

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: CROSS CREEK SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Ken Fulop

SAC Chair: Peg Lesch

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 04, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Grades – N/A</li> <li>• 2007/08 - 29% of students were proficient in reading and math. 56% made learning gains in reading and 72% made learning gains in math. 9% of students were meeting high standards in reading and math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2008/09 - The percentage of students proficient in reading was 30% and 33% in math. 53% of students made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 53% made gains in reading and 28% made learning gains in math. 11% were meeting high standards in reading and 7% were meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2009/10- The percentage of students proficient is 27% in reading and 35% in math. 58% (38) of students made learning gains in reading, 69% (44) made learning</li> </ul>

Principal	Ken Fulop	Administration/ Supervision (grades K-12) ESOL Endorsement School Principal (all levels) Specific Learning Disabilities (grades K-12)	16	26	<p>gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 71% made learning gains in reading and 70% made learning gains in math. 13% of students are meeting high standards in reading and 10% are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•2010/11 – The percentage of students proficient is 28% (20) in reading and 16% (10) in math. 52% (29) of students made learning gains in reading, 46% (21) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 35% (6) made learning gains in reading and 14% (2) made learning gains in math. 7% (5) of students are meeting high standards in reading and 3% (2) are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2011/12 – School Grade: Declining. The percentage of students proficient was 17% (13) in reading, 7% (1) in elementary math, and 5% (1) in middle school math. 56% (24) of students made learning gains in reading, 29% (2) made learning gains in elementary math, and 44% (8) made learning gains in middle school math. Of the lowest 25%, 55% (6) made learning gains in reading, 0% (0) made learning gains in elementary math, and 43% (3) made learning gains in middle school math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> </ul>
Assis Principal	Thomas W. Steele	Specific Learning Disabilities (grades K-12) Emotional Handicaps (grades K-12) Psychology (grades 6-12) Educational Leadership (grades K-12)	22	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•• School Grades – N/A</li> <li>• 2007/08 - 29% of students were proficient in reading and math. 56% made learning gains in reading and 72% made learning gains in math. 9% of students were meeting high standards in reading and math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2008/09 - The percentage of students proficient in reading was 30% and 33% in math. 53% of students made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 53% made gains in reading and 28% made learning gains in math. 11% were meeting high standards in reading and 7% were meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2009/10- The percentage of students proficient is 27% in reading and 35% in math. 58% (38) of students made learning gains in reading, 69% (44) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 71% made learning gains in reading and 70% made gains in math. 13% of students are meeting high standards in reading and 10% are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>•2010/11 – The percentage of students proficient is 28% (20) in reading and 16% (10) in math. 52% (29) of students made learning gains in reading, 46% (21) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 35% (6) made learning gains in reading and 14% (2) made learning gains in math. 7% (5) of students are meeting high standards in reading and 3% (2) are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2011/12 – School Grade: Declining. The percentage of students proficient was 17% (13) in reading, 7% (1) in elementary math, and 5% (1) in middle school math. 56% (24) of students made learning gains in reading, 29% (2) made learning gains in elementary math, and 44% (8) made learning gains in middle school math. Of the lowest 25%, 55% (6) made learning gains in reading, 0% (0) made learning gains in elementary math, and 43% (3) made learning gains in middle school math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> </ul>

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Maureen Cleary	Media (grades K-12) ESOL Endorsement English (grades 5-9) Gifted Endorsement Reading (grades K-12) Specific Learning Disabilities (grades K-12)	11	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Grades – N/A</li> <li>• 2007/08 - 29% of students were proficient in reading and math. 56% made learning gains in reading and 72% made learning gains in math. 9% of students were meeting high standards in reading and math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2008/09 - The percentage of students proficient in reading was 30% and 33% in math. 53% of students made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 53% made gains in reading and 28% made learning gains in math. 11% were meeting high standards in reading and 7% were meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2009/10- The percentage of students proficient is 27% in reading and 35% in math. 58% (38) of students made learning gains in reading, 69% (44) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 71% made learning gains in reading and 70% made gains in math. 13% of students are meeting high standards in reading and 10% are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2010/11 – The percentage of students proficient is 28% (20) in reading and 16% (10) in math. 52% (29) of students made learning gains in reading, 46% (21) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 35% (6) made learning gains in reading and 14% (2) made learning gains in math. 7% (5) of students are meeting high standards in reading and 3% (2) are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2011/12 – School Grade: Declining. The percentage of students proficient was 17% (13) in reading, 7% (1) in elementary math, and 5% (1) in middle school math. 56% (24) of students made learning gains in reading, 29% (2) made learning gains in elementary math, and 44% (8) made learning gains in middle school math. Of the lowest 25%, 55% (6) made learning gains in reading, 0% (0) made learning gains in elementary math, and 43% (3) made learning gains in middle school math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> </ul>
All curriculum	Carlotta Rody	Varying Exceptionalities (grades K-12) Emotional Handicapped (grades K-12) Earth/Space Science (grades 6-12) Elementary Education (grades 1-6)	15	2	<p>School Grades – N/A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2007/08 - 29% of students were proficient in reading and math. 56% made learning gains in reading and 72% made learning gains in math. 9% of students were meeting high standards in reading and math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2008/09 - The percentage of students proficient in reading was 30% and 33% in math. 53% of students made learning gains in reading, 66% made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 53% made gains in reading and 28% made learning gains in math. 11% were meeting high standards in reading and 7% were meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2009/10- The percentage of students proficient is 27% in reading and 35% in math. 58% (38) of students made learning gains in reading, 69% (44) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 71% made learning gains in reading and 70% made gains in math. 13% of students are meeting high standards in reading and 10% are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met.</li> <li>• 2010/11 – The percentage of students proficient is 28% (20) in reading and 16% (10) in math. 52% (29) of students made learning gains in reading, 46% (21) made learning gains in math. Of the lowest 25%, 35% (6) made learning gains in reading and 14% (2) made learning gains in math.</li> </ul>

				7% (5) of students are meeting high standards in reading and 3% (2) are meeting high standards in math. AYP criteria was not met. • 2011/12 – School Grade: Declining. The percentage of students proficient was 17% (13) in reading, 7% (1) in elementary math, and 5% (1) in middle school math. 56% (24) of students made learning gains in reading, 29% (2) made learning gains in elementary math, and 44% (8) made learning gains in middle school math. Of the lowest 25%, 55% (6) made learning gains in reading, 0% (0) made learning gains in elementary math, and 43% (3) made learning gains in middle school math. AYP criteria was not met.
--	--	--	--	--

## 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	Mentoring	Administration	6/2013	
2	NESS	Dana Thomson	6/2013	
3	On-going professional development	Administration	6/2013	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	

## 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
20	0.0%(0)	30.0%(6)	40.0%(8)	30.0%(6)	50.0%(10)	100.0%(20)	25.0%(5)	0.0%(0)	65.0%(13)

## 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
		Mr. Maldonado is an	Both mentor and mentee will observe each other in lesson delivery. Mentor will periodically provide feedback on lesson plan development.

Dana Thomson

Ariel  
Maldonado

experienced  
teacher, but  
is new to  
Cross Creek  
School

Mentor will review data  
chat format and  
participate with mentee  
on initial data chats.  
Mentor will support  
mentee on adhering to  
procedures delineated in  
the staff handbook.

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

### School-based MTSS/Rti Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Cross Creek School services ESE students K-12. The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team membership will vary depending on the student(s) targeted and his/her particular grade level. Our entire population are students with disabilities and receive ESE services throughout their entire school day. Our teachers are dually certified in ESE and the subject area they teach.

Administrator  
Guidance Director  
ESE Specialist  
Teacher (student's assigned teacher(s))  
School Psychologist  
Family Counselor (student's assigned therapist)  
Reading Coach  
Curriculum Coach  
Behavior Specialist

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

The team meets bi-monthly or as needed and develops comprehensive intervention plans for students who are significantly below grade level in core academic subjects and/or students exhibiting significant behavioral difficulties. The ESE Specialist will be responsible for case management, coordinating meetings, and recording/logging student information. Information regarding student interventions is disseminated during weekly level team meetings.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team looks at both academic and behavioral data in order to identify grade level academic needs and areas of focus, as well as individual behavioral needs. All of our students need ongoing intensive interventions based on their individual education plans and therefore each student requires Tier 3 interventions. The MTSS Leadership Team creates individual behavior and/or academic plans to increase student achievement. The information gained in the RTI process is reported to the SIP sub committees and the School Improvement Plan activities/interventions are modified as necessary.

### 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.

BAT 1, 2 and Virtual Counselor are used for Reading, Math, Science, and Writing to identify Tier 1, 2, and 3 students. We also use that information to identify the weakest areas for remediation. Monthly school-wide writing prompts are used to identify Tier 1, 2, and 3 students. The six traits writing rubric is used to determine the weakest areas for remediation. Time out logs, Impulse Control Education logs, and suspension records are used to pinpoint Tier 1, 2 and 3 students for behavior difficulties. FBA analysis is done to target problem behaviors. Due to the size of our student population and diverse makeup of classes (grade and ability levels) all data is looked at individually, disaggregated, and school-wide trends are identified and action plans developed. Progress monitoring graphs will be used to monitor students' academic progress.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Through the Professional Learning Community process, the MTSS Leadership Team will train the staff. Trainers will consist of administrators, instructional coaches, and ESE Specialists. Training will occur during the first five teacher planning days and on specified teacher workdays. Content will consist of data collection, data analysis, and the three-tiered system of

intervention delivery. All students receive tier 3 interventions, therefore professional development content will focus on this area. The goal of the training is to ensure all instructional staff know how to implement the RtI process and use data sources effectively to monitor progress and prescribe intervention strategies. Follow-up will include lesson plan monitoring, progress monitoring graphs, FBA tracking forms, and behavior logs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Weekly RTI/PBIP meetings are held at each level (elementary, middle, high), data is analyzed, and modifications to individual plans are made as necessary. These meetings are monitored by the MTSS Leadership Team to insure efficiency and effectiveness. Strategies for improvement are developed and implemented as needed.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal or Assistant Principal  
Reading Specialist  
Curriculum Coach  
Guidance Director  
Media Specialist  
ESE Specialist  
Select ESE Reading Teachers (High School, Middle School, Elementary School)  
Science and Reading Teacher, Middle School  
Electives Teacher (all levels, Language Arts Teacher)  
Science Teacher, High School

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

The LLT is scheduled to meet bimonthly; due to conflicts with testing, some months it will only meet once. Data collected from the 2012 FCAT, AP3 FAIR, Diagnostic Assessments of Reading and teacher input were used to plan the focus, goals, and initiatives of the LLT. In the Cross Creek Instructional Focus Calendar, the four FCAT 2.0 reporting categories are aligned with CRISS/McRel, High Yield Strategies and the Common Core State Standards. This will assist in the goal of raising student achievement in the areas of content specific reading, vocabulary, background knowledge and text complexity. The LLT analyzes student and teacher data at the elementary, middle, and high school levels; progress monitoring and revisions to instruction are addressed as needed. The Comprehensive Core Reading Programs and Comprehensive Intensive Reading Programs are monitored to ensure implementation with fidelity. Team members participate in a Professional Learning Community/Study Group.

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

Under the auspices of the LLT, two model/demonstration classrooms will be implemented. The LLT will be following the district model of shifting to the CCSS for English and Language Arts and the implications this will have for classroom instruction. To increase recreational reading, the LLT sponsors a number of reading motivation programs for all levels including Reading Across Broward, Get Caught Reading, and Read Across America. Having a cadre of qualified teachers is a major initiative of the LLT. The reading coach works closely with teachers to encourage and support reading professional development. The school enables teachers to become reading endorsed by providing Temporary Duty Authorizations to attend district reading workshops. University schedules of classes leading to reading certification are posted, and Teacher Directed Improvement Funds are available for tuition reimbursement.

## 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.

Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

All students enrolled in grades 6-8 receive daily reading instruction in a separate class. All 6-12 teachers receive on-going professional development in reading strategies. The reading coach models, provides guidance, and instructs all teachers (content area and electives) on CRISS/McRel reading strategies. Many teachers at the 6-12 level are either reading certified, endorsed, or have taken CRISS or McRel training. Lesson plans will be reviewed periodically, and classroom walkthroughs will be used to ensure all teachers are utilizing effective reading strategies.

### \*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?

Intensive Reading, Pre-Algebra and Integrated Science courses are provided for students to utilize skills learned in academic areas, and to give them the opportunity to see how these skills apply to real life.

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?

Due to our small student body (59 high school students), all high school students meet frequently with the Guidance Director to discuss course selections, career goals, and post secondary options. The annual guidance plan is implemented, which focuses on academic and career planning. FACTS.org and ePEP are utilized to inform students of academic and career information to plan appropriate coursework. The course progression charts are used with students who are transferring to mainstream schools to ensure students are enrolled in the proper rigorous courses. All students also discuss future goals and opportunities in individual and group counseling with Family Counselors.

### 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](#)

At the start of their junior year, all students are referred to Vocational Rehabilitation. This resource provides students with support while they transition from high school to the work force and/or post secondary education. Students also have the opportunity to dual enroll at either a local community college or technical program while they are still in high school. College fairs are available for students to attend to gain information about college entrance requirements such as SAT and ACT scores. Students receive preparation for these exams in their junior and/or senior year. Job coaches work with interested students to assist them in finding employment and also teach them the skills they need to obtain and maintain a job while in school and after graduation. Post secondary group counseling also prepares students with career exploration as well as interest and aptitude inventories. Students who are enrolled in reading and math courses receive ACT/SAT prep. Students who are interested in further preparation are referred to a community school for evening classes. Fee waivers for disadvantaged students are submitted to SAT/ACT. Accommodations for these tests are applied for each ESE student.



## 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:	Of those students who participated in the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading 2.0, 47% scored a level 1, and 36% scored a level 2.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% of students in grades 3-10 scored a level 3 in reading.	14% of students in grades 3-10 will score a level 3 in reading

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 3 or above do not take reading as a separate class.	Reading strategies in content area classes to include elective courses will be expanded. This will include Comprehension Instructional Sequence.	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom observations; teacher support provided by the reading coach; data chats between reading coach and students three times a year	Teacher lesson plans and progress monitoring including FAIR and Benchmark Assessments; content area assessments
2	Students in grades 3-8 scored lowest in Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction and Informational Text/Research Process on the 2011 FCAT Reading Assessment	Students in reading and content area classes will include CRISS, High Yield Strategies, and Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or close reading practice.	Reading Coach Administration	Reading coach observations and conferences with teachers; teacher and/or data chats with students three times a year	Teacher lesson plans and progress monitoring including FAIR and fluency rubrics; in-program assessments in reading and content areas.

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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

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

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

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:	Of the students that took the 2011-2012 Reading FCAT 2.0, 6% of students scored a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6% students scored at or above level 4 in reading.	9% students will score at or above level 4 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	9th and 10th grade students who scored a Level 4 or 5 do not take reading as a separate class.	Reading strategies in content area classes to include elective courses will be expanded. This will include Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or close reading practice.	Reading Coach Administration	Teacher observations, support and conferences with the reading coach; data chats with students and reading coach three times a year; review of teacher lesson plans	Teacher lesson plans and progress monitoring including FAIR and fluency rubrics; content area assessments.
2	Students in grades 3-8 scored lowest on Literary Analysis: Fiction and Nonfiction and Informational Text/Research Process on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	Strategies in reading and content area classes will include CRISS, High Yield Strategies, and Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or close reading practice.	Reading Coach Administration	Teacher observations, support and conferences with the reading coach; data chats with students and reading teacher three times a year; review of teacher lesson plans	Teacher lesson plans and progress monitoring including FAIR, fluency rubrics, and in-program reading and content area assessments.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  Reading Goal #2b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	There were 43 students in grades 4-10 whose data was evaluated for the achievement of learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% students made learning gains in reading.	62% students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in Reading.	Individual and small group tutoring will use pull-out or push-in models. Students will receive instruction according to the area(s) that need improvement.	Reading Coach	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments related to the particular deficit(s); classroom walkthroughs	FAIR, BAT, DAR, in-program reading assessments; work samples and informal assessments
2	Many Cross Creek students lack strategies to comprehend complex literary and informational texts.	Content area teachers will use CRISS, Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or close reading techniques, and other reading strategies.	Reading Coach Administration	Teacher lesson plan reviews, observations, data chats and informal discussions between teachers and the Reading Coach	FAIR, BAT, DAR, fluency rubrics, in-program reading and content area assessments
3	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided; techniques include coping and relaxation strategies, bibliotherapy, and journal writing.	Administration, Clinical Team Leader	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	For the lowest 25% of students, 10% increased a level, and 90% increased their developmental scores.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% students made learning gains in reading.	61% students will make learning gains in reading.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in Reading.	Individual and small group tutoring will use pull-out or push-in models. Students will receive instruction according to the area(s) that need improvement.	Reading Coach	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments related to the particular deficit(s); classroom walkthroughs	FAIR, BAT, DAR, in-program reading assessments; work samples and informal assessments
2	Many Cross Creek students lack strategies to comprehend complex literary and informational texts.	Content area teachers will use CRISS, High Yield Strategies, Comprehension Instructional Sequence and/or close reading techniques and other pertinent reading strategies.	Reading Coach Administration	Teacher lesson plan reviews, observations, and informal discussions between teachers and the reading coach	FAIR, BAT, DAR, in-program content area assessments
3	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Administration, Clinical Team Leader	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data notes

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 #					
	There were 72% of students who were not proficient in reading for the 2010/2011 school year.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	There were 82%	There will be 72	There will be 62	There will be 52	There will be 42	

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:	A total of 56% of all ethnic groups combined demonstrated learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

The following ethnic subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress during 2011/2012: White-80%, Black 50%, Hispanic-14%, Asian-100%, American Indian-N/A	The following ethnic subgroups will make Adequate Yearly Progress during 2012/2013: White-86%, Black-56%, Hispanic-20%, Asian-100%, American Indian-N/A:
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	For all subgroups: Students have deficiencies in vocabulary and background knowledge.	Word walls, vocabulary development including Outside-In strategy, morphemic analysis, CRISS and High Yield Strategies	Reading Coach Administration	Evaluation of standardized and informal assessments; project-based learning	Evaluation of standardized and informal assessments; project-based learning products

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:	Cross Creek School has only 3 English Language Learners (ELL) out of an average student population of 120 that were included in the data analysis.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0) of English Language Learners (ELL) made Adequate Yearly Progress.	6% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

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	ELL students' primary language is not English and often English is not spoken in the home setting.	Individual and small group tutoring to include oral and written exposure to the English language; classroom strategies to include CRISS, morphemic analysis and Outside-In strategy.	Reading Coach, ESOL Coordinator, Speech Therapist	Evaluation of standardized test scores and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	Cross Creek School is a Center for Emotionally/Behaviorally Disabled (EBD) students grades K-12. There are no regular education students attending Cross Creek School (all students are Students with Disabilities (SWD)). In 2011/2012, of the students who had scores for comparison, 56% made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% students made learning gains in reading.	62% students will make learning gains in reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes.	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	For those Economically Disadvantaged Students who had scores that could be compared, 51% made satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% of students demonstrated learning gains (satisfactory progress).	57% of students will demonstrate learning gains (satisfactory progress) on the 2012/13 assessment.

**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	Frequently, Economically Disadvantaged students are not exposed to life experiences that enrich their education and knowledge base across all curriculum areas.	Provide students with curriculum rich in non-linguistic representation. Students will use technology to enhance background knowledge and increase their knowledge base.	Reading Coach Media Specialist Classroom teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores and informal assessments; project-based learning	Standardized tests and informal assessments; project-based learning products

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
PARCC/Common Core Reading/Language Arts strategies	K-12 - all	Reading Coach	All non-clinical instructional staff K-12	9/25/2012	Reading Coach modeling with follow-up observations of selected teachers; teacher conferencing	Reading Coach
High Yield Strategy - Generating and Testing Hypotheses	K-12 – all subjects	Reading Committee Members	All non-clinical instructional staff K-12	11/27/2012	Classroom observation	Reading Coach

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
Increase student comprehension and motivation for reading.	Renaissance Learning	Accountability	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
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
Reading for Enjoyment	Recreational reading materials	Accountability	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
			Grand Total: \$450.00

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:		There was one ELL student (9th grade) who met criteria for CELLA testing. The score was 709 (Low Intermediate range).			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
There were 0% students who were proficient in Listening/Speaking.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students at Cross Creek have mental health issues that impact their ability to concentrate and maintain focus on listening/speaking.	Multi-modal strategies will be used to assist students retain information presented using a variety of methods.	Administration	Student progress will be monitored by the classroom teacher via student oral presentations.	Oral Presentation Rubric

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:	There was one ELL student (9th grade) who met criteria for CELLA testing. The score was 742 (Beginning range).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

There were 0% (0) students who were proficient in Reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students' primary language is not English and often English is not spoken in the home setting.	Individual and small group tutoring to include oral and written exposure to the English language; classroom strategies to include CRISS, morphemic analysis, and Outside-In strategy	Reading Coach, ESOL Coordinator, Speech Therapist	Evaluation of standardized test scores and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

There was one ELL student (9th grade) who met criteria for CELLA testing. The score was 728 (Beginning range).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

There were 0% students who were proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students at Cross Creek have difficulty organizing their thoughts to transfer information to a written format.	Multi-Modal and a variety of graphic organizers will be used to assist students to organize their ideas develop transitional statements, and include detail statements to enhance their writing skills.	Writing Committee, Administration	Writing products will be reviewed and analyzed by the classroom teacher with feedback provided to students.	Writing products

CELLA Budget:

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



No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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:	On the 2011/2012 FCAT, 7% of students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% of students in grades 3-5 scored a Level 3.	10% of students in grades 3-5 will score a Level 3.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math lacking many basic skills.	Individual and small group testing will be conducted to identify gaps in basic skills and individualized targeted instruction will be provided via small group/tutorial format.	Classroom Teachers	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments	Key Math, BAT 1 and BAT 2
2	Students in grades 3-5 do not consistently complete homework.	Each Friday provide motivation/incentive of a ½ price Rock Out ticket to students who complete homework all week.	ESE Teacher/Behavior Specialist	Frequency of ½ price tickets	Teacher grade books
3	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors Administration	Group observations and review of group therapy agendas and therapeutic progress notes. Evaluation of time-out data	Test invalidation data, standardized test scores, and time-out/referral data

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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:	Of the students taking the 2011/2012 FCAT, 0% scored Level 4 or 5. Typically, students who score a Level 4 or 5 are experiencing school success and are therefore able to maintain that success in a less restrictive placement (neighborhood school). As a result, the students who remain enrolled at Cross Creek are less stable, which has an effect on their academic performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students in scored a Level 4 or 5.	3% of students will score a Level 4 or 5.

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 deficient in the ability to apply math concepts to multi-step word problems.	Hands-on technology and project-based learning activities that require the solution of word problems by the application of a variety of concepts will be integrated into academic instruction.	Curriculum Specialist and mathematics teachers	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments
2	Students are not motivated to learn, which is evidenced by a lack of authentic engagement in the classroom.	Curriculum will be presented with real-world applications to make mathematics relevant to the students.	Administration Mathematics SIP Committee	Classroom observations	Classroom Observation and Time-Out Data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2011/2012, 29% of elementary students made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% of students in grades 4-5 made adequate learning gains.	35% of students in grades 4-5 will make adequate learning gains.

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	Upon return from an absence, students frequently do not complete make-up work.	Students and parents will be made aware of the eTutoring tool and internet based academic resources. A letter/notification will be sent home with instructions for students and parents.	Mathematics Teachers	Increased number of make-up work assignments being completed as documented by teacher grade book.	Teacher grade books
2	Students are unmotivated/unwilling to utilize technology and/or do not have access to computers at home.	Twice a month, visit the computer lab during regular math instructional hours to practice MiniBats/EOC utilizing BEEP.	Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores/BAT and informal assessments	Benchmark assessment test

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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Of all elementary students identified as the lowest 25% on the FCAT, 0% made learning gains.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	6% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math.	Tutoring (pull-out), eTutoring, hands-on activities, differentiated instruction based on functioning levels (deficit skill areas).	Learning Lab Coordinator	Evaluation of standardized test scores and tutoring activities	Key Math, BAT 1 and BAT 2 and mini-BAT assessments
2	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math.	Incentives will be delivered at quarterly awards assemblies to students in grades 4-5 who scored in the lowest 25% in math and achieved a grade of C or above.	Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of student grades/ Data Chats	Teacher grade books (grade/point average)
3	According to standardized tests students in the lowest 25% have deficiencies in geometry and measurement.	Expand student prior knowledge by improving content vocabulary and by using measurement tools.	ESE/math teacher	Informal Assessment and Grade Book	Standardized Test and Grade book

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 #					
	There were 80% of students who were not proficient in elementary math for the 2010/11 school year.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	There were 93%	There will be 84	There will be 76	There will be 67	There will be 58	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In the 2011/2012 school year Cross Creek School (gr.4-5) had 2 ethnic groups. The school's ethnic diversity comparatively reflects the ethnic diversity of Broward County Schools.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The following ethnic subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress during 2011/2012: White-50%, Black 20%, Hispanic-N/A, Asian-N/A, American Indian-N/A	The following ethnic subgroups will make Adequate Yearly Progress during 2012/2013: White-56%, Black-26%, Hispanic-N/A, Asian-N/A, American Indian-N/A:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Students may have limited exposure to daily application of math concepts in the home setting.	Increased homework assignments designed to expand real-world usage of mathematics within the home setting	Mathematics teachers	Evaluation of returned homework assignments	Standardized test scores and completed homework
2	Lack of basic skills and background knowledge especially math vocabulary.	Weekly lessons on vocabulary by using direct instruction, and by using activities on smart board.	ESE teacher	Evaluation of student performance	Standardized Test and Grade Book

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:	Cross Creek School has no English Language Learners (ELL) in the elementary grades.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students' primary language is not English and English is not often spoken in the home.	Individual and group tutoring	Curriculum Specialist, ESOL Coordinator	Evaluation of standardized test scores and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	Cross Creek School is a Center for Emotionally/Behaviorally Disabled (EBD) students. K-12. There are no regular education students. attending Cross Creek School (all students are Students with Disabilities (SWD)).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) made Adequate Yearly Progress.	35% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

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	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes.	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data notes.

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:	Of the total of Economically Disadvantaged students who could be evaluated for making satisfactory progress in 2011/2012, 29% made Adequate Yearly Progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% of students made Adequate Yearly Progress.	35% of students will make AYP in 2012/2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Frequently Economically Disadvantaged students are not exposed to life experiences that enrich their education and knowledge base across all curriculum areas.	Provide opportunities for students to apply mathematics to real-world problems within the school environment.	Curriculum Specialist/Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores	Standardized tests

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:	In grades 6-8, 5% scored a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% of students in grades 6-8 scored Level 3.	8% of students in grades 6-8 will score Level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	50% (12 students) of all middle school students have deficiency in geometry and measurement.	Math teacher will use geometry cards to reinforce skills during in-class warm-ups and homework activities.	ESE Teacher/Math Teacher	Formal and Informal Assessment	Standardized Test and Informal Assessments
2	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math.	Hands-on technology and project-based learning activities will be used.	Curriculum Specialist and mathematics teachers	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments
3	Students are unable to generalize learned math concepts from the classroom setting/activities to a testing environment.	Twice a month students will visit the computer lab during regular math instructional hours to practice MiniBats/Math Tests via BEEP and other on-line resources.	Math Teacher	Evaluation of practice tests	MiniBats and on-line math tests.

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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Of the students taking the 2011/2012 FCAT, 0% scored Level 4 or 5. Typically, students who score a Level 4 or 5 are experiencing school success and are therefore able to maintain that success in a less restrictive placement (neighborhood school). As a result, the students who remain enrolled at Cross Creek are less stable, which has an effect on their academic performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students in grades 6-8 scored Level 4 or 5	3% of students in grades 6-8 will score Level 4 or 5.

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	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math.	Hands-on technology and project-based learning activities will be integrated into academic instruction.	Curriculum Specialist and mathematics teachers	Evaluation of formal and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments
2	Students are not motivated to learn, which is evidenced by a lack of authentic engagement in the classroom.	Curriculum will be presented with real-world applications to make mathematics relevant to the students.	Administration	Classroom observations	Classroom Observation and Time-Out Data
3	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning, which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Administration, Family Counselors	Evaluation of standardized test scores and therapeutic progress notes	Standardized tests and informal assessments
4	High Level 3 students have weaknesses in geometry and measurement that prevent them from achieving level 4 or 5.	Student will be guided in hands on activities in building three – dimensional figures.	ESE teacher/Math teacher	Informal observations and assessments.	Teacher created rubrics.



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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2011/2012, of the students who had scores for comparison, 44% made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% of students in grades 6-8 made adequate learning gains.	50% of students in grades 6-8 will make adequate learning gains.

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 unmotivated/unwilling to utilize technology and/or do not have access to computers at home.	Twice a month, visit the computer lab during regular math instructional hours to practice MiniBats/EOC utilizing BEEP	Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores/BAT and informal assessments	Benchmark assessment test
2	Upon return from an absence, students frequently do not complete make-up work.	Students and parents will be made aware of the eTutoring tool. A letter/notification has to be sent with instructions to students.	Mathematics Teachers	Increased number of make-up work assignments being completed as documented by teacher grade book.	Teacher grade books
3	Students have a lack of skills in geometry and measurement area.	Teacher will use opening activities and homework assignments to reinforce students' skills.	ESE teacher/ Math teacher	Formal and Informal Assessment	Standardized tests and informal assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Of the elementary students identified as the lowest 25% on the FCAT, 0% made learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	6% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Many students enter Cross Creek functioning below grade level in math.	Tutoring (pull-out), eTutoring, hands-on activities, differentiated instruction based on functioning levels (missing skills in class).	Learning Lab Coordinator	Evaluation of standardized test scores and tutoring activities	Key Math, BAT 1 and BAT 2 and mini-BAT assessments
2	Many students are unmotivated to engage in classroom activities and assignments.	Incentives will be delivered at quarterly awards assemblies to students in grades 6-8 who scored in the lowest 25% in math and are achieving a grade of C or above.	Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of student grades/ Data Chats	Teacher grade books
3	Many of our lowest 25% students enter our school lacking basic, elementary math skills.	Teacher will use math logic puzzles to improve terminology and vocabulary skills necessary for solving math problems.	ESE teacher/Math teacher	Evaluation of students grades and standardized testing.	Teacher grade book and standardized test results.

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 # There were 86% students who were not proficient in middle school math during the 2010/2011 school year. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	88% not proficie	79% not proficie	70% not proficie	61% not proficie	52% not proficie	

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:	Grades 6-8 have 3 ethnic groups. Following are the percentages of students in each ethnic group who had scores to compare to determine satisfactory progress: Black 44%, Hispanic 28%, and White 28%. The school closely reflects the ethnic diversity of Broward County Schools.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The following ethnic subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress during 2011/2012: White-80%, Black-29%, Hispanic-0%, Asian-NA, American Indian-N/A	The following ethnic subgroups will make Adequate Yearly Progress during 2012/2013: White-86%, Black-35%, Hispanic-6%, Asian-NA, American Indian-N/A:

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Due to the variety of family backgrounds, students may not be exposed to technology.	Technology is infused into daily lessons using differentiated instruction and students will be exposed to media technology class.	ESE teacher /Media Technology teacher	Grade book and informal observations.	Standardized testing
2	Limited exposure to daily application of math concepts in the home setting.	Homework assignments designed to expand real-world usage of mathematics within the home setting.	Mathematics teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores	Standardized test scores

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:	Cross Creek School has only 4 English Language Learners (ELL) out of 25 Middle School students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% of ELL students made Adequate Yearly Progress in 2011/2012.	31% of ELL students will make Adequately Yearly Progress in 2012/2013.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students' primary language is not English and English is not often	Individual and group tutoring	Curriculum Specialist ESOL Coordinator	Evaluation of standardized test scores and informal assessments	Standardized tests and informal assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:		Cross Creek School is a Center for Emotionally/Behaviorally Disabled (EBD) students grades K-12. There are no regular education students attending Cross Creek School (all students are Students with Disabilities (SWD)). In 2011/2012, of 18 students who had scores for comparison, 44% made learning gains in math.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
44% of students in grades 6-8 made adequate learning gains.		50% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make Adequate Yearly Progress in 2012/2013.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes.	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:		There were a total of 15 Middle School students who were tested at Cross Creek School that were identified as Economically Disadvantaged.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
33% of students made Adequate Yearly Progress.		39% of students will make AYP in 2012/2013.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Frequently, Economically Disadvantaged students are not exposed to life experiences that enrich their education and knowledge base across all curriculum areas.	Provide opportunities for students to apply mathematics to real-world problems within the school environment.	Curriculum Specialist/Mathematics Teachers	Evaluation of standardized test scores	Standardized tests

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:		No students took the Florida Alternate Assessment in 2012.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

## 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:	Of the high school students who took the EOC Algebra Assessment, 0% of the students scored a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students in grades 9-11 scored a Level 3.	3% students in grades 9-11 will score a level 3.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students come to Algebra class weak in prerequisite skills required for mastering Algebra (fraction operations, decimals, etc.).	Daily warm-ups containing fraction operations for the first 3 months, named Algebra Prerequisites Enhancement Program.	Mathematics SIP Chairperson	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.
2	Lack of parental/guardian support due to unclear understanding of math content.	Students will be encouraged to access eTutoring website provided by Broward County Schools.  Provide students with tutoring in the Learning Lab. The IFC (Instructional Focus Calendar) may be revised based on student progression and EOC benchmarks.	Learning Lab Coordinator	Student tutoring attendance and skill performance will be monitored.	Student performance data and class testing data will be evaluated using the mini BATS and teacher-created assessments.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Of the High School students who took the EOC Algebra Assessment, 11% scored at or above level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
There were 11% of students in grades 9-11 who scored a level 4.	14% of students in grades 9-11 will score a level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not comfortable being assessed on the computer.	Math teacher will take the Algebra students to the Media Center to practice using computers for math testing.	Math Chair, Curriculum Coordinator	Personal supervision on the computer training at the Media Center.	Computer test results identifying familiarity with questions and environment.

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 # In 2010/2011, 50% of students scored in the middle third (level 3). 3A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	89% not proficient	45% not proficient	40% not proficient	35% not proficient	30% not proficient	

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:	There were 4 ethnic groups that took the Algebra EOC assessment: White 22%, Black 56%, Hispanic 11%, and Asian 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:  The following ethnic subgroups level of performance for 2011/2012 were: White-100% level 2, Black-60% level 2, 20% level 1, and 20% level 4, Hispanic-100% level 1, Asian-100% level 2, American Indian-N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:  The following ethnic subgroups level of performance for 2012/2013 will be: White-50% level 3, Black-40% level 3, 60% level 2, and 20% level 4, Hispanic-100% level 1, Asian-100% level 3, American Indian-N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	78% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored 20% or below in polynomials.	Students will be taught self-questioning and self-monitoring strategies to ensure step by step progress. Students will create a summary chart with graphic representation to remember the process to solve.	Mathematics teacher	Students will be given weekly quizzes and summary charts will be checked for accuracy.	Quiz 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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3C:	There was 1 ELL student who took the Algebra EOC assessment.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The 1 ELL student who took the Algebra EOC scored a level 2.	100% of ELL students who will take the Algebra EOC will score a level 3 or higher.

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 ELL student scored 30% in solving polynomials.	Students will be taught self-questioning and self-monitoring strategies to ensure step by step progress. Students will create a summary chart with graphic representation to remember the process to solve.	Mathematics teacher	Students will be given weekly quizzes and summary charts will be checked for accuracy.	Quiz 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:

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3D:	Of those SWD High School students who took the EOC Algebra Assessment, 11% scored a level 1, 78% scored a level 2, and 11% scored a level 4.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
There were no students who scored at level 3 and there was 11% student who scored at level 4.	There will be 17% students who will score level 3 or higher on the Algebra EOC assessment.

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	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes.	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data notes
2	Students have emotional/behavioral disabilities that interfere with their ability to recall and use rules and formulas.	Students will be taught how to keep math notes and use a variety of strategies (ie foldables, three column notes etc.).	Mathematics teacher	Weekly quizzes	quiz 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:

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.  Algebra Goal #3E:	78% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC fall within the economically disadvantaged category.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% of students scored a Level 2 and 14% of student scored	29% will score a Level 3, and 14% student will score a Level



a Level 4 on the 2012 Algebra 1 EOC.			4 on the Algebra 1 EOC.		
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	78% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored 20% or below in polynomials.	Students will be taught self-questioning and self-monitoring strategies to ensure step by step progress. Students will create a summary chart with graphic representation to remember the process to solve.	Mathematics teacher	Students will be given weekly quizzes and summary charts will be checked for accuracy.	Quiz grades

*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:			By May 2013, 40% of students who scored below Level 3 will master basic mathematical skills required to pass Geometry EOC.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students scored a 2 (level 3), and 25% of students scored a 1 (level 1) on the Geometry EOC.			In 2012/2013, 75% of students will score a 2 (level 3) and 25% will score a Level 3 on the Geometry EOC.		
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 took the 2012 Geometry EOC scored 50% or below in two-dimensional geometry.	Models and manipulatives will be used to solidify the meaning and use of formulas.	Mathematics teacher	weekly quizzes, model rubrics	model rubrics and quiz grades.
2	Students come with limited prior knowledge of geometric concepts. Prerequisite skills required for mastering Geometry (two-dimensional shapes and angles, three-dimensional shapes, and abstract visualization) are lacking.	Warm-ups containing fraction operations from the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program will be used on a daily basis for the first 3 months.	Math Chair	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.	Weekly specific quizzes for the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program.

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 0%		
---	--	--	---	--	--

Geometry Goal #2:	of students scored a 3 (level 4 or 5).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 0% of students scored a 3 (level 4 or 5).	6% of students will score a 3 (level or 5) on the 2013 Geometry EOC.

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 took the 2012 Geometry EOC scored 50% or below in two-dimensional geometry.	Models and manipulatives will be used to solidify the meaning and use of formulas.	Mathematics teacher	weekly quizzes, model rubrics	model rubrics and quiz grades.
2	Students come with limited prior knowledge of geometric concepts. Prerequisite skills required for mastering Geometry ( two-dimensional shapes and angles, three-dimensional shapes, and abstract visualization) are lacking.	Warm-ups containing fraction operations from the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program will be used on a daily basis for the first 3 months.	Math Chair	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students	Weekly specific quizzes for the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program.

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 # 25% of students scored a 1 (Level 1), not proficient, on the Statewide Comparison by Thirds. 3A :				
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	22% not proficie	19% not proficie	17% not proficie	15% not proficie	

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:	In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 100% of White students scored in the middle third, 100% of Black students scored in the middle third and 50% scored in the first third, and 100% of Hispanic students scored in the middle third. There were no Asian or American Indian students who tested.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 100% of White students scored in the middle third, 50% of Black students scored in the middle third and 50% scored in the first third, and 100% of Hispanic students scored in the middle third. There were no Asian or American Indian students who tested.	In 2012/2013, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 33% of White students will score in the top third, 56% of Black students will score in the middle third and 33% of Hispanic students will score in the top third.

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 come with limited prior knowledge of geometric concepts. Prerequisite skills required for mastering Geometry ( two-dimensional shapes and angles, three-dimensional shapes, and abstract visualization) are lacking.	Warm-ups containing fraction operations from the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program will be used on a daily basis for the first 3 months.	Math Chair	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.	Weekly specific quizzes for the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program.
2	Students who took the 2012 Geometry EOC scored 50% or below in two-dimensional geometry.	Models and manipulatives will be used to solidify the meaning and use of formulas.	Mathematics teacher	weekly quizzes, model rubrics	model rubrics and quiz 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:

3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3C:	In 2011/2012 0 ELL students took the Geometry EOC.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3D:	In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students scored a 2 (level 3) and 25% scored 1 (level 1).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students scored a 2 (level 3) and 25% scored 1 (level 1).	In 2012/2013, on the statewide comparison by thirds 75% of students will score at least a 2 (level 3) and 6% will score 3 (level 4).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health issues have a negative impact on cognitive functioning which affects student performance on standardized testing.	Individual and group therapy will be provided.	Family Counselors	Group observations and review of data from therapists' progress notes.	Test invalidation data and time out/referral data notes.

2	Students who took the 2012 Geometry EOC scored 50% or below in two-dimensional geometry.	Models and manipulatives will be used to solidify the meaning and use of formulas.	Mathematics teacher	weekly quizzes, model rubrics	model rubrics and quiz grades.
3	Students come with limited prior knowledge of geometric concepts. Prerequisite skills required for mastering Geometry, (two-dimensional shapes and angles, three-dimensional shapes, and abstract visualization) are lacking.	Warm-ups containing fraction operations from the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program will be used on a daily basis for the first 3 months.	Math Chair	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.	Weekly specific quizzes for the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program.

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3E:	In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students scored a 2 (level 3) and 25% scored 1 (level 1).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011/2012, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students scored a 2 (level 3) and 25% scored 1 (level 1).	In 2012/2013, on the statewide comparison by thirds, 75% of students will score a 2 (level 3) and 6% will score 3 (level 4).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who took the 2012 Geometry EOC scored 50% or below in two-dimensional geometry.	Models and manipulatives will be used to solidify the meaning and use of formulas.	Mathematics teacher	weekly quizzes, model rubrics	model rubrics and quiz grades.
2	Students come with limited prior knowledge of geometric concepts. Prerequisite skills required for mastering Geometry ( two-dimensional shapes and angles,three-dimensional shapes, and abstract visualization) are lacking.	Warm-ups containing fraction operations from the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program will be used on a daily basis for the first 3 months.	Math Chair	Assessments given by the teacher and ongoing monitoring of progress of students.	Weekly specific quizzes for the Geometry Prerequisites Enhancement Program.

*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
Applying						

measurement across all subject areas	Grades 3-10	Mathematics SIP Chairperson	Instructional Staff	RDS morning meetings 12/11/2013	Periodic review of teacher lesson plans	Administration
Enhancing mathematics vocabulary through real world problems.	Grades 3-10	Mathematics SIP Chairperson	Instructional Staff	RDS morning meetings 11/13/2012	Periodic review of teacher lesson plans	Administration/Mathematics SIP Chairperson
Improving geometry and measurement skills through building three-dimensional figures.	Grades 3-10	Mathematics SIP Chairperson	Instructional Staff	RDS morning meetings 1/22/2012	Periodic review of teacher lesson plans	Administration/Mathematics SIP Chairperson
Motivating students by incorporating math educational games targeting basic skills that students are lacking.	Grades 3-10	Mathematics SIP Chairperson	Instructional Staff	RDS morning meetings 4/4/2012	Periodic review of teacher lesson plans	Administration/Mathematics SIP Chairperson

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands-on activities utilizing three-dimensional figures to teach geometry and measurement skills.	Construction materials (card paper, rulers, etc.).	Accountability	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increasing student motivation via educational computer software games.	Computer software	Accountability	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide incentives for underachieving students to motivate them to increase math achievement levels.	Certificates and tangible rewards	Accountability	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
			Grand Total: \$400.00

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.  Science Goal #1a:	The 2011/12 FCAT Science Data indicates that of 25 students tested, 16% scored a level 3, 28% scored a level 2, and 56% scored a level 1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT, 16% scored a level 3 in science.	On the 2012/13 FCAT, 19% of students will score a level 3 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health issues have a significant impact on student performance on standardized testing.	Concrete Incentives Use of Technology Hands on Science Activities Positive Behavior Intervention Plans (PBIP).	Classroom teachers, Family Counselors, Administrators, Behavior Specialist, ESE Specialist	Lesson plan reviews, analyze time-out logs, data from therapists' progress notes, Annual FBA/PBIP reviews	Mini-BAT scores FCAT scores Time-out log Behavior intervention tracking
2	Students lack of knowledge in foundational science concepts and deficits in the Nature of Science.	Students will use technology to further research methods, STEM projects, scientists notebook, inquiry based learning, cross-curricular instruction (ie using science text during reading, and student awareness through data chats).	Classroom teachers, Administrators, Curriculum Coach	Lesson plan review	FCAT scores Mini-BATs Informal assessments
3	Differentiated Instruction for several academic levels within the classroom.	Use of Technology: SMART/Promethean Boards and/or iPads, individualized specialized instruction.	Curriculum Coach, Classroom teacher, Administrator	Lesson plan review	FCAT scores

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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	For the 2012/13 year, 3% of students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science as measured by the 5th and 8th grade FCAT 2.0 Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011/2012 FCAT Science Data, 0% of students achieved a Level 4 or 5.	3% of students will achieve a Level 4 or 5 in science as measured by the 5th and 8th grade 2012/13 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health issues have a significant impact on student performance on standardized testing	Concrete Incentives Use of Technology Hands-on science activities Positive Behavior Intervention Plans (PBIP).	Classroom teachers, Administrators, Family Counselors, Behavior Specialist ESE Specialist	Lesson plan review, data chat logs, analyze time-out log, data from the Family Counselor	FCAT scores Mini BAT results  Informal assessments Behavior intervention tracking
2	Differentiating Instruction for several academic levels within the classroom	Use of Technology: SMART/Promethean Boards and/or iPads, individualized specialized instruction	Curriculum Coach, classroom teacher, Administrator	Lesson plan review	FCAT scores
3	Deficits in the Nature of Science	Students will keep research journals, students will use technology to further research methods, student awareness through data chats, inquiry based learning, and STEM projects	Classroom teacher, Administrator, Curriculum Coach	Lesson plan review	FCAT scores Mini BAT results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

## Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:	Based on the 2012 EOC Biology Exam, 63% of students scored in the top third (level 4 or 5), 13% of students scored in the middle third, and 25% scored in the lowest third.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 EOC Biology Exam 13% of students tested scored a level 3 (middle third).	By June 2013, 16% of students will score a level 3 on the EOC Biology Exam.

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 of knowledge in foundational science concepts and deficits in molecular and cellular biology.	Data chats, inquiry based learning, scientist notebooks, STEM projects.	Classroom teacher, Administrators	Data chat log review, iObservation, lesson plan review	Biology pre-test and post-test scores Biology EOC project assessment
2	Mental health issues have a significant impact on student performance on standardized testing.	Concrete Incentives Use of Technology Hands on activities Positive Behavior Intervention Plans (PBIP).	Classroom teachers, Family Counselors, Administrators, Behavior Specialist, ESE Specialist	Lesson plan review, data chat logs, analyze time out log, data from the Family Counselor	Mini BAT results Biology EOC Exam Informal assessments Behavior intervention tracking

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 Biology. Biology Goal #2:	75% of students will score a level 4 or 5 on the EOC Biology Exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011/2012 EOC Biology Exam, 63% of 8 students tested scored a level 4 or 5.	66% of students will score a level 3 on the EOC Biology Exam.

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 of knowledge in foundational science concepts and deficits in molecular and cellular biology.	Data chats, inquiry based learning, scientists notebooks, STEM projects.	Classroom teacher, Administrators	Data chat log review, iObservation, lesson plan review	Biology pre-test and post-test scores Biology EOC project

## 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
District STEM PD	K-12	District Facilitator	Instructional Staff	Based on district calendar	Teacher lesson plan review and iObservation	Administration
Inquiry based learning PD	K-12	Science SIP Chair or Curriculum Coach	Instructional Staff	1/8/02 - PLC	Teacher lesson plan review and iObservation	Administration, Science SIP Chairperson
District Science Notebook PD	K-12	District Facilitator	Science Teachers	Based on district calendar	Teacher lesson plan review and iObservation	Administration, Science SIP Chairperson

### Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.

Students in grades 4, 8, and 10 will acquire a score of at least a 3.0 on the Florida Writes Assessment. There were

Writing Goal #1a:	32 students in grades 4, 8 and 10 who took the 2011-2012 writing assessment. 66% scored below a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% of students grades 4, 8, & 10, scored a level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing Test.	37% of students grades 4, 8, & 10, will score a level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Based on mental health issues, students are unable to complete FCAT Writing Assessment.	1.1. Continued incorporation of flexible schedules and accommodations to assist students in completing writing assignments.	1.1. Writing Committee, Administration	1.1. Writing Committee will collect attendance, referral, and on/call data on students during testing.	1.1. Attendance Data Referral Data Therapeutic Data
2	1.2. Based on mental health issues, students are unable to complete monthly practice prompts in preparation for the FCAT Writing Assessment.	1.2. Continued incentives to reward students who participate consistently in completing writing prompts.	1.2. Language Arts Teachers, Writing Committee	1.2. The clinical/therapeutic staff will conduct group sessions with students and obtain feedback on student interest and the effectiveness of writing incentives.	1.2. Writing prompt completion data
3	1.3. Students fail to maintain focus on the writing topic and their writing products contain unrelated information.	1.3. After baseline prompts are administered and scored, teachers will conduct data chats with students to discuss strengths and weaknesses, and identify appropriate goals. Students will be administered monthly writing prompts.	1.3. Writing Committee	1.3. Writing products will be reviewed and data chats will be conducted bi-monthly (student & teacher). Goals will be monitored and modifications will be made as necessary.	1.3. Writing prompt scores
4	1.4. Students lack organization in their writing.	1.4. Students will be instructed in various methods of organization (thinking maps, foldables, etc.) for the pre-writing and final writing processes.	1.4. Writing Committee, Teachers	1.4. Data chats will be conducted with students and writing products will be reviewed.	Writing products

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:	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective writing strategies and the utilization of the Six Traits Rubric for grading across the curriculum	K-12	Curriculum Specialist	K-12 instructional staff	10/9/12, 10/23/12 - PLC	Monthly school-wide prompts, classroom visits, review of feedback from evaluations of PLP activities, teacher interviews, collaboration	Writing Committee Chairperson, Curriculum Specialist
Writing using technology across the curriculum	K-12	Writing Committee	K-12 instructional staff	2/15/13 - PLC	Teacher surveys, interviews, classroom visits, review of evaluations of PLP activities	Writing Committee Chairperson, Administration
Writing: PARCC/CCSS	K-12	Writing Committee Chairperson	K-12 instructional staff	2/19/13 - PLC	Classroom observations and lesson plan reviews	Administration and Team Leaders

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writer's Cafe	Snack items, writing tools (stationery, journals, books, pens) for incentives	Accountability	\$200.00
			Subtotal: \$200.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$200.00</b>

## 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*

## U.S. History 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 U.S. History.				
U.S. History 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 U.S. History.  U.S. History 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						

U.S. History 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 U.S. History EOC 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:		Cross Creek School is a center school for students with emotional/behavioral disabilities (EBD). Students' mental health stability affects their attendance. Medication issues along with hospitalizations have a direct impact on attendance.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
The average attendance rate for Cross Creek School during the 2011-2012 school year was 85.2%.		The average attendance rate for Cross Creek School during the 2012-1013 school year will be 87% or higher.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
67% of students were absent 10 or more times during the 2011-2012 school year.		The expected number of students with excessive absences will be 60% or less.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
16% of students were tardy 10 or more times during the 2011-2012 school year.		15% or fewer students will be tardy 10 or more times during the 2012-2013 school year.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Cross Creek's catchment contains a large geographical area, rather than a community based school, resulting in students relying on school bus transportation that may arrive late to school.	Increased coordination/communication with area transportation.	Administration, Cross Creek Transportation Liaison	Evaluation of tardy student data using attendance records	Attendance records
2	Many students are unmotivated to attend school regularly.	Provide incentives to students who attend school regularly at quarterly awards assemblies.	Team Leaders, Administration	Evaluation of tardy student data using attendance records	Attendance records



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
Workshop on mental health issues that impact attendance and strategies to increase student attendance.	K-12	Family Counselor, SIP Attendance Committee	Instructional Staff	Early Release (9/27/12)	Family Counselors will track absences for their assigned students. Students will be counseled and be made aware of alternative educational options that may increase their academic participation.	Family Counselors

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
Incentives for attendance	Certificates and tangible rewards	Accountability	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
			Grand Total: \$100.00

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:	All Cross Creek students have a psychiatric diagnosis, which are often manifested by inappropriate and negative behavioral characteristics not conducive to positive participation in the school setting.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
Due to our unique student population, this section is not	Due to our unique student population, this section is not

applicable to our school.	applicable to our school.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.	Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 139 out-of-school suspensions in the 2011-2012 school year.	There will be 80 or fewer out-of-school suspensions in the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
44% of Cross Creek students were suspended out-of-school in the 2011-2012 school year.	40% or fewer Cross Creek students will be suspended during the 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mental health disabilities substantially impact student achievement and behavior in a school setting.	Individual and group therapy will be provided. Annual review of PBIPS and changes to plan as needed.	Family Counselor, Behavior Specialist	Evaluation of suspension data.	Suspension data
2	Lack of parent involvement regarding behavioral support.	Pre and/or post suspension parental meeting. Focus on contacting these parents by making personal contacts prior to parent involvement events.	Behavior Specialist, Family Counselor	Evaluation of suspension data.	Suspension data.
3					
4	Students fail to recognize the consequences for their behavior.	A school wide behavior plan will be developed and implemented based on the top incidents for suspension.	Behavior Specialist, Assistant Principal	Evaluation of suspension data.	Suspension data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Behavior Management	K-12	Behavior Specialist	Para Professionals	September 27, 2012	Suspension date, time-out logs.	Behavior Specialist and Assistant Principal
Behavior						Behavior

Management, FBA/PBIP development	K-12	Behavior Specialist	Instructional Staff	Pre planning day 8/14/2012	Suspension date, time-out logs.	Specialist and Assistant Principal
----------------------------------	------	---------------------	---------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

\* 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. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Goal #1:		Cross Creek School is a center for Emotionally/ Behaviorally Disabled students. Most Students have been unsuccessful in their home schools. As a result, students often have a lack of motivation and desire to remain in school.			
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout Rate:		2013 Expected Dropout Rate:			
1% of students dropped out during the 2011/2012 school year.		1% of students will drop out in 2012/2013.			
2012 Current Graduation Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:			
78% of potential 12th grade students graduated in 2011/2012.		84% of potential 12th grade students will graduate in 2102/2013.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Lack of parental involvement can lead to increased dropout rates.	Individual conferences with parents regarding graduation criteria, the importance of students obtaining diplomas, and the role parents play in discouraging their children from dropping out.	Guidance Director	Evaluation of graduation data.	Graduation data.
2	Mental health disabilities often prevent students from completing their high school education.	Individual, group and career counseling.	Family Counselors Guidance Director	Evaluation of attendance data	Attendance data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Strategies to increase student motivation, academic engagement, and graduation rates.	K-12	Guidance Director	All Instructional Staff	Early Release (9/27/12)	Clinical staff will meet with targeted students and discuss and review individual plans to increase school/academic participation.	Guidance Director

Dropout Prevention 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

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement  Parent Involvement Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Cross Creek is a center for Emotionally Behavioral Disabled (EBD) students grades K-12. Parent involvement is a challenge for several reasons. Cross Creek is not a neighborhood school and services students in the north geographic area of Broward County. The distance some parents must travel makes it difficult for them to attend school events and meetings. We also have a high population of students in foster care and/or group homes. Many of Cross Creek students reside in homes with single working parents.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:  96% of students' (grades K-12 who have been enrolled nine weeks or longer) parents participated in the educational process one or more times by attending annual reviews, reevaluations, FBA/PBIP, individualized orientation, SAC/SAF, therapeutic sessions, academic and/or social events, open house, or graduation.	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:  In 2012/2013, the Expected Level of Parent Involvement will be measured by completed and returned registration packets. 90% of students' parents, grades K-12, will return their registration packet (includes student code of conduct, media release, library privileges, and ESE medical information form).
--	---

### 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	Cross Creek has a high population of students who live in foster care and group homes.	Invite outside agencies involved with the student, (i.e. therapists, case managers, etc.) to participate in the event in lieu of parent.	ESE Specialist and Team Leaders	Data analysis utilizing attendance lists	Attendance lists

## 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:		Increase STEM literacy for all students, including those who do not pursue STEM-related careers or additional study in STEM disciplines.			
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. Students are highly mobile and have major gaps in their prior science education.	1.1. Teachers need to incorporate more inquiry based projects into the curriculum to engage students in basic scientific process.	1.1 Teachers and Curriculum Coach	1.1. – SIP committee meetings to discuss teaching methods	1.1.iObservation
2	1.2. Teachers are not adequately trained in STEM strategies.	1.2. Teachers will be provided with staff development opportunities that focus on STEM strategies.	1.2. Administration	1.2 Review of lesson plans and classroom observations	1.2 iObservation
3	1.3 Students do not understand the relevance of STEM and do not integrate subject area content into problem solving within their academic studies.	1.3 Students will be given real world problems requiring the integration of science, technology, engineering, and math content. Teachers will provide support and feedback.	1.3 Teachers	1.3 Analysis of real world problem based products	1.3 Teacher made rubric

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
Review of GLIDES STEM grants (Pets in the Classroom, Bionic Hands, Padded Frogs).	K-12 Science, Math and Reading	Science/Math SIP Chairpersons, Teachers, Curriculum Coach	All Teachers	Monthly SIP Committee meetings,	Meeting minutes, lesson plan review, iObservations	Science/Math SIP Chairpersons, and Administration
FINDS research method.	K-12 Science, Technology, Engineering, Math	Media Specialist	K-12 teachers		Classroom observation	Curriculum Coach

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STEM hands-on inquiry	Bionic Hand Kit	Accountability	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
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: \$350.00

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:		Due to our unique student population, this section is not applicable to our school.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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)

N/A Goal:

---



---

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of N/A Goal(s)

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Hands-on activities utilizing three-dimensional figures to teach geometry and measurement skills.	Construction materials (card paper, rulers, etc.).	Accountability	\$100.00
STEM	STEM hands-on inquiry	Bionic Hand Kit	Accountability	\$350.00
				Subtotal: \$450.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase student comprehension and motivation for reading.	Renaissance Learning	Accountability	\$300.00
Mathematics	Increasing student motivation via educational computer software games.	Computer software	Accountability	\$200.00
				Subtotal: \$500.00
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	Reading for Enjoyment	Recreational reading materials	Accountability	\$150.00
Mathematics	Provide incentives for underachieving students to motivate them to increase math achievement levels.	Certificates and tangible rewards	Accountability	\$100.00
Writing	Writer's Cafe	Snack items, writing tools (stationery, journals, books, pens) for incentives	Accountability	\$200.00
Attendance	Incentives for attendance	Certificates and tangible rewards	Accountability	\$100.00
				Subtotal: \$550.00
				Grand Total: \$1,500.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Each subcommittee has identified specific needs necessary to accomplish SIP goals using SAC funds. SAC funds will be utilized for motivational activities, technology, software, and reading programs.	\$1,500.00

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

The SAC committee will meet monthly in combination with SAF to review the School Improvement Plan(SIP), and the identified barriers and strategies. Each SIP subcommittee will report to the SAC/SAF the current progress on their goals. Student achievement data will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the SIP and modifications will be made as necessary.

## 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