FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: CITRUS GROVE ELEMENTARY

District Name: Martin

Principal: Tyson Villwock

SAC Chair: Danny Rendell

Superintendent: Nancy Kline

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/21/2012

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	Tyson Villwock	Degrees: B.S. Elementary Education M.S. Educational Leadership Certification: Elementary Education Educational Leadership Gifted Endorsement ELL Endorsement	5	13	Years 2000-2012 the school I was an administrator at received a grade of "A". In the 2009-2010 school year CGE had the highest number of FCAT points in the District.
Assis Principal	Jennifer Radcliff	Degrees: Elementary Education Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Education Educational Leadership ELL Endorsement	5	5	Each year of administrative experience has resulted in a school grade of "A".

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Increase exposure to applicant pool.	Administration	July 30, 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	0.0%(0)	19.6%(9)	56.5%(26)	23.9%(11)	37.0%(17)	0.0%(0)	13.0%(6)	8.7%(4)	50.0%(23)

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

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)

> We will use our $872 to either purchase instructional materials for academically struggling students or our ESE students, or use the funds to pay a stipend for additional targeted instruction for those same students.

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)

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Itinerant RtI Coach
> Itinerant Reading Coach
> Guidance Counselor
> Administration
> ESE Teachers (4)
> School Psychologist
> Mainstream Consultant
> General Education Teachers (2)

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?

> Teachers work with both Guidance Counselor and RtI Coach for the initial identification of students to engage in the MTSS process. Paperwork commences, then an MTSS Team meeting. Interventions are documented. Progress is monitored by the person implementing the intervention, and then reviewed by the MTSS team at approximately 6 week intervals.

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 goals of the school improvement plan are the ultimate goals of the MTSS Team. Both focus on high student achievement.
>
> The SIP teams use the same process as the MTSS Team in developing goals and strategies for the SIP. Baseline and recent data is reviewed. Attention is given to other variables. We brainstorm the "problem" and identify a goal. Then solutions and interventions are brainstormed and selected. Finally, methods of monitoring are identified.

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.

> We will draw data from FAIR and District testing via their respective data management interfaces. We will organize and disaggregate classroom data using Excel.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> Workshops are scheduled to train staff on the various componants of the MTSS process. The Team has workshops specific to them, and the staff has workshops pertinent to the target audience. Resources for the workshops include the MTSS Coach, school psychologist, and others with specialized knowledge.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> Students receiving support beyond tier 1 will be monitored by a team including their teacher(s), the RtI coach, and the guidance counselor. Other support personnel will be included as needed. The MTSS team will convene to identify appropriate interventions and support specific to each student.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The LLT is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, reading coach, mainstream consultant, guidance counselor, and representatives from each grade level team (our School Improvement Reading Committee).

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

The core LLT team holds regularly scheduled meetings monthly and meetings more frequently to address MTSS demands several times each month, at which we analyze data, plan to address needs and concerns, and coordinate professional development.

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

This year a major task will be the blending of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) with NGSS in grades 2-5, and the monitoring of CCSS instruction in grades K and 1. The LLT will also increase our "toolbox" of assessments to assist with MTSS interventions and data collection.

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.

Voluntary Pre-K is involved with staff professional development and school programs to align expectations and experiences for pre-k students to matriculate successfully in elementary school.

Local preschools tour our elementary school each spring to give incoming kindergartners experience with the school.

*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:	Improve student performance in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (101) of students achieved Level 3 on 2012 FCAT Reading.	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 5%. The percentage of students in FCAT Level 4 and 5 will increase by 10% resulting in 30% (86) of students scoring FCAT Level 3.

	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	Lack of time to attend to individual needs of students	Teachers will utilize III time to provide additional differentiated activities to address individual learning goals	Reading Coach Teachers Administration	Progress monitoring	Skill mastery as demonstrated in report cards and assessment tests
2	Additional demands on teacher time for differentiation	Increase student interaction with literature through the use of leveled readers and running records/Rigby	Reading Coach Teachers	Observation of small group instruction Leveling data	Skill mastery as demonstrated on report cards and assessment tests
3	Limited time to address needs of lower performing students to bring them up to Level 3	Increase instructional time with instructional opportunities before the school day begins	Administration Computer lab assistant	Progress monitoring of engaged students	Data reports generated from programs being used by students

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase achievement in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
49% (142) of students scored at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading test.	54% (153) of students will score at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Opportunities for acquisition and application of higher order thinking</td><td>Instruction utilizing Marzano's Design Questions #2, #3, and #4 will be employed</td><td>Reading SIP Committee Administration Reading Coach Teachers</td><td>Benchmark Assessments Classroom Assessments</td><td>2013 FCAT Reading Results</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Lack of opportunity to significantly increase scores due to higher baseline</td><td>Attend to areas where high performing students have room for growth through disaggregation of test and classroom data and provide enrichment of higher level questioning in small group instruction.</td><td>Teachers Reading Coach Administration</td><td>Benchmark assessments Classroom assessments</td><td>Benchmark assessments 2013 FCAT Reading results</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Attention to higher achieving students</td><td>Increase student interaction with literature through the use of leveled readers during the morning before class begins, and recognition of students engaged in this practice.</td><td>Administration Hallway monitors</td><td>Observation of reading practices</td><td>2013 FCAT Reading results</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase student performance in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (207) of students made learning gains in 2012 FCAT Reading.	77% (222) of students will make learning gains in 2013 FCAT 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	Attention to higher performing students	Monitor progress of Level 3-5 students to ensure that growth will occur via DSS score or maintenance of FCAT Level	Teachers Administration Reading Coach	Benchmark assessments Classroom performance	2013 FCAT Results
2	Effective use of assessment data	Teachers will combine evaluation of assessment data and the development/use of instructional focus calendars as part of the Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) to streamline instruction and address student needs	Classroom teachers Reading and RtI Coaches Administration	Monitor via progress monitoring testing Instructional Focus Calendars	2013 FCAT Results
3	Teachers new to FCAT and school expectations and practices.	Meet specifically with teachers new to our school to review: 1. FCAT Test Item Specifications 2. Attention to individual students 3. Data disaggregation practices	Administration Teachers	Benchmark assessments FAIR assessments	2013 FCAT results
4	Increase exposure to FCAT type questions	Utilize FOCUS Achieves online assessments to ensure that students have opportunities to practice FCAT format questions, and teachers have the opportunity to monitor their progression through the program	Teachers Administration	Focus Achieves data reports	Progression through the Focus program

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

N/A		N/A		

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Increase student performance in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (48) of lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2011 FCAT Reading test.	73% (52) of lowest quartile students will make learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading test.

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	Engaging the appropriate instruction of students with learning disabilities.	Engage an inclusive instructional delivery model with support of the Florida Inclusion Network	Administration, Classroom and ESE teachers	Progress monitoring of Lowest Quartile students	2013 FCAT Reading results
2	Early identification of the students who comprise our lowest 25% for state reporting purposes.	Use District personnel and resources to identify the lowest quartile of students and disseminate details to teachers	Administration District Personnel Teachers	Identification of lowest quartile students Differentiation to lowest quartile as demonstrated by observation and lesson plan	2013 FCAT Reading results
3	Identification of struggling readers before FCAT / benchmark assessment grades	Increase collection of data from criterion referenced sources for reading performance	Teachers Reading Coach RtI Coach	FAIR results RtI logs Rigby logs	RtI log relative to FAIR and Rigby results
4	Lack of vocabulary development for the lowest quartile	Increase exposure to new vocabulary through cooperative learning, academic resources, and News Crew "word of the week"	Reading SIP Committee Teachers Media Specialist	Classroom walk through, data analysis of resources	Classroom assessments

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 # Percentage of students scoring in the proficient range will increase to 81% in 2013. 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 reading. Reading Goal #5B:	N/A	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
N/A	N/A	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	N/A	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
N/A	N/A	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

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:	
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
Inclusion	K-5	Florida Inclusion Network	Teachers involved with inclusive classes	September 2011 through May 2012	Progress monitoring results	Administration Mainstream Consultant
Common Core Exemplar Texts	K-5	Administration	All instructional staff	September 2012-May 2013		Administration

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Improve student performance in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
34% (97) of students achieved Level 3 on 2012 FCAT Mathematics.	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 5% (14). The percentage of students in FCAT Level 4 and 5 will increase by 10% resulting in 31% (90)of students scoring FCAT Level 3.

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	New math adoption	Provide additional planning time for teachers to engage the materials for effective use	Administration	Staff schedules	Lesson plans
2	Lack of guidance for parents to support their child's math applications to real world problems.	Provide a CGE Family Math Night at a local grocery store to increase family involvement and support in mathematics.	Math SIP committee members	Participation at event.	Rate of participation. Parent and teacher feedback.

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

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

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.	Improve student performance in mathematics.

	Mathematics Goal #2a:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (127) of students scored at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test.	49% (141) of students will score at Levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics test.

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	Cognitive complexity of instruction	Increase teacher knowledge of FCAT Test Item Specifications. Increase instruction targeting high complexity problems Provide training to discuss complexity and item specs.	Classroom Teachers Administration	Benchmark Assessment progress monitoring data	Lesson Plans 2013 FCAT results
2	Demands of differentiating to the high achieving students	Increase opportunities for differentiation by manipulating the master schedule to provide additional instructional time Increase teacher knowledge of differentiation techniques to increase frequency	Administration RtI Coach District Math Coordinator	Observations Benchmark Assessments	2013 FCAT Results Benchmark Assessment progress monitoring results
3	Efficient coverage of standards	Increase proficiency with the curriculum maps to provide for optimal approach to covering standards	Administration District Math Coordinator	Benchmark ASsessments	2013 FCAT results

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (228) of students made learning gains in 2012 FCAT Mathematics.	84% (241) of students will make learning gains in 2013 FCAT 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	Effective use of progress monitoring data	Use Performance Matters and other assessment data during team meetings to focus instruction	Classroom Teachers Administration	Benchmark Assessment progress monitoring data	2013 FCAT results
2	Effective use of progress monitoring data	Engage District support for evaluation of assessment data	Administration District Mathematics Coordinator	Lesson Plans Benchmark Assessment progress monitoring data	2013 FCAT results
3	Attention to high achieving students	Periodically review the frequency of instruction engaging higher cognitive complexity	Administration Reading Coach RtI Coach	Lesson Plans Observations	2013 FCAT results

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

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

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:	Increase the learning gains of our lowest quartile of students.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	79% (56) of lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test.	84% (60) of lowest quartile students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics test.

	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	Engaging the appropriate instruction of students with learning disabilities.	Engage an inclusive instructional delivery model with support of the Florida Inclusion Network	Administration Teachers	Progress monitoring of Lowest Quartile students 2012	2013 FCAT results
2	Lack of instructional time to provide intensive remediation	Modify the master schedule to provide time for remediation and iii	Guidance Counselor Administration Teachers	Master schedule Observations Benchmark assessments	2013 FCAT results
3	Identification of those students comprising the lowest quartile	Engage District staff to assist with the identification of our lowest quartile, and share results with teachers	Administration Reading Coach	Production of list of lowest quartile students.	List of lowest quartile students

---

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 # Percentage of students scoring in the proficient range in Reading will increase to 81% in 2013. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	77	79	81	83	85	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide Opportunity for a Family Math Night.	Time, copying, materials	SAC	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement

	Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Increase student proficiency in science.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	33% (34) of students scored Level 3 on FCAT Science in 2012.	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 5% (6). The percentage of students in FCAT Level 4 and 5 will increase by 10% resulting in 26% (27) of students scoring FCAT Level 3.

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	Adjustment to Next Generation Standard 2.0 with adhesion to curriculum map	Provide FCAT Test item specifications to teachers for focus on proficiency of FCAT 2.0 standards	Administration, science lab teacher	Lesson Plans Progress Monitoring Tests	2013 FCAT Science Results
2	Access to hands on experiences	Expose all students in all grade levels to hands on experiences through in class and take home labs	Science Lab Teacher, teachers, Administration	Observation Program Records	Observations
3	Shifting focus to higher cognitive complexity	Science Fair projects will be required by all fifth graders	Science Fair coordinators Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring data Participation in Science Fair	2013 FCAT Science Results

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Increase student proficiency in science.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (25) of students scored Levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Science in 2012.	34% (36 students) will score Levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Science in 2013.

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	Shifting focus to higher cognitive complexity	Modify Science Fair activities/expectations to positively engage more students and align goals more closely to FCAT expectations	Science Fair Coordinator Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring data Participation in Science Fair	2013 FCAT Science results
2	Moving towards a green school	Improvements in school green activities	Green Team Members-students and teachers	Garden clubs Green activities and programs	Observations

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

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Increase student proficiency in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
94% (83) of students were proficient in Writing on the 2012 FCAT test.	96% (85) of students will be proficient in Writing on the 2013 FCAT.

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	Lack of continuity in expectatations at lower grades	K-1 Grades will use the Common core writing standards as a resource for instruction and scoring, Grades 2-5 will use the state rubric and the new anchor papers from FDOE to define grade level expectations.	All instructional staff Continued collaboration on defining the grade level expectations for writing, facilitated by the SIP writing committee	Teacher feedback regarding their understanding of expectations and being able to score writing	Student assessment, consistent writing prompts developed by teachers, FCAT 2.0 writing scores

					members
2	Adherence to new state expectations for FCAT 2.0	Refresh school wide expectations for minimum proficiencies / writing skills K-5	Fourth grade representative will share directions and updates from FDOE after receiving district training on September 21, 2012	Student writing grades 3-4 matches revised state expectations for FCAT Writes 2.0	FCAT results
3	Continued understanding of rubrics and usage of them, as developed by the Writing Committee in 2011-12	Access to rubrics on the shared network (G Drive) Team collaboration in using the rubrics	SIP writing team members will provide feedback as requested and needed	Teacher feedback.	Student writing assessments, classroom based evaluation
4	Promote and celebrate writing instruction school wide, writing for a common audience	K-5 will participate in an Earth Day Writing event, with all writing displayed in a central location	SIP Writing committee members Classroom teachers	Writing displayed matches grade level standards	Displayed work

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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
Fourth grade teacher attend district meeting to get updated on FDOE changes for FCAT 2.0	Teacher attend and come back with information to share with team and SIP Writing Committee	District funds a sub	$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:	Increase the percentage of daily attendance in class.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94.5% (572) of our students attend school each day.	96% (581) of our students will attend school each day.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
27.4% (166) of our students had 10 or more absences.	25% (149) of our students will have 10 or more absences.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
26.4% (160)of our students had 10 or more tardies.	25% (149)of our students will have 10 or more tardies.
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 place lower priority on school attendance	Educate parents via use of Bring It 180 information	Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor	Monitoring through PBiS and data team meeting	Final attendance data
2	Parents place lower priority on student arrival time.	Educate parents through parent conferences and the school newsletter.	Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, Mainstream Consultant and Teachers	Monitoring quarterly	Final Attendance Data
3	Parents are unaware of the impact of loss of school time on academic performance.	Educate parents through parent conferences and the school newsletter.	Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, Mainstream Consultant and Teachers	Monitoring quarterly	Final Attendance Data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	Nov. Staff meeting	As indicated above	Assistant Principal

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:	Decrease the number of suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 8 in-school suspensions the 2011-2012 school year.	There will be no more than 5 in-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
There were 8 in-school suspensions the 2011-2012 school year.	There will be no more than 5 in-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 2 out-of-school suspensions the 2011-2012 school year.	There will be 0 out-of-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
There were 2 out-of-school suspensions the 2011-2012 school year.	There will be 0 out-of-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year.

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. Recurring behaviors lead to suspensions when behavior plans are in place but not effective.	Continue to work with the MTSS team to develop effective behavioral interventions.	MTSS Team, MTSS coach	RTiB database to compare data	Final behavior data
2	Often the suspensions are the same students for repeat behaviors.	On first suspension require a parent meeting before allowing the child to return to school.	Administration	Monitoring by Teacher and Administration	Final behavior data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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.*	Increase parent involvement.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85% (357) of families were involved at CGE during the 2011-2012 school year.	87% (422) or families will be involved at CGE during the 2012-2013 school year.

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	Lack of connection with parents	Teachers will conduct Curriculum Nights to discuss academic and other expecations with parents	Teachers Administration	Attendance by parents at Curriculum Nights	Attendance by parents at Curriculum Nights
	Lack of consistency	Communicate the	PBiS Core Team	Monitor behavior data	Final behavior

| 2 | with school - home expectations | campus implementation of PBS to families | Administration | | data |
| 3 | Lack of involvement by male family members | Advance Watch D.O.G.S. program using men from the school community to increase their volunteer presence on campus. | Volunteer Coordinator Administration | Volunteer documentation | Volunteer hours documentation |

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
Male involvement Volunteer / Mentors	K-5	CGE Volunteer Coordinator & Watch Dog Volunteer Coordinator	Various Male Volunteers	Orientation of new Watch D.O.G.S. 8-14-12	E-mail, CGE website, All calls	Volunteer Coordinator & Watch Dog Volunteer Coordinator
Consistently communicate expectations with school - home	K-5	PBIS team	PBS Core Team Administration	PBIS information will be shared during School Advisory Council (SAC)	Log of commumication of expectations	PBS Core Team & Administration
Curriculum Nights	K-5	Classroom teachers	Parents, legal guardians	8-13-12 Kindergarten parent orientation 8-20-12 5th grade curriculum 8-21-12 4th grade curriculum 8-22-12 3rd grade curriculum 8-23-12 2nd grade curriculum 8-27-12 1st grade curriculum	Parent teacher conferences (pre-designated dates)	Classroom teachers

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Watch D.O.G.S.	Food, T-shirts, supplies, ect..	Business Partners (Mulligan's) Watch D.O.G.S. personal donations	$500.00
Watch D.O.G.S.	Food, T-shirts, supplies, ect..	P.T.A. Parent Teacher Association	$200.00
			Subtotal: $700.00
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: $700.00

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:	N/A

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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
Parent Involvement	Watch D.O.G.S.	Food, T-shirts, supplies, ect..	Business Partners (Mulligan's) Watch D.O.G.S. personal donations	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Watch D.O.G.S.	Food, T-shirts, supplies, ect..	P.T.A. Parent Teacher Association	$200.00
				Subtotal: $700.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	Fourth grade teacher attend district meeting to get updated on FDOE changes for FCAT 2.0	Teacher attend and come back with information to share with team and SIP Writing Committee	District funds a sub	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Provide Opportunity for a Family Math Night.	Time, copying, materials	SAC	$200.00
				Subtotal: $200.00
				Grand Total: $900.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

◌ Priority	◌ Focus	◌ Prevent	◌ NA

Are you a reward school: ◌ Yes ◌ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/19/2012)

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
Funds will be used to increase student achievement and parent involvement.	$900.00

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

The CGE School Advisory Council will monitor expenditures of the school discretionary budget, approve the expenditure of school improvement funds, oversee the implementation of the school improvement plan, and provide guidance for other initiatives to improve the school..

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Martin School District
CITRUS GROVE ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	92%	79%	68%	332	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	74%	71%			145	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?	79% (YES)	81% (YES)			160	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					637	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Martin School District
CITRUS GROVE ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	94%	93%	93%	83%	363	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	71%	74%			145	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?	73% (YES)	78% (YES)			151	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					659	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested