SWD subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math. Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	5D.1. Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data. Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system.	5D.1. RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers	5D.1. RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the effectiveness of program delivery using data.	5D.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 28% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 30%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (13)	30% (14)

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
	5E.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0	5E.1. Teachers and interventionists maintain fluidity in the grouping of	5E.1. RtI Leadership Team, Math Coach and teachers	5E.1. RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress and the	5E.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim

					effectiveness of program delivery using data.	Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments
1	Mathematics assessment, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in math. Student interventions must maintain structure, consistency, and cohesiveness.	students, and remove/add students as needed according to ongoing data. Teachers and interventionists meet on a regular basis to review the intervention curriculum, discuss ongoing data, and other issues pertaining to student progress. Teachers and interventionists track and monitor student progress through the use of an established system. Utilizing data identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate intervention groups within the first two weeks of the 2012-2013 school year, provide PD to tutorial teachers, and monitor student progress monthly.				Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

End of Middle School Mathematics Goal

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	
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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	

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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
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				

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
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 Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Geometry Goal # 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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 subgroup:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
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:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
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					

End of Geometry EOC 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
School-wide/ Pre-planning Academy	Grades 6-7	Assistant Principal, Math Coach	Grade 6-7 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Math Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Math Coach
NGSSS Math	Grades 6-7	Math Coach	Grade 6-7 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Math Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Math Coach
Math Item Specifications Training	Grades 6-7	Math Coach	Grade 6-7 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Math Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Math Coach

Lesson Study	Grades 6-7	Assistant Principal and Math Coach	Grade 6-7 Teachers	October 2012 Ongoing	Administration and Math Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Math Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics Goal 1, 2, and 3	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics Goal 4	After School Tutoring	School Improvement Grant Fund	$32,000.00
Mathematics Goal 4 and 5	Interventions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$25,000.00
Mathematics Goal 1, 2, and 3	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$16,000.00
			Subtotal: $73,000.00
			Grand Total: $78,000.00

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency. The expected level performance for 2013 is 29% achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (13)	29% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1A.1. The area of deficiency	1A.1. Incorporate reading	1A.1. Administrative	1A.1. Ongoing review of	1A.1. Formative:

1	according to the 2012 FCAT 2.0 administration was Physical Science. Students need to strengthen reading skills and develop higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency.	comprehension and writing strategies into science instruction. Utilize the Interactive Whiteboard to display text and model reading comprehension strategies while students follow along. Provide students with opportunities to write in their interactive journals on a daily basis. Include the use of structured (pre-printed) graphic organizers (i.e. flip charts, Venn diagrams, foldables, webs, t-charts, etc) during instruction.	Team, Science Coach and teachers	lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs. Review of interactive science journals.	Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	1A.2. Students need scaffolding to strengthen science inquiry skills.	1A.2. Conduct scientific investigations following the scientific method. Conduct ETO Essential Labs in accordance to the pacing guide. Ensure that all parts of the ETO lab template are completed for every lab and are revised based on teacher feedback. Supplement ETO Essential Labs with Gizmos and Discovery Fun-damentals.	1A.2. Administrative Team, Science Coach and teachers	1A.2. Ongoing review of lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs. Review of interactive science journals.	Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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 Goal #2a:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0, 7% of students scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). The expected level of performance for 2013 is 9% above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% (4)	9% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Students lack the ability to utilize critical thinking strategies to answer higher order thinking questions.	2A.1. Collaborate during Common Planning to write higher order questions as well as the answers to the questions to include in each lesson plan. Anticipate student responses in order to develop follow-up and probing questions to guide students to the correct answer. Use questioning techniques such as re-directing, wait-time and probing. Require student accountable talk to justify correct answers and explain incorrect answers. Implement the Coaching Cycle to model and monitor the use higher order thinking strategies.	2A.1. Administration, Science Coach and teachers	2A.1. Ongoing review of lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.	2A.1. Formative: Student work samples, Interim Assessments, and Monthly Benchmark Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
School-wide/ Pre-planning Academy	Grades K-7	Assistant Principal, Science Coach	Grade K-7 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach
Utilizing Interactive Science Notebooks Effectively	Grades 3-7	Science Coach	Grades 3-7 Teachers	September 2012 grade level planning	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach
Inquiry Method Training	Grade 4-7	Science Coach	Grade 4-7 Teachers	November 2012 grade level planning	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach
FOCUS & GIZMOS	Grade 5	Science Coach	Grade 5 Teachers	October 2012 grade level planning	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach
Science Item Specifications Training and Lesson Planning using the Gradual Release Model.	Grade 5	Science Coach	Grade 5 Teachers	October 2012 grade level planning	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach

Science Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Goal 2	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Goal 1	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$16,000.00
Science Goal 2	Science Journals (100 sewn pages notebooks)	School Improvement Grant Fund	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $17,000.00
			Grand Total: $18,000.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	On the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing assessment, 90% of students in grade 4 achieved a Level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by one percentage point of students achieving at or above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (37)	91% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students who score in the 0-3 range on the district assessment at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year need small group instruction on effective writing strategies.	1A.1. Utilize writing assessment data to develop intervention and differentiated instruction. Hire an hourly teacher to provide small group pull-out instruction and provide individual student conferencing and feedback.	1A.1. Administration, Hourly Teacher and Reading Coach	1A.1. Ongoing classroom assessments/observations and monitoring of pull-out interventions. Leadership team will review the results of monthly practice writing prompts and year-end posttest.	1A.1. Formative: District and school-site writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test
	1A.2. Authentic writing instruction and practice must be developed earlier than 4th grade.	1A.2. Develop a school-wide plan for writing. Through common planning coaches will ensure that conventions are	1A.2. Administrative Team	1A.2. Administration will review writer's notebooks upon classroom observations.	1A.2. Formative: District and school-site writing assessments.

		addressed as outlined in the pacing guides, in lesson plans and instructional delivery.			Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test
2		Every student will develop a working writing portfolio that will matriculate with the student to each grade level to show working writing progress. Students at all grade levels K-7 will apply the stages of the writing process to various writing assignments throughout the year.			
3	1A.3. Students need additional practice in following the writing process and experience in editing and revising their work. Students are unclear on where and how they need to improve in their writing.	1A.3. Increase descriptive and corrective feedback on student work in order to provide opportunities for the students to make adjustments and improvements towards mastery of targeted writing skills. Utilize anchor papers and rubrics to increase the quality of student's writing.	1A.3. Administrative Team and teachers	1A.3. Review writing portfolios and writing notebooks for adequate descriptive and corrective feedback	1A.3. Formative: District and school-site writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test

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

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Effective Writing Strategies	Grade K-7	Hourly Writing/Reading Coach	Grade 4 Teachers	September 2012	Administration and Hourly Writing/Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Hourly Writing/Reading Coach
Common Core and Writing	K-2	ETO/ Hourly Writing/Reading Coach	Grade K – 2 teachers	October 2012	Administration and Hourly Writing/Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Reading Coach
Descriptive and Corrective Feedback	Grade 3- 7	Reading Coach	Grade 3-6 Teachers	October 2012 Grade level meetings	Administration and Hourly Writing/Reading Coach will observe through classroom visitations. Additional training and classroom demonstrations will be provided to those in need.	Administration Hourly Writing/Reading Coach

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
Writing Goal 1	Small Group Pull-Out Sessions for Students	School Improvement Grant Funds	$25,000.00
			Subtotal: $25,000.00
			Grand Total: $25,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) 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:

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
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						

Civics 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 Civics 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:	Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 95.91% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.41%(375)	95.91% (377)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
125	119
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
122	116
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	Student attendance increased from 94.97% in 2010-2011 to 95.41% in 2011-2012. Due to insufficient parental involvement, students lack the desire to strive for perfect attendance.	Develop, promote, and implement a student incentive program that rewards good attendance habits. Provide incentives for students with perfect attendance on a quarterly basis.	Assistant Principal and Counselor	Daily tracking of attendance goal and Bi-weekly updates to entire faculty during faculty meetings. Administration will provide incentives to all students with perfect attendance quarterly	Attendance Rosters Truancy Intervention Meeting Log
2	1.2. Student attendance increased from 94.97% in 2010-2011 to 95.41% in 2011-2012. Due to low academic standards, students lack the desire to strive for perfect attendance.	1.2. Follow district protocol and procedures for referring students to truancy intervention.	1.2. Assistant Principal	1.2. Assistant Principal will provide monthly updates to entire faculty during faculty meetings	1.2. Attendance Rosters Truancy intervention meeting log.

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
Truancy Prevention	Grades K-7/Attendance Clerk	Staff from Attendance Services & Counselor	Grade K-7 Teachers Counselor Attendance Clerk	August 2012	Assistant Principal and Counselor will review attendance rosters on a weekly basis and meet with students individually and small groups.	Assistant Principal Counselor

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
70	63
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
42	38

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. The total number of outdoor suspensions decreased from 79 incidents during the 2010-2011 school year to 70 in the 2011-2012 school year, a decrease of 10 incidents. The Code of Student Conduct must be sufficiently promoted to all stakeholders. The school-wide discipline	1.1. Publicize and promote the Code of Student Conduct and School-Wide Discipline plan in classrooms daily and at parent workshops.	1.1. Administrative Team	1.1. Monitor SPOT Success report by grade level and monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor suspension rate.	1.1. Monthly COGNOS Suspension Report List of Students on Conduct Honor Roll

	plan through positive behavior support must be implemented effectively.				
2	1.2. The total number of outdoor suspensions decreased from 79 incidents during the 2010-2011 school year to 70 in the 2011-2012 school year, a decrease of 9 incidents. Parents are unfamiliar with the Student Code of Conduct and are unaware of the reasons for their child's suspensions.	1.2. The Administration and Counselor will contact parents of students who are placed on suspension. The counselor will provide training for parents on building an understanding of the Student Code of Conduct and school – wide discipline plan.	1.2. Administration Counselor	1.2. Monitor Parent Contact log for evidences of communication with parents of students who have been placed on suspension.	1.2. Parent Sign-In Sheet for Student Code of Conduct meeting Parent Contact Log

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
Student Code of Conduct	All Teachers	Assistant Principal Counselor	All Teachers	August 2012	Utilize classroom observations to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct and School Wide Discipline. Monitor SPOT Success monthly report.	Administration
Positive Behavior Support and School Wide Discipline Procedures	All Teachers	Assistant Principal Counselor	All Teachers	August 2012	Utilize classroom observations to monitor teachers' enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct and School Wide Discipline. Monitor SPOT Success monthly report.	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2011-2012 school year, 137 parents were registered parent volunteers. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase registered parent volunteers by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
137	151

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Many parents are hesitant to register as parent volunteers as they have limited knowledge and understanding of the curriculum.	1.1. Provide a Community Involvement Specialist to plan and deliver monthly workshops to empower parents with the skills needed to assist their child as well as teachers and students in the classroom. Conduct "town hall" or community meetings, at day and evening hours with Power Point presentations on the School's progress and explain school test scores. Follow up with print version information for those who were unable to attend, and for those who want to review the information.	1.1. RtI Leadership Team Community Involvement Specialist	1.1. Review parent sign-in sheets at monthly meetings and the Community Involvement Specialist Log of contacts as well as the number of registered parent volunteers.	1.1. Parent Involvement Monthly School Report List of registered parent volunteers
	1.2. Parents have limited understanding of the many ways and opportunities to volunteer at the school. A parent volunteer	1.2. Provide a volunteer drive facilitated by the CIS to expedite and streamline the application process and to promote volunteer	1.2. RtI Leadership Team Community Involvement Specialist	1.2. Review sign-in sheets to see the number of parents attending this workshop and the correlation between improved student	1.2. Sign-in sheets

| 2 | drive to motivate parent participation and facilitate (expedite and streamline) the application process is needed. | opportunities at the school. Share all the volunteer activities available on a quarterly basis. Vary the time of workshops to include day and evening hours and provide incentives for attending. | | achievement. | |
| 3 | 1.3. Many parents have a difficult time communicating with teachers on an ongoing basis regarding academics and behavior. | 1.3. All students will be provided with a home learning log to use as a home to school communication tool. | 1.3. RtI Leadership Team Community Involvement Specialist | 1.3. Administrators will review the home learning logs and determine if Home Learning and Teacher/Parent Communication is taking place. | 1.3. Home Learning Logs |

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
Reading, Mathematics, Writing, and Science	K-7	Leadership Team	Parents	October 2012, November 2012, December 2012, January 2013	Review sign-in sheets	RtI Leadership Team
Understanding Data	K-7	Leadership Team	Parents	October 2012	Review sign-in sheets	RtI Leadership Team

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parental Involvement Goal 1	Parent Incentives for attending workshops	Title 1	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement Goal 1	Community Involvement Specialist	Title	$24,192.00
			Subtotal: $24,192.00
			Grand Total: $24,692.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students participating in a school wide Science Fair.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students lack sufficient exposure to focused and rigorous instruction.	1.1. Conduct scientific investigations following the scientific method. Model all the steps involved in creating a science project. Provide students with opportunities to use collaborative strategies to complete a science project. Supplement classroom instruction with Gizmos and Discovery Fun-damentals.	1.1. Administrative Team, Science Coach and teachers	1.1. Classroom observations, review of student interactive science journals and science projects.	1.1. Formative: Student Science Fair projects and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment
2	1.2. Inconsistent integration of the STEM practices in the classroom.	1.2. Science Coach will provide coaching cycles related to integrating STEM practices in the classroom.	1.2. Administrative Team, Science Coach and teachers	1.2. Classroom observations and review of the student interactive science journals.	1.2. Formative: Student Science Fair projects and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Projects	Grades K-7	Science Coach	Grade K – 7 Teachers	October 2012	Administration and Science Coach will observe through classroom instruction. Additional training will be provided to those in need.	Administration Science Coach

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)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE CTE 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						

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Goal 2	Literature Books	School Budget	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Parental Involvement Goal 1	Parent Incentives for attending workshops	Title 1	$500.00
				Subtotal: $1,500.00
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
Reading	Reading Goal 1, 2, and 3	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$5,000.00
Mathematics	Mathematics Goal 1, 2, and 3	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$5,000.00
Science	Science Goal 2	Stipends for Training Sessions	School Improvement Grant Funds	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $11,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Goal 4	After School Tutoring	School Improvement Grant Fund	$32,000.00
Reading	Reading Goal 4 and 5	Interventions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$25,000.00
Reading	Reading Goal 1, 2, and 3	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$17,000.00
Mathematics	Mathematics Goal 4	After School Tutoring	School Improvement Grant Fund	$32,000.00
Mathematics	Mathematics Goal 4 and 5	Interventions	School Improvement Grant Fund	$25,000.00
Mathematics	Mathematics Goal 1, 2, and 3	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$16,000.00
Science	Science Goal 1	Pre-opening of School Curriculum Planning	School Improvement Grant Fund	$16,000.00
Science	Science Goal 2	Science Journals (100 sewn pages notebooks)	School Improvement Grant Fund	$1,000.00
Writing	Writing Goal 1	Small Group Pull-Out Sessions for Students	School Improvement Grant Funds	$25,000.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Involvement Goal 1	Community Involvement Specialist	Title	$24,192.00
				Subtotal: $213,192.00
				Grand Total: $225,692.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA	

Are you a reward school: jn Yes   jn No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Curricular Initiatives (Literacy Night)	$250.00
Rewards and Incentives for students and teachers	$500.00
Positive Behavior Support (School safety and discipline)	$300.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of North County K-8 Center. The SAC is instrumental with its assistance in providing suggestions and feedback throughout the development of the SIP, reviewing progress monitoring data of SIP goals, providing monies to purchase incentive items for students, reviewing school needs in the area of personnel, assisting in the fostering of community partnerships that enhance curricular initiatives, and in making recommendations that enhance school safety and discipline.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	49%	64%	88%	27%	228	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	51%	62%			113	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	60% (YES)			121	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					462	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
NORTH COUNTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	38%	46%	77%	16%	177	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	42%	58%			100	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	53% (YES)	77% (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					407	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested