FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: COTEE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Pasco

Principal: Lou Cerreta

SAC Chair: Debra Medina

Superintendent: Heather Fiorentino

Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/17/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Lou Cerreta	Master's Degree Educational Leadership, Bachelor's Degree Elementary Education 1-6, ESOL Endorsement, Gifted Certification	1	17	2011-2012 School Grade B; AYP: No 2010-2011 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2009-2010 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2008-2009 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2007-2008 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2006-2007 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2005-2006 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2004-2005 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2003-2004 School Grade A; AYP: Yes 2002-2003 School Grade A; AYP: Yes
Assis Principal	Rebecca Younglove	Master's Degree Educational Leadership Bachelor's Degree Elementary Education K-6	3	3	2011-2012 School Grade: B; AYP: No 2010-2011 School Grade: A; AYP: No 2009-2010 School Grade: B; AYP: No 2008-2009 N/A Out of State 2007-2008 School Grade: A; AYP: No

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of

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

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)
Literacy	Kathleen Muir	Masters Degree in Reading Education, Bachelors Degree in K12 Education (K-6) and Reading Endorsement, K-12 Varied Exceptionalities		1	

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. Job embedded professional development (PLC by grade level)	Administration, School-based Coaches, District Office	On-going	
2	2. Pre-planning orientation for new teachers and staff new to the school.	Administration, Office, Social Committee	On-going	
3	3. All new teachers (to the profession and to the school) are assigned a “building buddy” to assist with understanding and procedures. In addition, mentors are assigned to all who meet criteria established by the district. These mentors have received clinical educator training to provide this level of support and meet weekly for at least an hour with their mentee.	Administration, Mentors, District Office	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
4	Enrolling in ESOL classes this year towards endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
44	0.0%(0)	20.5%(9)	54.5%(24)	25.0%(11)	29.5%(13)	100.0%(44)	6.8%(3)	0.0%(0)	31.8%(14)

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
Laurel James	Jennifer Gula	Same grade level/previous mentoring experience, leadership experience	Mentoring meetings, co-planning, peer observations
Gabriela Perico	Stephanie Shihadeh	Same grade level/team	Mentoring meetings, co-planning, peer observations
Janice Failla	Stephanie Shihadeh	Same grade level/team	Mentoring meetings, co-planning, peer observations
Diane Johnson	Sharon Uhr	Same grade level/team, leadership experience	Mentoring meetings, co-planning, peer observations
Jennifer McFarland	Kara Owen	Previous experience as intervention support, leadership experiences	Mentoring meetings, co-planning
Kathleen Muir	Kara Owen	Leadership experience	Mentoring meetings
Shelby Earle	Anthony Terranova	Same grade level/team, leadership experience	Mentoring meetings, co-planning, peer observations
Jennifer Hoffman	Jill Tracy	Media/technology team	Mentoring meetings, co-planning
Phyllis Khorsandian	Kimberly Bachmann	ESE experience	Mentoring meetings, co-planning
Michelle Virata	Phyllis Khorsandian	SLP experience	Mentoring meetings, co-planning

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I funds will be used to provide professional development to both teachers and administrators in targeted areas as identified by student achievement data analysis.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide additional summer programs for academically at-risk students (level 1 on FCAT).

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Cotee River Elementary offers breakfast for all students free of charge.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

As a Professional Learning Community, Cotee River Elementary School staff share the responsibility for continually increasing student achievement. Cotee River's MTSS Leadership (CORE) Team members include: Principal, Assistant Principal, Basic Education Teacher, Intervention Teachers, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, Behavior Specialist, Speech/Language Pathologist, and two Guidance Counselors.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least once a month to focus on current reality of beliefs/understanding among staff and plan for how to build consensus for understanding and capacity for problem solving. The team will utilize staff survey data results from the previous year to establish current beliefs and understandings. This information will be used, along with areas of identified targeted need based on observation/analysis of SBIT discussions, to create an action plan for staff development. This plan will include the presentation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 data to show identified areas of need across grade levels and subject areas. The members of the MTSS Leadership Team will assist with weekly grade level meetings aimed at increasing the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction through core best practices, differentiated instruction, and small group problem solving based on student trend data. Members of the Leadership Team will also participate in our SBIT (School Based Intervention Team) meetings weekly to facilitate problem solving of individual student concerns. The Leadership Team and teachers at CRES will work collaboratively with parents and community members to achieve high levels of learning gains for all students.

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 problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP.
The school-based MTSS Leadership Team reviews all school-wide data (academic, behavioral, demographic subgroups) to determine areas of focus for the SIP. The Leadership Team will analyze data from end of the year grade level meetings. Based on this data analysis, recommendations for tiered support will be put into place for each team. The school's

intervention team will collaborate with grade level teams and the MTSS Leadership Team to establish targeted plans, progress monitoring support, and follow up on intervention fidelity. In addition the Leadership team is challenged with providing professional development to the staff focusing on team level (tiers 1 and 2) problem solving prior to SBIT referral. Each grade level will be assigned a member of the MTSS Leadership Team as a liaison to answer questions, assist with graphing data, and support as needed. All of these pieces incorporate the common threads of the SIP (common grade level expectations, collaborate planning and data analysis, more frequent progress monitoring of learning).

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.

The MTSS Leadership Team will analyze current data throughout the year, but minimally each quarter, to include the following data sources:
-Baseline data: PMRN (FAIR and FLKRS), FCAT, Running Records, Core K12 Assessments (math and science), teacher created grade level common assessments, math pre/post tests.
-Mid-year data: PMRN, Running Records, MMH Unit Assessments (core reading program), Core K12 Assessments (math and science), teacher created grade level common formative assessments, math pre/post tests.
-End of year data: PMRN, Running Records, MMH Unit Assessments (core reading program), Core K12 Assessments (math and science), teacher created grade level common formative assessments, FCAT, SAT 10, math pre/post tests.
-Frequency of data chats: grade level groups will meet weekly to discuss evidence of student learning and plan for instruction based on data analysis/student needs. Half day data analysis/curriculum planning sessions will occur with grade level groups twice.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The leadership team will prioritize targeted areas for staff professional development and create an action plan for the year. The team will continue to build consensus with the staff on implementation of MTSS as members of a collaborative unit in a professional learning community. MTSS principles and beliefs are reflected within the school's values, mission, and vision. Monthly staff development will be planned and implemented by the Leadership Team (aligned with action plan). Data on tier I and tier II instruction will be used to facilitate conversations on the problem solving process. The emphasis for small group problem solving prior to individual problem solving will be modeled through these meetings and a focus during PLC grade level discussions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

A comprehensive approach to intervention planning was used to develop targeted tiers of support for students who are not meeting standards. Through this approach, all students, regardless of label, are included in the level of support they need based on individualized data analysis. The MTSS Leadership Team meets monthly to review progress monitoring data on students receiving intervention support. This analysis of data will be prepared to share with the entire faculty as a means of quarterly progress monitoring of the SIP. In addition, this data will also be discussed in grade level PLC meetings to assist in the problem solving process. Based on this analysis of data, resources will be allocated where student needs are the greatest.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Cotee River's school-based Literacy Leadership Team members include: Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, two primary teachers, two intermediate teacher, and one RtI intervention teacher.

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

The CRES school-based LLT will serve as change agents and facilitators of learning within the school. The team will examine SIP goals and establish how data collection will occur and be analyzed to specifically address tier I needs across the school. After data has been analyzed from grade level assessments and walkthroughs, the LLT will prioritize areas of strength and weakness to share with the staff and develop professional development to support needs.

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

Building background knowledge and understanding surrounding the Common Core Standards initiative. The LLT will build knowledge and skills to help facilitate professional development conversations with all staff.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/10/2012)

*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.

At Cotee River Elementary School, we offer an early registration date both during the day and in the evening. At this time we screen all incoming students on kindergarten readiness skills. Parents receive information regarding school programs and ways to help their child at home prior to starting the school year. In addition, CRES offers a Kindergarten Kick-start Camp where incoming students are able to experience many of the daily activities from kindergarten while they are the only students on campus. Students become familiar with arrival and departure, cafeteria procedures, fire drills, circle time, calendar time, and center/small group activities.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students achieving a level 3 on the FCAT will increase from 53% to 58%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%	58%

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 learning goals are not always clear to the teacher or the students.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to deepen their knowledge of student learning goals.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review of walkthrough tools and data collected by LLT.	Walkthrough tool designed by the LLT based on school needs.
2	Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review of unit assessment data.	Student or teacher created charts or graphs.
3	Tier One instruction lacks depth and application across content areas.	Teaching teams will collaborate to examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities to deepen student understanding based on unit assessment data.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review of unit assessment data; teacher reflections.	Unit assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring a level 4 or above will increase from 23% to 28%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23%	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	Time for grade level teams to plan for differentiated instruction.	Teaching teams will examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities to differentiate instruction to meet different learning styles.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Literacy Scans, lesson plans, PLC discussions	Literacy Scans, 5x5's, FAIR, Core Curriculum assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 58% to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%	68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review of unit assessment data	Student or teacher created charts or graphs, teacher reflection
2	Time for grade level teams to plan for differentiated instruction.	Grade level teams will examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities to differentiate instruction to meet different learning styles.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Literacy Scans, lesson plans, PLC discussions	Literacy Scans, 5x5's, FAIR, Core Curriculum assessment data

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 65% to 70%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65%	70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who are below grade level standards require increasing levels of support.	During PLC and data analysis meetings, teaching teams will use the problem solving process to develop intensified instruction and/or intervention based on progress monitoring data.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review intervention plans (small group and individual) with grade level teams quarterly.	Intervention observation data, TBIT intervention plans.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : To reduce the number of students scoring a level 1 or level 2 in reading by 23%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	45%	40%	35%	30%	25%	

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the white subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from ___ to ___.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (data needed)	0% (data needed)

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	Tier One instruction lacks depth and application across content areas.	Teaching teams will collaborate to examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities to deepen student understanding based on unit assessment data.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Literacy Scans, lesson plans, PLC discussions	Literacy Scans, 5x5's, FAIR, Core Curriculum assessment data.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from 52% to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52%	57%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Review of unit assessment data	Student or teacher created charts or graphs, teacher reflection

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from __% to ___%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (data needed)	0% (data needed)

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 learning goals are not always clear to the teacher or the students.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to deepen their knowledge of student learning goals.	Teachers, Literacy Coach, Lead Literacy Team, Administration	Literacy Scans, lesson plans, PLC discussions	Literacy Scans, 5x5's, FAIR, Core Curriculum assessment data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Running Record Update Training	K-5	Kathleen Muir	K-5 and all interventionists and ESE teachers	August 2012	Grade Level PLC discussions to compare scoring on running records	Administration, Literacy Coach
Grade Level PLC Meetings	K-5	Administration/ PLC Facilitators (Teacher Leader)	K-5	At least twice monthly for 1.5 hours in length	Walk-through observation data, lesson plan documentation, data chats with administration (quarterly)	Administration
K12 Literacy Meetings-Common Core Standards	K-5 and self contained ESE	Kathleen Muir, Rebecca Younglove	K-5 and all interventionists and ESE teachers	Weekly on Wednesday and Thursday mornings	Walk-through observation data, grade level PLC planning discussions	Administration, Lead Literacy Team

Reading Budget:

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring a level 3 in mathematics will increase from 44% to 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%	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	Pre-test data is not analyzed to inform grouping/instructional planning on a consistent basis across all grade levels.	Teaching teams will administer a pre-test for each unit and plan instruction together based on spreadsheet data analysis using the planning graphic organizer.	Teachers, administration	Analysis of data by grade level teams, teacher reflection/dialogue on impact of instructional strategies on evidence of student learning.	Quarterly data chats with administration
2	Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Administration	Pre/post test and Core K12 data will be analyzed, increased student engagement in math instruction as observed through math walkthroughs.	Student or teacher created charts or graphs, teacher reflection. Quarterly data chats with administration.
3	Lack of opportunity to summarize learning- both verbally and in written form.	Teaching teams will examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities for students to summarize learning.	Teachers, Administration	Analysis of pre/post test data as well as Core K12 data walkthrough observations show evidence of summarization.	Pre/post test spreadsheet, Core K12 data, Walkthrough observation data.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) in mathematics will increase from 9% to 14%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9%	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
1	Differentiated instruction extending student learning to higher application levels.	Teaching teams will collaborate to create differentiated extension activities for students who show high levels of prerequisite skills on pre-tests and Core K12 assessments.	Teachers, Administration	Evidence of differentiated activities in lesson plans, walk-through observations reflect higher level differentiated activities in centers.	Lesson plans, walk-through observation data by grade level, grade level reflection during PLC meetings.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will increase from 58% to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%	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	Students have various learning styles/needs.	Teaching teams will collaborate to plan and implement differentiated instructional strategies to support various learning styles and needs.	Teachers and administration	Lesson plans will show evidence of differentiated strategies, walk-through data will be analyzed by grade level to provide feedback to teams on progress towards goal.	Lesson plans, walk-through data by grade level, quarterly data chats with administration.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics will increase from 67% to 72%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%	72%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Administration, Math Committee	Pre/post test and Core K12 data will be analyzed, increased student engagement in math instruction as observed through math walk-throughs.	Pre/post test spreadsheets, Core K12 data, walk-through data.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A : To reduce the number of students scoring a level 1 or level 2 in math by 27%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54%	49%	44%	39%	33%	

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the white subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from 58% to 63%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%	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	White/ Hispanic: Students are not aware of learning goals and their progress towards achievement.	Teaching teams will collaborate as a PLC group to establish how students can track their own progress towards learning goals.	Teachers, Administration, Math Committee	Pre/post test and Core K12 data will be analyzed, increased student engagement in math instruction as observed through math walk-throughs.	Pre/post test spreadsheets, Core K12 data, walk-through data.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from 52% to 57%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52%	57%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Pre-test data is not analyzed to inform grouping/instructional planning on a consistent basis across all grade levels.	Teaching teams will administer a pre-test for each unit and plan instruction together using various instructional models depending on student needs (whole group, small group, center practice).	Teachers, Administration	Analysis of data by grade level teams, teacher reflection/dialogue on impact of instructional strategies on evidence of student learning.	Pre/post test spreadsheet data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieving a level 3 or higher will increase from ___% to ___%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (need data)	0% (need data)

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
	Pre-test data is not analyzed to inform grouping/instructional planning on a consistent	Teaching teams will administer a pre-test for each unit and plan instruction together using	Teachers, Administration	Analysis of data by grade level teams, teacher reflection/dialogue on impact of instructional	Pre/post test spreadsheet data

1	basis across all grade levels.	various instructional models depending on student needs (whole group, small group, center practice).		strategies on evidence of student learning.	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC Grade Level Meetings	K-5	Administration, PLC Facilitators (Teacher Leader)	K-5 Teachers	bi-weekly	Walk-through observational data, pre/post spreadsheet data analysis, Core K12 data analysis, quarterly data chats with administration.	Administration
Data Based Instructional Planning Training (spreadsheet)	K-5	District Office Data Coach	K-5 Teachers	September 2012	Lesson planning using graphic organizer, evidence of differentiated instruction in walk-through observational data.	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teaching teams will collaborate to plan and implement differentiated instructional strategies to support various learning styles and needs.	First in Math (computer based program)	Internal Funds	$3,500.00
			Subtotal: $3,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teaching teams will collaborate to plan and implement differentiated instructional strategies to support various learning styles and needs.	Laptop computers	Title 1	$21,000.00
			Subtotal: $21,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teaching teams will administer a pre-test for each unit and plan instruction together using various instructional models depending on student needs (whole group, small group, center practice).	Substitutes for PLC data analysis/planning meetings	Title 1	$9,000.00
			Subtotal: $9,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $33,500.00

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring a level 3 in science will increase from 37% to 42%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%	42%

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	Integration of content area concepts into reading/writing processes is limited.	Teaching teams will examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and identify where science concepts can be connected to reading and writing processes.	Teachers, Administration, Science Committee	Grade level meeting discussions, Evidence collected through walk-through observational data, Lesson plans reflect integration activities.	Walk-through data, Core K-12 assessment data.
2	Lack of opportunity to summarize learning-both verbally and in written form.	Teaching teams will examine units of instruction within the core curriculum and plan for opportunities for students to summarize learning.	Teachers, Administration, Science Committee	Meeting discussions (reflection/refining process), Evidence collected through walk-through observational data; Lesson plans reflect summarization activities.	Walk-through observational data by grade level, Lesson plans.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring at a level above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) will increase from 3% to 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3%	10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need increased opportunities to extend thinking and learning.	Teaching teams will plan for units of instruction to extend thinking through cooperative learning and inquiry based processes.	Teachers, Administration, Science Committee	Meeting discussions (reflection/refining process), Evidence collected through walk-through observational data.	Walk-through observational data by grade level, Lesson plans.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus	Grade Level / Subject	PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Follow up-Professional Development on Science NotBOKs	K-5	District (Science)	K-5	After school training	Evidence collected through walk-through observational data and PLC discussions.	Administration, Teachers, Science Committee
PLC Meetings	K-5	Administration and PLC Facilitators	K-5	Bi-weekly for 1.5 hours	Meeting discussions (reflection/refining process), evidence collected through walk-through observations and lesson plans.	Administration, Teachers, PLC Facilitators

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
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 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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students scoring a level 4.0 or higher in writing will increase in writing from 72% to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%	77%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need clear objectives and high quality feedback to improve their writing skills.	Teachers will provide students with clear learning objectives for writing and use student conferencing to provide high quality feedback.	Teachers and Administration	PLC meeting discussions to identify clear learning objectives, Walk-through observation results analyzed and shared by grade level.	Walk-through observational data lesson plans.
2	Writing processes need to be integrated across all curriculum areas.	Teachers will utilize writing journals and writing to summarize daily in various content areas.	Teachers and Administration	PLC meeting discussions to monitor progress and plan for integration, Walk-through observation results analyzed and shared by grade level.	Walkthrough data, 5x5 data, lesson plans.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing across the Curriculum	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide	Monthly	Analysis and discussion of student writing samples (vertical)at least bi-monthly.	Administration, Teachers, Literacy 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
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	By June 2012, the percent of students with excessive absences and tardiness will decrease 10%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
241	217
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
18	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
	There is a lack of consistency in following the attendance flowchart, which details steps to follow when a	Teachers will be provided with a current copy of the attendance flowchart. Part of the quarterly data analysis	Teachers, Administration, School Social Worker	Quarterly analysis of attendance data by administration/ school social worker. Those students who have	TERMS Reports of attendance data

1	child has excessive absences or tardiness.	discussion will focus on any student on the grade level who has excessive tardiness or absences and where the teacher is on the flowchart of notification.		excessive tardiness/absences will be discussed during data chats and support will be provided to increase the child's attendance.	
2	Students lack a connection between school attendance and achieving success in school.	During quarterly awards assemblies, students with perfect attendance and no more than one early release/tardy will be awarded the "Lightning Learner" award.	Teachers, Administration, School Social Worker	Quarterly analysis of attendance by administration/school social worker.	TERMS Reports of attendance data

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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
Mathematics	Teaching teams will collaborate to plan and implement differentiated instructional strategies to support various learning styles and needs.	First in Math (computer based program)	Internal Funds	$3,500.00
				Subtotal: $3,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Teaching teams will collaborate to plan and implement differentiated instructional strategies to support various learning styles and needs.	Laptop computers	Title 1	$21,000.00
				Subtotal: $21,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Teaching teams will administer a pre-test for each unit and plan instruction together using various instructional models depending on student needs (whole group, small group, center practice).	Substitutes for PLC data analysis/planning meetings	Title 1	$9,000.00
				Subtotal: $9,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $33,500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	● Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/17/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The Cotee River Elementary School Advisory Council meets monthly and will be involved in the following activities in order to help increase and/or maintain student performance:
1. SIP development, review, implementation, and revision
2. Assessment results review (at least 3 times a year)
3. Parent Survey
4. Parent Involvement

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

Pasco School District
COTEE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	60%	79%	51%	258	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	67%	68%			135	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	78% (YES)			136	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					529	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Pasco School District
COTEE RIVER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	65%	81%	48%	269	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	66%	66%			132	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?	60% (YES)	60% (YES)			120	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					521	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested