FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: BRIDGEPOINT ACADEMY OF VILLAGE GREEN

District Name: Dade

Principal: Director of Governing Agency:Jenny Rodriguez

SAC Chair: Ilette Calzadilla

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: PENDING

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Maria Saunders	D. Ed.	1	24	2010-2011 School Grade: NG AYP: Y High Standards Rdg.: 87 High Standards Math: 74 Lrng. Gains-Rdg.: 50 Lrng. Gains-Math: 21 Gains-Rdg.-25%: 50 Gains-Math-25%: 21 This is Dr. Saunders 3rd year as a charter school principal. Prior to that, Dr. Saunders served for 21 years as the principal of St. Paul Lutheran School. SAT-10 scores for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 averaged 70% for the full battery assessment. 2011-2012 School Grade A Reading % Satisfactory or Highe r 73% Math % Satisfactory or Higher 83% Writing % Satisfactory or Higher 89%

					Science % Satisfactory or Higher 65% Reading Points for Gains 60 Math Points for Gains 82 Reading Gains for Low 25% 60 Math Gains for Low 25% 82
Assis Principal	Mitzie Ortiz	K-6 Elem. Ed. (ESOL Endorsed) awaiting Masters in Educational Leadership	1	3	2007-2008 Student, Carlos Albizu University, B.A. Elementary education FY 2008-2009 Employed out of field (Insurance Agent) FY 2009-2010 Middle School Self Contained Teacher, Adequate progress of lowest 25% evident in the data for the school Lincoln Marti, Little Havana. FY FY 2010-2011 Miami Dade School District Administrator, Lincoln Marti Hialeah School grade increased from a “D” to an “A” with 573. 60% of the students making high standards in Reading, 58 % of the students making high Standards in math, 76% high standards in writing, 49% high standards in science. Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading 87% and in math 87%. School also made 100% AYP. FY 2011-2012 Miami Dade School District Administrator, Lincoln Marti Hialeah School grade maintained the school grade at an “A” with 637 points. 56% of the students making high standards in Reading, 54 % of the students making high Standards in math, 85% high standards in writing, 58% high standards in science. Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading 76% and in math 79%. School also made 100% AYP. AMO-2 data pending.

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)
Curriculum	Margaret Olson	M.S. Ed., Ed. S. (Reading)	1	3	2010-2011 School Grade: NG AYP: Y High Standards Rdg.: 87 High Standards Math: 74 Lrng. Gains-Rdg.: 50 Lrng. Gains-Math: 21 Gains-Rdg.-25%: 50 Gains-Math-25%: 21 This is Margaret Olson’s 3rd year as a curriculum specialist for a charter school. Prior to that, Margaret Olson served as an assistant principal at St. Paul Lutheran School. . 2011-12 School Grade A Reading % Satisfactory or Highe r 73% Math % Satisfactory or Higher 83% Writing % Satisfactory or Higher 89% Science % Satisfactory or Higher 65% Reading Points for Gains 60 Math Points for Gains 82 Reading Gains for Low 25% 60 Math Gains for Low 25% 82

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1.The NAEP (National Academic Educational Partners) Team will meet weekly with K-4 and 6th grade teachers to assist with lesson plans, teaching strategies and classroom management.	Administration and NAEP	On going	
2	2.The principal and the NAEP team will assist teachers within their grade levels and provide instructional support when needed.	Administration and NAEP	On going	
3	3.The mentoring and induction for new teachers (MINT) program assists in providing guidance and support to new teachers by pairing them with an experienced teacher.	Administration and NAEP	On going	
4	4. For job vacancies, the school will seek referrals when hiring teachers.	Administration and NAEP	On going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
18% (2)	Administration will mentor teacher this year to provide support in completing her missing course as well as her teaching experience. Administration will provide study material for test certification and any support needed to help teacher pass the test.

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
11	9.1%(1)	54.5%(6)	27.3%(3)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	81.8%(9)	9.1%(1)	0.0%(0)	63.6%(7)

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
Ms. Handal	Ms. Piloto	Ms. Handal is an experienced teacher who can assist in answering questions and providing support,	Lesson plannin/ behavior management

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

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 Leadership Team.
MTSS is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

1. RtI leadership is vital, therefore, our team we have considered the following:

• Administrator(s) who will ensure commitment and allocate resources;
• Teacher(s) and Coaches who share the common goal of improving instruction for all students; and
• Team members who will work to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.
2. The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• School reading, math, science teacher
• Special education personnel
• School psychologist
• School social worker
• Member of advisory group
Community stakeholders

3. RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support (resources) are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.
• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.
• The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.
There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data. The RtI four step problem-solving model will be used to plan, monitor, and revise instruction and intervention. The four steps are problem identification, problem analysis, intervention implementation, and response evaluation.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet every Thursday at 7:45 a.m. The team meets to discuss any data generate by State, District and school based assessment in order to make necessary changes to our pacing guides and ensure that our students have mastered the NGSSS benchmarks. The team collaborates, solves problems, shares best practices, makes decisions, identifies professional development opportunities/needs and discusses upcoming events. School-wide programs are monitored regularly to check fidelity and participation. Decisions are made after everyone's input has been given and the pros and cons for every grade level have been addressed.

The following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The Leadership Team will:

1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:

• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (Enrichment opportunities).

2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.

3. Hold regular team meetings.

4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.

6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.

7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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?

1. The MTSS Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.

2. The MTSS Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.

3. The MTSS Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

• adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
• adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
2. Managed data will include:

Academic
• FAIR assessment
• Interim assessments
• State/Local Math and Science assessments
• FCAT
• Student grades
• School site specific assessments
• Edusoft software

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:

1. training for all administrators in the MTSS problem solving, data analysis process;

2. providing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS principles and procedures; and

3. providing a network of ongoing support for MTSS organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS

framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.

2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.

3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.

4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.

5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.

6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.

7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.

8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal Dr. Maria Saunders, Assistant Principal Mitzie Ortiz, Margaret Olson, Curriculum Specialist. Classroom teachers: Maggie Fernandez (K), Ms. Riverol (1), Ms. Childers (2),
Ms. San Martin (3/4) and Ms. Florez (4/5) as well as support personnel Matthew Benoliel from NAEP.

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

The school-based literacy team is led by the Principal who helps to define instructional leadership to her coaches, and teachers. The Literacy Leadership team's primary goal is to meet the school population in its areas of greatest literacy need, and to meet that need through professional collaboration and support. This would include collaboration across the curriculum and support at the district and community level. This team functions to encourage literacy in the school community as well as to make sure that a multi-tiered approach to teaching in implemented at the school and individual level and works with the MTSS/RTI in a support
The Literacy Leadership Team is made up of participating members of the schools community. It includes the principal, the curriculum specialist, the special education specialist, grade level team leaders, special area teachers, media specialist, student and community representatives. These members meet monthly to address the best way to encourage a community of literacy to develop. Items included on meeting agendas include, but are not limited to: ensuring the 90 minute daily reading instruction using the CRRP, whole group initial instruction using the CRRP/Houghton Mifflin, explicit instruction in phonics/spelling/vocabulary, differentiated instruction/immediate intensive intervention (iii) using appropriate materials, guided reading using leveled text and/or skills based lessons. Also under review will be whether literacy centers are in use, that groups are fluid and using assessment results, classroom libraries being used effectively, theme related CRRP assessment (unit test) are being used to monitor student learning, instruction for all levels of learners including LEP , and that lesson plans reflect instruction in -phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

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

"Learning to Gain"
Our reading coach will attend the monthly coaches' meetings; return to the school and train the staff. The principal by visiting the
classrooms will ensure that all teachers are using differentiated instructions and that the level I and II students are being pulled out for intensive small group reading.
The major initiative of the LLT will be "Put Reading First", a program for family literacy, encouraging families to read together through monthly literacy activities. The literacy activities will require that parents and students attend a family activity night. At the family nights, we will take the opportunity to encourage reading in the family circle. We will be using ¬¬¬Reading Strategies to support our initiative. We will be using Reading Plus for our 2nd,3rd , 4th and 5th grade students and Tumble Books for our Kindergarten and 1st graders

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 31%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (10)	31% (11)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 2 Reading Application.	Teachers will provide students with reading application strategies: graphic organizer, reciprocal reading, think-pair-share, think aloud, modeling, and cooperative groups. Instruction will provide students with opportunities to read in all content areas, with increased focus on reading application	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed.	On-going formative assessments: FAIR, Graded Portfolio, Group projects, self-evaluation, peer evaluation. Baseline, and Interim Assessments. Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4, 5, and 6 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 20%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (7)	20% (8)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 2 Reading Application.	2.1 Teachers will provide students with reading application strategies: graphic organizer, reciprocal reading, think-pair-share, think aloud, modeling, and cooperative groups. Instruction will challenge students to create their own graphic organizers to help focus thinking across genres and foster critical thinking	2.1. MTSS Team	2.1. 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students	2.1. On-going formative assessments: FAIR, Graded Portfolio, Group projects, self-evaluation, peer evaluation. Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (16)	77% (17)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 2 Reading Application and Informational Text.	Teachers will implement the use of word walls in each classroom and expose students vocabulary word maps and a wide variety of texts. Teachers will provide interventions through the use of the Voyager kits (two times a week, 120 minutes).	MTSS Team	1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor Data 4. Data Chats with students	Formative: weekly mini assessments Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

72% (N<30)	77% (N<30)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was reporting category 2 Reading Application and Informational Text.	Teach students to identify and interpret elements of the story structure within a text. Increased reading by student population to strengthen fluency using Accelerated Reader program. Tutoring services after school using the Florida Reads book.	MTSS Team	1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor Data 4. Data Chats with students	Formative: weekly mini assessments Baseline and Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011 FCAT Reading Test indicates that 41% of students achieved learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase student learning gains by 6 percentage points to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (16)	47% (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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT reading test was Category 1, Vocabulary. Students entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful	Teachers will focus on direct instruction of vocabulary and provide students with practice in recognizing word relationships and identifying the multiple meanings of words. Instruction will provide students with opportunities to read in all content areas, with increased emphasis on	Administration	1. Walk-through 2. Lesson plans 3. Monitor PACES 4. Mentor staff 5. Monitor data 6. Bi-weekly LLT meetings 7.Data chats	On-going formative assessments: FAIR Graded assignment Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

	readers.	cross-content reading throughout the early grades			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	
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:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	According to results of the 2012 FCAT, 39% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory performance in reading. Our goal is to increase that percentage by 6% points to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (8)	45% (9)

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 may have less time with parents who are struggling to work long hours.	Teacher will monitor student need for homework help.	Teacher and administration.	Teacher will monitor homework turned in or missing.	Formative: baseline,interim weekly mini assessments Summative:

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
Task Cards	3rd, 4th and 5th	Administrator	Teachers of 3rd, 4th and 5th	August 16, 2012 Teacher Planning Day	Classroom Walk throughs	Administration
Reading Plus	3rd, 4th and 5th	Administrator	Teachers of 3rd, 4th and 5th	August 16, 2012 Teacher Planning Day	Usage Logs	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
Reading Plus	reading software for students (3-5)	PTA	$2,000.00
Ticket to Read	reading software for students (K-2)	PTA	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $4,000.00
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
Tutoring	teachers tutor students	SAC funds	$750.00
			Subtotal: $750.00
			Grand Total: $4,750.00

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:	. Based on the 2012 CELLA data, what percentage of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking? Based on the 2012 CELLA 52%(17) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. Our goal is to reduce the number of non-proficient ELL students in Listening/Speaking by 10%. Our current percentage of non-proficient ELL students is 48% (16)which we would like to reduce by 10% to (14).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
52% (17)	

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 entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful English language listeners and speakers.	Implement intervention plan during the day by using modeling and repetition strategies during instruction	Administration	Review assessments from the intervention program and adjust placement and instruction as necessary.	Formative: weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

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:	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, what percentage of students were proficient in Reading? Based on the 2012 CELLA 18%(6) of ELL students were proficient in Reading. Our goal is to reduce the number of non-proficient ELL students in Listening/Speaking by 10%. Our current percentage of non-proficient ELL students is 82% (27)which we would like to reduce by 10% to (24).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
18% (6)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful English language readers.	Implement intervention plan during the day by incorporating the daily task cards and cooperative learning during instruction.	Administration	Review assessments from the intervention program and adjust placement and instruction as necessary	Formative: weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, what percentage of students were proficient in Writing? Based on the 2012 CELLA 24%(8) of ELL students were proficient in Writing. Our goal is to reduce the number of non-proficient ELL students in Writing by 10%. Our current percentage of non-proficient ELL students is 76% (25)which we would like to reduce by 10% to (23).
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
24% (8)	

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the Students entering school with limited vocabulary will have difficulty being successful English language writers.	Implement intervention plan during the day by using graphic organizers and daily journals.	Administration	Review assessments from the intervention program and adjust placement and instruction as necessary	Formative: weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
English-Spanish Dictionaries	English-Spanish Dictionaries	PTA Funds	$200.00
ELL tutoring	after school tutoring	grant	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,700.00
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: $2,700.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 23% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (7)	23% (9)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category Geometry and Measurement.	o Grade 3 – Describe and analyze properties of two-dimensional shapes; examine and apply congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes; select appropriate units, strategies and tools to solve problems involving perimeter; measure objects using fractional parts; and tell time and determine the amount of time elapsed. o Grade 4 – Develop an understanding of area and determine the area of two-dimensional shapes; classifying angles; identify and describe the results of transformations; and identify and build a three-dimensional object from a two-dimensional representation and vice versa. o Grade 5 – Describe three-dimensional shapes and analyze their properties, including volume and surface area; identify and plot ordered pairs on the first quadrant; compare, contrast, and convert units of measures within the same dimension to solve problems; solve problems requiring attention to approximations, selections of appropriate tools, and precision in measurement; and derive and apply formulas for	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed.	On-going formative assessments: Baseline and Interim Assessments. Graded assignments; Group projects; Self-evaluation; Peer-evaluation. Summative assessment: 2013 FCAT

		area. Technology o Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Gizmos, Riverdeep® or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense.			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 15%(6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (5)	15% (6)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was reporting category Number and Operations.	o Grade 3 – Students will use higher order thinking skills to work on project-based assignments covering multiplication facts and related division facts; o Students will use higher order thinking skills to	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students

1		work on project-based assignments covering fractions and fraction equivalence; represent, compute, estimate and solve problems using numbers through hundred thousand; and solve non-routine problems through the use of manipulatives (i.e. paper clips, blocks, counters, etc.). o Grade 4 – Students will use higher order thinking skills to work on project-based assignments covering decimals, including the connection between fractions and decimals; develop quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts and fluency with whole number multiplication; use and represent numbers through millions in various contexts; use models to represent division; estimate and describe reasonableness of estimates; determine factors and multiples; relate fractions to decimals and percents; and generate equivalent fractions and simplify fractions. o Grade 5 – Students will use higher order thinking skills to work on project-based assignments covering division of whole numbers; develop an understanding of and fluency with addition and subtraction of fractions and decimals; identify and relate prime and composite numbers, factors and multiples within the context of fractions; describe real-world situations using positive and negative numbers; compare, order, and graph integers; and solve non-routine problems.		and adjust instruction as needed.	and adjust instruction as needed.

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45%(10)	55%(12)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category Number and Operations.	Develop school-wide check of manipulatives to ensure that they are being utilized for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of numbers and operations. Students will be using the Remediation program within the Go Math series.	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed	Summative Assessment: Weekly mini assessments Formative Assessment: . Baseline and Interim Assessments. 2013 FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 55%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (N<30)	55% (N<30)

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 as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Reporting Category Number and Operations.	Students will be given the opportunity of receiving extended intervention through a before school small group tutoring program. Students will be using the Remediation program within the Go Math series.	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed	Summative Assessment: Weekly miniassessments Formative Baseline and Interim Assessments. Assessment: 2013 FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 Math test indicate that 29% Hispanic students made adequate progress in mathematics.. Our goal is to increase learning gains by 7 percentage points to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

29% (11)	36% (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	Based on our data analysis, the area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT math test was Category 1, Number Sense. Students are lacking knowledge of math facts and need daily practice to achieve proficiency in number operations	Daily practice in whole and small group instruction will emphasize the memorization of math facts to be used in number operations. Manipulatives will be used to aid in visualization. Math Literacy Team will work throughout year to analyze data to direct instruction for student learning gains	Administration	Lesson plans will reflect student practice of math facts and number operations.	Formative Weekly mini assessments Summative 2013 FCAT.

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:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Results of the 2012 FCAT indicate that 33% of economically disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in math. Our goal is to increase the percentage by 7% to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (7)	40% (8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who are economically disadvantaged may not have parental help with homework due to parents long work hours	Teachers will monitor homework turned in or missing	Administration Math Literacy Team (MLT	Administration and MLT will meet to review data monthly and change instruction as needed	Formative: baseline,interims weekly mini assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	
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:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	
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:	
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:	
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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	
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:

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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics 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				

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making	

satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Mathematics FCAT 2.0	K-5th Grade	N.A.E.P.	K-5th Grade Teachers	August 2012	Classroom Walk throughs, data chats and informal/formal evaluations.	Administration
Common Core strategies	K-5th Grade	District PD	K-5th Grade Teachers	uly 2012	Classroom Walk throughs, data chats and informal/formal evaluations.	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
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

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:	This is our school's first year to have a 5th grade. . During the 2012-2013 school year our goal is for 36% of our 5th grade students to achieve a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	36% (4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack experience of hands on science to broaden understanding from the abstract to the concrete.	Teachers will provide lessons that will emphasize on FCAT hands-on inquiry investigation activities and include essential science labs that allow for testing hypothesis, data analysis, explanation of variables and experimental design and physical science.	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed.	On-going formative assessments: Graded assignments Portfolio Group project Self-evaluation Peer Evaluation Summative assessments: 2013 FCAT

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	This is our school's first year to have a 5th grade..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	Exceed district performance on the 5th grade Science 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	Students are not motivated to think creatively when using science and math combined.	Implementation of the EiE program will expose students to the excitement of creative thinking in science and engineering	Science teacher.	Teacher observation.	Science projects. 2013 Science FCAT

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
Science Essential Labs Administration	K-5th Grade	NAEP Consultant	K- 5th Grade Teachers	Aug. and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration
Science FCAT 2.0	K-5th Grade	NAEP Consultant	K- 5th Grade Teachers	Aug. and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Students will be given opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in sciences: life, physical and chemical.	Science Kits for grades K-5th to allow for class appropriate demonstrations of the scientific process.	Book Allocation	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase by 1 percentage point to 92%(10).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% (10)	92% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was Reporting Category Drafting. Grammar and Conventions	Using the Four Square Writing graphic organizer, students will design a prewriting plan to develop the main idea with supporting details that provide facts and/or opinions and practice scoring following a rubric. Students will strive to improve their mechanics by practicing peer editing skills.	MTSS Team	Administration will monitor through: 1. Walk-through 2. Mini-assessments 3. Monitor data 4. Data Chats with students and adjust instruction as needed	On-going formative Baseline, Interim Assessments. assessment: portfolio, group projects, self evaluation rubric, peer-evaluation Summative Assessment: 2013 FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing FCAT 2.0	K-5th Grade	NAEP Consultant	K-5th Grade Teachers	Aug. and monthly WebEx	Teacher conferencing and Professional Learning Community	Administration and NAEP

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School will implement the four square writing process to motivate and enrich writing instruction.	Four Square Writing Method Grades K-5th: "A Unique Approach to Teaching Basic Writing Skills"	PTA	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
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: $200.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

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

End of Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	During the 2012-2013 school year, our goal is to increase by .5 percentage points in attendance rate to 96.71%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.21% (124)	96.71% (125)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
31	29
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
32	30

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. Parents are not aware of the connection between attendance and academic performance.	Implementation of parent newsletters, advisor bulletins and parent conferences to emphasize attendance policies. Implementation of students' attendance incentives.	Administration	Administration will monitor attendance record weekly.	Student 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
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:	During the 2012-2013 school year, our school’s goal is to keep suspension rates below 2% of the student population
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1% (1)	1%(1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents and students may be unaware of student code of conduct and our school disciplinary policies.	School will provide student code of conduct and disciplinary policies in the student handbook to be distributed in the beginning of the year via hard copy and electronic copy.	Administration	Administration will monitor any student suspension monthly.	District SCAM forms and teacher referrals
2	Students lack of motivation to behave well and follow rules.	School will implement positive discipline program that includes incentives for student-of-the-week	Administration	Monitor classroom behavior and referrals.	Walkthrough forms and referrals

---

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
Student Incentives	Student rewards	PTA	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
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: $200.00

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.*	Our school provides a 20 hour parent participation program per family per year. Our school's goal is to maintain the high percentage of parent involvement at our school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
100% (128)	100%(150)

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	Some parents may not be aware of school activities.	All activities, such as the Meet and Greet, Open House and PTA functions will be posted on the internet, communicated through emails. Phone calls and text messages will also be made through the Bright Arrow System	Administrative Team	1.1. Monitoring participation	1.1. Volunteer logs, PTA membership.

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:	Students will learn to think analytically implementing their knowledge of math and science in innovative design and abstract thinking

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 may not have the motivation to apply imaginative thinking to science and math projects.	Teachers will use EiE (Engineering is Elementary) curriculum to foster enthusiasm for science and engineering hands-on projects through the use of manipulatives (i.e. blocks, legos, paper clips, etc.).	Administration	Administration will monitor enrollment of these activities.	Student Projects

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)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. CTE CTE Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	English-Spanish Dictionaries	English-Spanish Dictionaries	PTA Funds	$200.00
CELLA	ELL tutoring	after school tutoring	grant	$2,500.00
Science	Students will be given opportunities to design and develop science and engineering projects to increase scientific thinking, and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities that allow for testing of hypotheses, data analysis, explanation of variables, and experimental design in sciences: life, physical and chemical.	Science Kits for grades K-5th to allow for class appropriate demonstrations of the scientific process.	Book Allocation	$500.00
Writing	School will implement the four square writing process to motivate and enrich writing instruction.	Four Square Writing Method Grades K-5th: “A Unique Approach to Teaching Basic Writing Skills”	PTA	$200.00
Suspension	Student Incentives	Student rewards	PTA	$200.00
				Subtotal: $3,600.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Plus	reading software for students (3-5)	PTA	$2,000.00
Reading	Ticket to Read	reading software for students (K-2)	PTA	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $4,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring	teachers tutor students	SAC funds	$750.00
				Subtotal: $750.00
				Grand Total: $8,350.00

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

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
SAC funds will be used to tutor low achieving students.	$1,500.00

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

The school's SAC will meet though out the year in order to discuss all pertinent information and data relating to the achievement of our goals.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found
No Data Found
No Data Found