

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SKYLINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Charles Vilardi

SAC Chair: Gail Lewis

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/10/2012

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)
Assis Principal	Christopher Cann			4	Assistant Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2012-13.
					Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2012-13. Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2011-12. Grade: B Reading Mastery: 58% Math Mastery: 56% Science Mastery: 38% Writing Mastery: 80% Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2010-11. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 67% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: White, Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE did not meet AYP in Reading Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2009-10.

Principal	Charles Vilardi		6	12	<p>Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 48% Writing Mastery: 94% AYP: White, Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE did not meet AYP in Reading Principal of Skyline Elementary in 2008-09.</p> <p>Grade: A Reading Mastery: 80% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 50% Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. ESE did not meet AYP in Reading 2007-08: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 82% Math Mastery: 78% Science Mastery: 46% Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: Skyline made AYP through Safe Harbor 2006-07: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 46% Writing Mastery: 76%</p>
-----------	-----------------	--	---	----	--

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	Melinda Nelson	MS: Curriculum	4	4	<p>Skyline Elementary in 2012-13. Skyline Elementary in 2011-12. Grade: B Reading Mastery: 58% Math Mastery: 56% Science Mastery: 38% Writing Mastery: 80% Skyline Elementary in 2010-11. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 67% Science Mastery: 47% Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: White, Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE did not meet AYP in Reading Skyline Elementary in 2009-10. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 48% Writing Mastery: 94% AYP: White, Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE did not meet AYP in Reading Skyline Elementary in 2008-09. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 80% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 50% Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: Hispanic, ESE, and Economically disadvantaged did not meet AYP in Math. ESE did not meet AYP in Reading 2007-08: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 82% Math Mastery: 78%</p>

				Science Mastery: 46% Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: Skyline made AYP through Safe Harbor 2006-07: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 46% Writing Mastery: 76%
--	--	--	--	---

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	3. Faculty will participate in professional development to meet district, state and federal requirements in regards to certification renewal.	Charles Vilardi	On-going	
2	1.Regular meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	Christopher Cann	On-going	
3	2. Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff.	Christopher Cann	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

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
67	3.0%(2)	13.4%(9)	47.8%(32)	35.8%(24)	32.8%(22)	85.1%(57)	9.0%(6)	4.5%(3)	70.1%(47)

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
Kimberly Cross	Justin Ashley	New to Skyline	Weekly meetings, feedback, shared 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, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title I coordinates with other programs funded under NCLB through the SIP (School Improvement Plan) process. Within this plan, schools complete a Professional Development Plan in collaboration with Title II. The PDP is concentrated in reading, math, science and writing to meet the needs of the targeted subgroups not making AYP. The PDP includes teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators. As part of the School Advisory Council, parents are included in this planning process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. This collaboration ensures that all programs funded under NCLB use funds to support schools, not supplant district obligations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effectiveness. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between agencies. Each school's SIP is reviewed by all stakeholders and submitted to the Board for approval. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Title III

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title III to expand academic enrichment opportunities for ELLs. These services include after school tutorials, professional development, supplemental scientifically research based resources and materials. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Title X- Homeless

Title X coordinates with Title I, Part A, to provide comparable services to homeless children who are not attending Title I schools. By providing ongoing collaboration between Title X and Title I, Part A, program staff, the same services for homeless students in non Title I schools are provided to homeless students in Title I schools. In addition to serving homeless students not enrolled in Title I schools, set-aside funds are used to provide services to homeless students who are attending Title I schools. Homeless students who attend Title I school-wide or targeted assistance schools may have unique challenges that are not addressed by the regular Title I program at these schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions may not have a quiet place to study at the end of the day and may require extended after-school library time; tutoring and/or accessibility to tutoring as needed, school supplies, expedited evaluations, extended days/ learning opportunities, Saturday schools, summer academic camps, coordination of services with shelters or other homeless service providers, or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services. Through Title I, Part A, or Title I, Part A, in conjunction with Title X, McKinney-Vento funding homeless students can take part in services that enable them to benefit more from a school's Title I program.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI is used to provide unique learning programs at schools. SAI funds are also used to fund summer school programs throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs

Violence Prevention Programs

The Youth Coalitions within Lee County provide opportunities for partnerships between the District and other social services. These social services assist all at-risk students through after-school programs that include academic, social, and health services. Anticipated outcomes include a safe environment for children and increased academic achievement. Bullying prevention programs are offered throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs. Title X coordinates with Title I, Part A, to provide comparable services to homeless children who are not attending Title I schools. By providing ongoing collaboration between Title X and Title I, Part A, program staff, the same services for homeless students in non Title I schools are provided to homeless students in Title I schools. In addition to serving homeless students not enrolled in Title I schools, set-aside funds are used to provide services to homeless students who are attending Title I schools. Homeless students who attend Title I school-wide or targeted assistance schools may have unique challenges that are not addressed by the regular

Title I program at these schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions may not have a quiet place to study at the end of the day and may require extended after-school library time; tutoring and/or accessibility to tutoring as needed, school supplies, expedited evaluations, extended days/ learning opportunities, Saturday schools, summer academic camps, coordination of services with shelters or other homeless service providers, or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services. Through Title I, Part A, or Title I, Part A, in conjunction with Title X, McKinney-Vento funding homeless students can take part in services that enable them to benefit more from a school's Title I program.

Nutrition Programs

Food and Nutrition Services offers healthy meals to all students. This includes ensuring that families are offered free and reduced lunch applications throughout the year as well as free breakfast for all students. Skyline Elementary has also developed "Backpack Programs" in which nutritious food is sent home in a backpack each weekend to struggling families to ensure that children and families have food throughout the week. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Activities with Early Childhood include one blended VPK/Title I classroom for four-year olds. This is a voluntary program that identifies high-risk students to receive a full year of educational opportunities. The benefits for students include readiness for Kindergarten and focusing on building literacy for early reading skills. The expected outcome is for the four-year old who participates in the programs to be able to perform at the readiness level in all areas of the kindergarten readiness screening. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Adult Education

Adult Education partners with several Title I schools to offer ESOL classes for parents to learn English. Adult Education partners with Title I, Part A to offer paraprofessional classes to prepare paraprofessionals to take the qualifying test, Paraprofessionals. Adult Education instructors review reading, math and writing skills, as well as test administration. Title I paraprofessionals benefit by becoming highly qualified as defined by NCLB. The benefit of these classes is to help the monolingual parents learn English so that they can become more self-sufficient. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff.

The MTSS Leadership Team for Skyline Elementary consists of the following members:

List member names and titles:

Chuck Vilardi- Principal

Christopher Cann- AP

Nancy Afflerbach- Guidance Counselor

Mendy Nelson- Reading Specialist

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 at Skyline meets on a as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's MTSS Manual. The roles of each member are as follows: Choose appropriate members and roles below; and add any additional roles/responsibilities each may have.

Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, SAT 10 or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Implement Tier 2 & 3 interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotes of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings for some Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with Tier 2 & 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

Principal/Assistant Principal

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

Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- Often MTSS Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary MTSS forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

School Psychologist

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

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments

Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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

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

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.

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the MTSS process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The team will conference with the parents to discuss interventions that have taken place, data that has been collected, academic results, and areas of concern.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Reading Leadership Committee – Mendy Nelson - Chairperson

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

The RLC holds monthly meetings to discuss and address reading concerns, issues, or new implementations at the school level.
Each grade level has a representative that relays information to their team members.

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

Common Core Standards will be fully implemented in grades K-1 following the district's academic plan. All teachers will receive training in Common Core Standards and PARCC.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Reading will increase from 30% to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% at Achievement Level 3 in reading.	33% at Achievement Level 3 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Reading will increase from 29% to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4.	35% Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 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	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmilian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmilian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students making learning gains in Reading will increase from 67% to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% Students making learning gains in reading.	70% Students making learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data Learning In Me & Common Core training, analysis meetings,	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 71% to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% Students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	73% Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
#	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classrom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

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

	Reading Goal #
--	----------------

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

Skyline Elementary School will reduce their achievement gap in reading from ___% to ___% over a six year period, which will be a 50% reduction over 6 years.

5A :

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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient for the Hispanic subgroup will increase from 59% to 62% as measured by the FCAT. In 2011-2012, Skyline had 60% of White students at proficiency level for reading. In 2012-2013, the percent proficient for the White subgroup will increase to 63% as measured by FCAT.
---	--

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

White: 60% Black: Hispanic: 59% Asian: American Indian:	White: 63% Black: Hispanic: 62% Asian: American Indian:
---	---

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, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assesments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in reading for the ELL subgroup will increase from 14% to 21% as measured by the FCAT.
---	---

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

14% ELL not making satisfactory progress in reading	21% ELL not making satisfactory progress 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
	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention,	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring,	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA

1		monthly data analysis meetings, SIOP Model, ESOL classroom support, Learning In Me & Common Core training		ESOL LEP meetings	Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, CELLA, LAB tests
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, SIOP Model, ESOL classroom support, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring, ESOL LEP meetings	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, CELLA, LAB tes

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in reading for the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase from 29% to 35% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% SWD not making satisfactory progress in reading	35% SWD not making satisfactory progress in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, IEP accommodations, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist, ESE teacher	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring, IEP meetings	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, IEP

2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, IEP accommodations, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist, ESE teacher	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring, IEP meetings	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assesments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, IEP
---	---	--	--	--	---

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in reading for the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will increase from 56% to 60% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	60% Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assesments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR

2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom walk throughs, Macmilian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR
---	---	--	---	--	--

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						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Leader In Me	Implementation Day	Title II money	\$5,023.00
Leader In Me	Booster Training	Free	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$5,023.00
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
Common Core Training	Training of Teachers	Free	\$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: \$5,023.00			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:		In the 2012-2013 school year, students in grades 3-5 taking CELLA will increase from 4% to 12% students scoring proficient in listening and speaking on CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
4% scoring proficient in listening/speaking in CELLA.					
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, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, SIOP Model, ESOL support, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring, ESOL LEP meetings	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assessments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, CELLA, LAB tests

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	In the 2012-2013 school year, students in grades 3-5

CELLA Goal #2: taking CELLA will increase from 20% to 27% students scoring proficient in listening and speaking on CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

20% scoring proficient in reading on CELLA.

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, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Grade level meetings, committee meetings, Coteach small groups reading intervention, monthly data analysis meetings, SLOP Model, ESOL classroom support, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Teacher, administration, reading specialist	Data analysis, instructional focus calendar, ongoing progress monitoring, ESOL LEP meetings	Classroom walk throughs, Macmillian Assesments, SRA Assessments, STAR, Fluency check outs, FAIR, CELLA, LAB tests

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

In the 2012-2013 school year, students in grades 3-5 taking CELLA will increase from 12% to 19% students scoring proficient in listening and speaking on CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

12% scoring proficient in writing on CELLA.

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 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	1.1. Monthly writing prompts, writing committee sharing best practices, follow academic plans, Training teachers to score prompts utilizing	1.1. Administration Grade Level Chair Person	1.1. Monthly prompts, data collection and analysis, ESOL LEP meetings	1.1. Monthly prompt score review, CELLA, LAB tests

		rubrics, SIOP strategies, Learning In Me & Common Core training		
--	--	---	--	--

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Math will increase from 29% to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Achievement Level 3 in Math 29%.	Achievement Level 3 in Math 33%.

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, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning
2	1.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	1.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan. Learning In Me & Common Core training	1.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	1.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	1.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs.
3	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

	meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training		
--	---	--	--

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Math will increase from 29% to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Achievement Level 4 and above in Math 29%.	Achievement Level 4 and above in Math 35%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

2	2.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	2.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan. Learning In Me & Common Core training	2.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	2.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	2.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs
3	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students making learning gains in Math will increase from 71% to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Learning gains in math 71%.	Learning gains in math 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	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

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:	In the 2012-2013 school year, the percent of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in math will increase from 70% to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% lowest 25% making learning gains in math.	73% lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

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, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning
---	---	---	---	--	---

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 # Skyline Elementary School will reduce their achievement gap from ___% to ___% over a six year period, which is a 50% reduction each year.				
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:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2011-2012, Skyline had 55% of Hispanic students at proficiency level for mathematics. In 2012-2013, the percent proficient for the Hispanic subgroup will increase to 59% as measured by FCAT. In 2011-2012, Skyline had 58% of White students at proficiency level for mathematics. In 2012-2013, the percent proficient for the White subgroup will increase to 62% as measured by FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 58%	White: 62%
Black:	Black:
Hispanic: 55%	Hispanic: 59%
Asian:	Asian:
American Indian:	American Indian:

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
	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically	Skyline will work with the district's math	Administration, teachers and	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle	Achievement Series, Fast Math,

1	Disadvantaged Students	coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	reading specialist	grades,and district assessments.	Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades,and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in math for the ELL subgroup will increase from 29% to 35% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% ELL not making satisfactory progress in math.	35% ELL not making satisfactory progress in math.

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
	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades,and district assessments.ESOL LEP meetings	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning,CELLA, LAB tests

1		meetings.SIOP Model,ESOL classroom support, Learning In Me & Common Core training			
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings.SIOP Model,ESOL classroom support, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades,and district assessments.ESOL LEP meetings	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning,CELLA, LAB tes

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in math for the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase from 27% to 33% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% SWD not making satisfactory progress in math	33% SWD not making satisfactory progress in math

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings, IEP accommodations, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist, ESE teacher	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments, IEP meetings	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning, IEP
2	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings, IEP accommodations, Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist, ESE teacher	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments, IEP meetings	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning, IEP

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:	In 2012-2013, the percent proficient in math for the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will increase from 52% to 56% as measured by the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics	56% Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers and provide alternate strategies. Teacher will meet administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Learning In Me & Common Core training	Administration, teachers and reading specialist	Monitoring formative assessments, Pinnacle grades, and district assessments.	Achievement Series, Fast Math, Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Compass Learning
2		5D.1. Skyline will work with the district's math coordinator to work with teachers, model lessons, and provide alternate strategies.	5D.1. Administration	5D.1. Monitoring formative assessments and district assessments	5D.1. District Common Course Assessments, Chapter Tests, Unit Tests, Fast Math

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Compass Learning	Compass Computer Program	Provided by District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		In 2010-2011, Skyline had 22% of students at level three on FCAT science. In 2012-2013, the total percent at level three on FCAT Science will increase to 29% as measured by the FCAT.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
22% Achievement Level 3 in science.		29% Achievement Level 3 in science.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	1.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan.	1.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	1.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	1.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs.

		Learning In Me & Common Core training			
2	1.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	1.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan. Learning In Me & Common Core training	1.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	1.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	1.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs

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.	In 2010-2011, Skyline had 26% of students at level four and above on FCAT science. In 2012-2013, the total percent at level four and above on FCAT Science will increase to 32% as measured by the FCAT.
Science Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.	32% at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	2.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan. Learning In Me & Common Core training	2.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	2.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	2.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs
2	2.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	2.1. Integrate science in reading and writing, using P-SELL, Measuring Up, Collaborate with Science Coordinator ESOL and ESE strategies will be used with these two subgroups. Teachers will meet with administration twice a month for data analysis meetings. Grades 3-5 will follow the science academic plan. Learning In Me & Common Core training	2.1. District P-SELL Science Coordinator, Administration, school science teacher, and teachers	2.1 Data collection and analysis from district pre and post tests, Pinnacle grades, P-SELL coaching.	2.1 District Assessments, common course exams, classroom walk throughs

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
P-SELL	5th Grade Science	District Science P-SELL Coordinator	Grade 5 teachers, School Science teacher	Twice a quarter beginning August 2012 through May 2013	Grade Level meetings and classrooms walk throughs	Administration and district science P-SELL coordinator

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
Atlas Implementation of Software related technologies	Aver + Smart Notebook Smart Response Systems	0.00	\$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:	In 2012-2013, the total percent of proficient students increase from 82% to 84% as measured by FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	84% scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Student attendance, ESOL, Economically Disadvantaged Students	1.1. Monthly writing prompts, writing committee sharing best practices, follow academic plans, Training teachers to score prompts utilizing rubrics, Learning In Me & Common Core training	1.1. Administration Grade Level Chair Person	1.1. Monthly prompts, data collection and analysis	1.1. Monthly prompt score review

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
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

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

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Suspension	
Suspension Goal #1:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		100% of Skyline Elementary parents will be notified of school-wide events. Skyline Elementary School's PTO for the 2012-2013 school year will increase attendance and participation to all events from 1.6%(2) members to at least 100%(4) members by the end of the school year.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
1.6% 2 PTO Members		100% 4 PTO members			
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 Bilingual Translator.	1.1. We will use Parent Link, school newsletters, and parent conferences to notify the parents of school wide events.	1.1. Jhonathan Taveras-technology, classroom teachers and administration	1.1. Parent Link reports, parents surveys, and parent conference forms	1.1. Survey results
2	Bilingual Translator.	We will use Parent Link, school newsletters, and parent conferences to notify the parents of	Administration	Attendance and participation.	Meeting Minute notes.

school wide events.

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

Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013, Skyline Elementary Anti-Bullying Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. 2012-2013, Skyline Elementary Anti-Bullying Goal Goal		For the 2012-2013 school year, Skyline Elementary School will maintain the 0% number of bullying incidents as measured by student referrals.			
2012-2013, Skyline Elementary Anti-Bullying Goal Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
0%		0%			
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	None at this time.	Over a 6 week period, the school guidance counselor will conduct lessons in bullying recognition and prevention with all students at Skyline Elementary School. Students in grade 4 will be instructed using the Kleist Health Education Bullying Program. If a student is identified as a bully at Skyline, the guidance counselor will have the student participate in a social skills training called the Bully Proof Kit.	administration, school guidance counselor	Anti-bullying pretest and posttest grade 5	student referral reports and anti-bullying pretest and posttest results

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of 2012-2013.Skyline Elementary Anti-Bullying Goal Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Leader In Me	Implementation Day	Title II money	\$5,023.00
Reading	Leader In Me	Booster Training	Free	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$5,023.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Atlas Implementation of Software related technologies	Aver + Smart Notebook Smart Response Systems	0.00	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Common Core Training	Training of Teachers	Free	\$0.00
Mathematics	Compass Learning	Compass Computer Program	Provided by District	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$5,023.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/6/2012)

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 SAC committee will review school FCAT data and goals for the upcoming school year. The SAC committee will support all staff members for the school-wide implementation of the 'Leader in Me' Training. This training includes implementing "The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People."

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District SKYLINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	76%	83%	53%	291	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	63%	64%			127	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?	56% (YES)	64% (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					538	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District SKYLINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	73%	85%	54%	289	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	65%	67%			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?	58% (YES)	74% (YES)			132	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					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested