FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: KENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Jeanethe D. Thompson

SAC Chair: Elizabeth Webster

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/30/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Jeanethe D. Thompson	Bachelor's in History, Long Island University; Masters in Philosophy and Social Sciences, Columbia University; Educational Specialist, Nova Southeastern University; Doctorate in Education, Florida Atlantic University; and Principal Certification, State of Florida	4	22	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A A A A NA* High Standards Rdg. 81 92 93 91 NA High Standards Math 78 93 86 89 NA Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 76 79 74 NA Lrng Gains-Math 85 74 60 71 NA Gains-Rdg-25% 70 70 75 58 NA Gains-Math-25% 80 67 65 80 NA *Assigned to District Office
		BS in Management, Bethune-Cookman			

					'12 '11 '10 '09 '08
Assis Principal	Velda C. Christmas	University, MS- Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University; Certification in Educational Leadership, Varying Exceptionalities, and Business Education	3	8	School Grade A A A A A High Standards Rdg. 81 92 93 91 83 High Standards Math 78 93 86 88 89 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 78 76 79 80 79 Lrng Gains-Math 85 74 60 72 72 Gains-Rdg-25% 70 70 75 81 85 Gains-Math-25% 80 67 65 64 85

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)

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	Schedule regular meetings of new teachers with Administration.	Principal	Ongoing/ June 2013	
2	Assign veteran teachers as "buddies" for new teachers.	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	Encourage current employees to submit referrals.	Principal	N/A	Install suggestion box in main office and provide frequent opportunities for staff input relating to school functions.

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
1- Out of field 0- Less than effective	Inform teacher of upcoming professional development opportunities and classes that will lead to her reaching highly effective status.

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
35	0.0%(0)	8.6%(3)	48.6%(17)	42.9%(15)	42.9%(15)	100.0%(35)	8.6%(3)	14.3%(5)	88.6%(31)

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
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS/RtI leadership team.
The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team at Kendale Elementary will include the personnel listed below for the reason(s) indicated.
Administrator(s) who will ensure that:
• Activities are in concert with the school's vision and mission
• Decision-making is data-driven
• The school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, including assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, implementation of intervention
support and documentation
• Provide professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation; and
• Communicate(s) with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.
Teachers and Coaches who will:
• Provide information about core instruction, collect student data, and support the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and
Tier 3 intervention plans
• Collaborate with other staff in the implementation of interventions and the delivery of instruction
• Conduct school wide screening programs and provide support for assessment and monitoring; and
• Participate in the design and delivery of professional development.
Additional Personnel who will provide support for intervention fidelity:
• School Site Administrators
• School Guidance Counselor
• School Psychologist
• School Social Worker
• Classroom Teacher as needed

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/RtI Team at Kendale Elementary will meet as needed to engage in the following activities:
• Evaluate pre-tests and other screening data and ensure that students are assigned to appropriate academic and behavior programs
• Monitor individual, class and grade level data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting standards.
• Identify professional development and resources as needed.
• Collaborate regularly in order to problem-solve, share best practices, evaluation implementation, and implement new processes and skills.
• Facilitate the process of building consensus and making decisions about curricular and other programs.

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/RtI Leadership Team met with the school's Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) and principal to help
develop the SIP as follows:
• Evaluated data pertaining to academic and social/emotional needs, including Tier 1, 2, and possible Tier 3 students
• Recommended action steps to meet SIP goals and student needs
• Set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship)

- Facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching

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.

- FAIR assessment
- CELLA
- Edusoft data
- Reading Plus
- Baseline, mid and post assessments
- STAR
- State/District Reading, Mathematics and Science assessments
- School grades and site-specific assessments
- FCAT
Behavior
- Student Services referrals
- Student Case Management System referrals
- Suspensions/alternatives to suspensions
- Climate surveys
- Positive People Program targeting behavior and attendance

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided for administrators and staff in MTSS/RtI problem-solving and data analysis process. Staff will enroll in district provided online training courses. Staff will be trained during Quality Improvement Team (QIT) monthly meetings and on Staff Development Wednesdays throughout the year. Vertical, horizontal articulation through feeder patterns will facilitate ongoing support. The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meetings

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration will conduct quarterly grade level data chats to discuss individual student progress. MTSS/RtI Leadership team will meet to monitor student progress to ensure students' success.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Jeanethe Thompson, Principal; Velda Christmas, Assistant principal; Yvette Brizuela, Intermediate Teacher; Elizabeth Webster, EESAC Chair; Greeidy Gonzalez, SPED Teacher; Gail Timmons, Primary Teacher; Jaime Romero, Intermediate Teacher; Mayra Brody, Gifted

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

The functions of the LLT will be to: 1) Hold meetings at convenient times as needed. 2) Participate in ongoing data analysis and progress monitoring. 3) Suggest intervention, enrichment, and incentive strategies. 4) Review supplemental resources. 5) Offer professional development as needed.

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

The major initiative of the LLT will be to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concerns across the school. The LLT will: 1) Ensure implementation of CRRP with fidelity, utilizing Houghton Mifflin, the Core Reading program. 2) Enhance school wide reading performance through the use of site and web-based programs such as: Reading Plus in grades 3-5, Ticket To Read in grades K-2, STAR/ AR in grades 1-5 3) Implement the Voyager Passport and SuccessMaker programs for struggling readers in grades K-5. 4) Provide enrichment through the use of Reading Plus and Accelerated Reader.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 26% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Level 3 by 3 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (65)	29% (71)

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	One area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 - Reading Application. Students may lack opportunities to work on key skills such as drawing conclusions, main idea, and using graphic organizers.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies based on fiction and informational texts that include making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of the common core standards, AR, Reading Plus and Guided Reading Groups.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators will review monthly Reading Plus usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Assessments, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	Another area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 3 – Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction Students lack exposure to fiction and non-fiction text.	Provide students with opportunities to read fiction and non-fiction books through the use of Accelerated Reader.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader, Nine week goal and make adjustments as necessary.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Assessments, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 53% of students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 & 5 by 1 percentage point to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (130)	54% (133)

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	One area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 2 - Reading Application. Students lack opportunities for enrichment.	Enrichment will be provided from informational text through the use of Reading Plus and grade specific real world documents such as Time for Kids and Story Works to identify key text features such as subtitles, headings, charts, and graphs.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators and Reading Coach will review monthly Reading Plus usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	Another area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Category 3 – Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction Students lack exposure to fiction and non-fiction text.	Provide students with opportunities to read fiction and non-fiction books through the use of Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader 9 week goal and make adjustments as necessary. Media Specialists will pull AR reports for administration to review.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 2.0 FCAT Reading Assessment

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

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

Reading Goal #2b:	

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 76% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 81%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (138)	81% (147)

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	In order to maintain and improve the percent of students making learning gains, fidelity to the Reading Intervention schedules must be consistent.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies that include making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker and Reading intervention classes.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators and Reading Coach will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus , and SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	One area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 3 – Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction- Students lack exposure to fiction and non-fiction material.	Provide students with opportunities to read fiction and non-fiction books through the use of Accelerated Reader.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader 9 week goal and make adjustments as necessary. Media Specialists will pull AR reports for administration to review.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, Accelerated Reader , SuccessMaker and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 70% in the Lowest 25% Subgroup made learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (32)	75% (34)

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 lack opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs. Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies with an emphasis on informational reading including: making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker prior to start of the school day.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
	One area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	Provide students with opportunities to read	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration,	Teachers will monitor Accelerated Reader 9	Formative: FAIR, District Interim

2	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Category 3 – Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction	fiction and non-fiction books through the use of Accelerated Reader.	Literacy Leadership Team	week goal and make adjustments as necessary. Media Specialists will pull AR reports for administration to review.	Exams, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	Identified students in the lower 25% need additional opportunities to reinforce their reading skills.	Provide a variety of instructional reading strategies through the use of the Voyager Intervention program.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	The Reading Coach will generate Voyager Program reports to monitor progress.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	82	83	85	87	88	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	During the 2012-2013 school year, the White subgroup will increase from 88%(36) to 96% (39) making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 88% (36)	White 96% (39)

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 lack opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs. Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies with an emphasis on informational reading including: making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators and Reading Coach will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

		summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker prior to start of the school day.			

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 55% of students in the ELL subgroup made learning gains.. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ELL subgroup making learning gains by 13 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (15)	68% (18)

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	Small group tutoring will be needed to assist in maintaining the performance of the students in the ELL subgroup.	Identify students in grades 3-5 and, based on instructional needs, provide academic support during the school day, as well as tutoring sessions.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	Students lack opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs. Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies with an emphasis on informational reading including: making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker prior to start of the school day.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 32% of students in the SWD subgroup made learning gains.. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the SWD subgroup making learning gains by 18 percentage points to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	32% (9)			50% (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	Small group tutoring will be needed to assist in maintaining the performance of the students in the SWD subgroup.	Identify students in grades 3-5 and, based on instructional needs, provide academic support during the school day, as well as tutoring sessions.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	Students lack opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs. Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day.	Provide a variety of instructional strategies with an emphasis on informational reading including: making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker prior to start of the school day.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administrators and Reading Coach will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 76% of students in the ED subgroup made learning gains.. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the ED subgroup making learning gains by 4 percentage points to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (93)	80% (98)

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	Small group tutoring will be needed to assist in maintaining the performance of the students in the ED subgroup.	Identify students in grades 3-5 and, based on instructional needs, provide academic support during the school day, as well as tutoring sessions.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to	Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, Accelerated Reader and Reading Plus Reports.

| 2 | Students lack opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs.
Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day. | Provide a variety of instructional strategies with an emphasis on informational reading including: making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text through the use of SuccessMaker prior to start of the school day. | MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team | Administrators will review monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made | Formative: FAIR, District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports.
Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |

(continued from previous row: differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data. | Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment)

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Plus	3-5	District, Region, Administration, and Teachers	Grades 3-5	October 12, 2012	Reading Plus usage and progress reports	Administration and Teachers
Common Core Work Shop	K-5	District	Grades K-5	September 22, 2012	Hands-on Activites	Administration and Teachers
SuccessMaker	3-5	District, Region, Administration, and Teachers	Grades 3-5	September 21, 2012	SuccessMaker usage and progress reports	Administration and Teachers

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
Ready to use Activities Work Shop	Enrichment for Reading	School based	$350.00
			Subtotal: $350.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Time For Kids	Weekly reader	School Funds	$450.00
Story Works	Monthly reader	School Funds	$700.00
Scholastic News	Bi-Weekly reader	School Funds	$450.00
Crunch Time Tutoring	Small group instruction	EESAC	$1,170.50
			Subtotal: $2,770.50
			Grand Total: $3,120.50

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
1	Student lack opportunities to present oral reports and practice key words and vocabulary.	Monitor and adapt speech to ELL students: Adapt speech to meet the students' level of understanding of English. Provide specific explanations of key words and vocabulary, using examples and nonlinguistic props when possible. Provide opportunities for students to speak and understand spoken English.	LEP Committee, Administration, Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	CELLA 2013 Test Results

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
1	Students not having opportunities to practice reading at home due to limited parental support and command of the English language. Students also have limited exposure to computer based programs.	Practice words by chanting and writing them. Maintain high-frequency word walls which students use often in writing and through the use of Successmaker. Use a variety of activities to provide enough practice so that words are read and spelled instantly and automatically.	LEP Committee, Administration, Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	CELLA 2013 Test Results

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
1	Students have limited opportunities on how to use key vocabulary and tier 2 words in the writing process	Emphasize key vocabulary in various context to the students. Expose ELL students to the meaning of basic words or key vocabulary along with providing sufficient review and reinforcement in the writing process.	LEP Committee, Administration, Literacy Team, MTSS/RtI Team	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	CELLA 2013 Test Results

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 28% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Level 3 by 1 percentage point to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (69)	29% (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	The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics in 3rd grade, and Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement in grade 4 and Reporting Category 1: Number: Base Ten and Fractions in Grade 5. Students have limited opportunities to use technology and manipulatives in math.	Provide students with a strong focus on developing critical skills for base ten and fractions and providing real world problems through SuccessMaker and the use of manipulatives.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Math Liaison	Administrators will review monthly Success Maker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made on all NGSSS being addressed in the pacing guides.	Formative: Go Math! Series Chapter Exams, District Interim Exams and Success Maker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, Pre, Mid, & Post Baseline Exam

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 49% of students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain or increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 & 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
49% (120)	49% (121)

| | 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	The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations, Problems, and Statistics in 3rd grade, and Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement in grade 4 and Reporting Category 1: Number: Base Ten and Fractions in Grade 5. Students have limited opportunities for enrichment.	Provide an opportunity for students to gain enrichment by engaging in mathematical discourse and problem solving activities through the use of cooperative student learning teams using the Share and Show section of each lesson in the Go Math! Series and an opportunity to participate in a School Based Math Bowl that will be held twice a year.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Math Liaison	Provide time during department/grade level meetings to share best practices and reflect on effectiveness of strategies to ensure the NGSSS are being met according to the pacing guides.	Formative: Go Math! Series Chapter Exams, District Interim Exams Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, Pre, Mid, & Post Baseline Exam

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

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 85% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 90%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (143)	90% (151)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited opportunities for mathematical exploration and development of numbers and operations, to make connections to real life practical applications of numbers.	Provide concrete real world examples of mathematical applications of numbers and operations through the use of manipulative, models, literacy connections, and technology.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Math Liaison	Perform grade level articulation with administrative team to share resources and review student assessment data, making adjustments as necessary to ensure that NGSSS are addressed and supported throughout the curriculum and pacing guides.	Formative: Go Math! Series Chapter Exams, District Interim Exams and Success Maker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment, Pre, Mid, & Post Baseline Exam

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%	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 80% of students in the lowest 25% made

making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #4:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (34)	85% (37)

learning gains.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 85%.

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	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates students in grades 3-5 increased 15 percentage points from the 2011 FCAT Mathematics administration. Small group tutoring will be needed to assist in increasing the performance of the students in the lowest 25%.	Identify lowest 25% performing students in grades 3-5 and, based on instructional needs, provide academic support during the school day, as well as mathematical tutoring sessions.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Math Liaison	Review formative assessment and student performance data reports, as well as intervention assessments, to ensure academic progress and to differentiate instruction as needed according to the pacing guides and student data.	Formative: Go Math! Series Chapter Exams, District Interim Exams and Success Maker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment. Pre, Mid, & Post Baseline Exam

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 76% of students in the white subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in white subgroup making satisfactory progress by 15 percentage points to 91%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 76% (31)	White: 91% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students lack	Provide a variety of	MTSS/RtI Team,	Administrators will review	Formative: FAIR,

	1	opportunities to consistently use computer research based programs. Some students might not be able to attend before the start of the school day.	instructional strategies with an emphasis on base-ten and fractions, geometry, charts and graphs, and algebraic thinking through the use of SuccessMaker.	Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	monthly SuccessMaker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made	District Interim Exams, SuccessMaker Reports. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	

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

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

End of 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
Common Core Standards	K-5	District, Region, Administration, Teachers and Math Liaison	School-wide	October 19, 2012	Utilize chapter exams from the Go Math! series	Teachers, Math Liaison and Administration
Go Math! Series/Think Central	K-5	AdministrationTeachers	School-wide	October 26, 2012	Utilize chapter exams from the Go Math! series	Teachers, Math Liaison and Administration
SuccessMaker Math	3-5	District, Region, AdministrationTeachers and Math Liaison	Grades 3-5	September 14, 2012	Success Maker Math Usage reports	Teachers, Math Liaison and Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Crunch Time Tutoring	Small group instruction	EESAC	$1,170.50
			Subtotal: $1,170.50

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 39% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Level 3 by 3 percentage points to 42%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (36)	42% (38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Earth and Space and Physical Science. Students need a wider variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities to analyze, draw conclusions, and apply key scientific concepts.	Continue to implement weekly science labs, Gizmos, reports and science journals to provide hands on activities for students to enhance scientific thinking; and to provide inquiry based activities that include ongoing literacy connections and technology connections.	MTSS/RtI Team, Science Coach/Liaison	Conduct grade level articulations to discuss student performance data with administration and make adjustments as necessary to ensure that NGSSS are addressed and supported throughout the curriculum and pacing guides.	Formative: Classroom assessments, student authentic work samples and District Interim Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 26% of students achieved levels 4 & 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Levels 4 & 5 by 1 percentage point to 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (24)	27% (25)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need additional opportunities to engage in hands-on activities to increase scientific thinking as well as further instruction on Earth and Space Science and Physical Science as indicated by the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science results.	Provide students opportunities to compare, contrast, interpret, analyze and explain science concepts during hands-on lab activities and classroom discussions to reinforce higher order thinking skills.	MTSS/RtI Team, Science Coach/Liaison	Conduct grade level articulations to discuss student performance data with administration and make adjustments as necessary to ensure that NGSSS are addressed and supported throughout the curriculum and pacing guides.	Formative: Classroom assessments, student authentic work samples and Interim Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
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
NGSSS for Science	K-5	District, Region, Administration, Teachers and Science Liaison	Grades K-5	November 6, 2012	Utilize District Interim Science Assessment	Administration and Science Liaison
Gizmos	3-5	District, Region, Administration, Teachers and Science Liaison	Grades 3-5	November 6, 2012	Gizmos Usage Reports	Administration Science Liaison

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
Utilize hands-on technology	Brainpop and Eyewitness Videos	School Funds	$1,000.00
		Subtotal:	$1,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Science Night	Hands-on activities	School based	$400.00
		Subtotal:	$400.00
		Grand Total:	**$1,400.00**

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing assessment indicate that 89% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving Level 3 by 1 percentage point to 90%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

89% (74)	90% (75)

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	In order to maintain high standards, students should be exposed to the writing process at all grade levels prior to entering fourth grade. Students have limited exposure to the writing process.	Facilitate the implementation of a peer support group to assist in developing skills at each grade level preceding fourth grade. Continue to implement the Melissa Forney Six Traits of Writing model. Implement a Pre, Mid & Post Writing Prompt for first through fifth grade.	MTSS/RtI Team, Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Administration or pre/mid/post writing prompts to monitor student progress throughout the school year.	Formative: Student' scores on monthly writing prompts. District Writing Pre-tests and Interim Assessment

Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment. |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 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
Melissa Forney Writing Workshop	K- 5	Melissa Forney	Teachers	September 22, 2012	Certificate of Completion	Administration

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
Melissa Forney Workshop	Writing Strategies and Graphic Organizers	School Funds	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

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:	Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to 97.35% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more), and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.85 % (509)	97.35% (512)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
106	101
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
107	102

	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	Excessive student unexcused absences and tardies due to the large number of students with out-of-area transfers that do not live in our boundaries.	Students with 3 tardies and /or absences will see the counselor. Students with 5 tardies and/or absences will see the School's Social worker. Students with 6 or more tardies and absences will be seen by administration. Students with 100% attendance for the nine weeks will receive a certificate, pencil and recognition at the quarterly honor roll assemblies.	Administration, Counselor and School's Social worker	Analysis of daily attendance rosters.	Attendance rosters and District's quarterly and end-of-year attendance reports.

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
Attendance Incentives	Treats and Treasure Chest	School Funds	$300.00
			Subtotal: $300.00
			Grand Total: $300.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to not exceed two In-School and one Out-of -School suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2	2
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2	2
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
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	Recognize and address unique behavioral needs of students in a timely manner and ensure students fully understand the behavioral expectations according to the MDCPS Student Code of Conduct in order to reduce the number of in-door and outdoor suspensions.	Ensure that effective strategies are provided to address unique behavioral needs and a student orientation will be held at the beginning of the year to review the components associated with MDCPS Student Code of Conduct in order to reduce the number of in-door and outdoor suspensions.	Administration	Review of student referral reports and services provided.	Referral and Suspension Reports.

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.*	According to our volunteer sign-in logs for the 2011-2012, our level of parent participation was at 32%. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of parents participating in school wide activities by at least five percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

		32% (222)	37% (259)	

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	Parents need information on how to help their children at home.	Conduct hands-on training for parents at all grade levels on FCAT Writing skills and strategies to use at home. Conduct hands-on science night to encourage parental involvement in the science process.	Administration	Parent participation	Parent Sign-In Logs
2	Work schedules prevent some parents from attending school events	Workshops and activities will be offered at flexible times to provide more opportunities for attendance.	Administration	Workshop sign-in sheets	Sign-in sheets

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:	Positive effects of science increase academic performance and motivation both at school and in the community. The science projects that are entered into the Elementary Science Fair are aligned to the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and promote student understanding of scientific research, mathematics, and engineering.

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 limited time management and parental support in the development of their science project.	Facilitate an Elementary Science Fair in grades K-5 to encourage students' interest in science, to develop their inquiry and investigation skills, and to enhance children's pride in completing research projects. The science fair enables students to exhibit their projects and share ideas with other students and community members.	Administration, Science Liaison	Students in K-2 will submit a class project. Students in 3-5 will submit individual projects. The top science projects will be submitted to the Miami-Dade County Science Fair.	Classroom observations and Science project rubric checklist.

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Utilize hands-on technology	Brainpop and Eyewitness Videos	School Funds	$1,000.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Ready to use Activities Work Shop	Enrichment for Reading	School based	$350.00
Writing	Melissa Forney Workshop	Writing Strategies and Graphic Organizers	School Funds	$500.00
				Subtotal: $850.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Time For Kids	Weekly reader	School Funds	$450.00
Reading	Story Works	Monthly reader	School Funds	$700.00
Reading	Scholastic News	Bi-Weekly reader	School Funds	$450.00
Reading	Crunch Time Tutoring	Small group instruction	EESAC	$1,170.50
Mathematics	Crunch Time Tutoring	Small group instruction	EESAC	$1,170.50
Science	Parent Science Night	Hands-on activities	School based	$400.00
Attendance	Attendance Incentives	Treats and Treasure Chest	School Funds	$300.00
				Subtotal: $4,641.00
				Grand Total: $6,491.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ꞁn Priority	ꞁn Focus	ꞁn Prevent	ꞁn NA

Are you a reward school: ꞁn Yes   ꞁn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Provide hourly tutoring for FCAT levels 1 & 2 students and Crunch Time Tutoring	$2,341.00

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

The EESAC will do the following:
• Develop, review and monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
• Assist in the decision making process and make recommendations in the area of the budget and curriculum.
• Review needs and develop budget for EESAC funds.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District KENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	93%	90%	80%	355	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	76%	74%			150	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?	70% (YES)	67% (YES)			137	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					642	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District KENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	86%	94%	69%	342	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	79%	60%			139	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?	75% (YES)	65% (YES)			140	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					621	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested