

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LIMESTONE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Mrs. Suzanne Gibbs

SAC Chair: Mrs. Susan Wood

Superintendent: Mr. E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|---------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Suzanne Gibbs | B.S.- Special Education, Southern Connecticut State College, M.S.- Emotionally Handicapped Education, Nova University. Educational Leadership Endorsement, 30 credits beyond M.S. degree. | 4 | 15 | Principal of Limestone Creek ES in 2008-2012: 2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 79%, Math Mastery 75%, Writing 92%, Science 71%. 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery 88%, Math Mastery 90%, Writing 92%, Science 81%. AYP not met in the areas of SWD and Econ. Dis. for reading. 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery 91%, Math Mastery 89%, Writing 89% met state mastery, Science 82%. AYP was not met in the areas of SWD and Econ. Dis. for reading and math. 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 92%, Math Mastery: 92%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 83%, AYP: Met |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | Certification areas: School Principal, State of Florida, Emotionally Handicapped, Specific Learning Disabilities, Mentally Handicapped, ESOL Endorsement | | | Principal at Golden Grove ES from 2005-2008. 2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 88%, Math Mastery 87%, Writing Mastery: 96%, Science Mastery: 81%, AYP- Met. 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 80%, Writing Mastery: 91%, Science Mastery: 71%, AYP- Met. 2005-2006: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery: 81%, Writing Mastery: 86%, AYP- Met. AP at Golden Grove ES from 1997-2005. 2004-2005: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 79%, Writing Mastery: 88%, AYP- Met. |
| Assis Principal | Kelly Mullen | B.S.- Elementary Education, Ohio University. M.S.- Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University. Certification Areas: Educational Leadership, Elementary Education, ESOL Endorsement | 4 | 4 | AP at Limestone Creek ES in 2008-2012: 2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 79%, Math Mastery 75%, Writing 92%, Science 71%. 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery 88%, Math Mastery 90%, Writing 92%, Science 81%. AYP not met in the areas of SWD and Econ. Dis. for reading. 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery 91%, Math Mastery 89%, Writing 89% met state mastery, Science 82%. AYP was not met in the areas of SWD and Econ. Dis. for reading and math. 2008-2009: Grade A. Reading Mastery: 92%, Math Mastery: 92%, Writing Mastery: 93%, Science Mastery: 83%, AYP: Met. 5th grade teacher at Golden Grove ES 1998-2008: 2007-2008: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 88%, Math Mastery 87%, Writing Mastery: 96%, Science Mastery: 81%, AYP- Met. 2006-2007: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 80%, Writing Mastery: 91%, Science Mastery: 71%, AYP- Met. 2005-2006: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery: 81%, Writing Mastery: 86%, AYP- Met. 2004-2005: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 87%, Math Mastery: 79%, Writing Mastery: 88%, AYP- Met. |

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) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N/A | | | | | |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1. Regular feedback between teachers and administration | Principal Assistant Principal | on-going | |
| 2 | 2. Recruit highly qualified teachers, review recommendations from prior employers, test data | Principal Assistant Principal | on-going | |
| 3 | 3. Provide mentors for on-going collaboration for teachers who require it. | Principal Assistant Principal, Mentors | on-going | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an

effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
| All teachers are highly qualified. One teacher is currently out of field for gifted. | The teacher who is out of field for gifted is currently enrolled in gifted endorsement classes. She is paired with two experienced gifted teachers. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 65 | 0.0%(0) | 10.8%(7) | 26.2%(17) | 63.1%(41) | 23.1%(15) | 93.8%(61) | 10.8%(7) | 10.8%(7) | 78.5%(51) |

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 |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| N/A | | | |

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

[Empty text box]

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

[Empty text box]

Violence Prevention Programs

Single School Culture and appreciation for Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs

[Empty text box]

Housing Programs

[Empty text box]

Head Start

[Empty text box]

Adult Education

[Empty text box]

Career and Technical Education

[Empty text box]

Job Training

[Empty text box]

Other

Required Instruction Listed in 1003.42(2)F.S., as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: Principal, Suzanne Gibbs; Assistant Principal, Kelly Mullen (who is also the ELL Contact); ESE contact, Debra Pullon; School Psychologist, Beth Wruble; Speech and Language Pathologist (SLP), Kelly Bush (or Julie Scott-Daniels), Guidance Counselor and leader of team, Annette Kravick; school nurse, SAI teacher, Lois Fiser (if needed); Wendy Eissey or Lisa Lutz: VE teachers is needed; Nurse Linda Panozzo if needed and the classroom teacher.
The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure:
• a sound, effective academic program is in place;
• a process to address and monitor subsequent needs is created;
• the problem solving team (School Based Team) is assisting with academic and behavioral interventions;
• assessment of RtI skills of school staff is conducted;
• fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented;
• adequate professional development to support the RtI framework is provided; and
• effective communication with parents regarding school-based RtI intervention plans and activities occurs.

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 School-Based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team identifies the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Core Instruction (Tier 1) is in place, the team identifies students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students are offered supplemental interventions and monitored over time. Those who continue to not make adequate progress are referred to the problem solving team. The

SBT uses the Problem Solving Model* to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team identifies students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan is developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team ensures that necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity.

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?

Members of the School-Based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and help develop the SIP. Utilizing the previous year's data, information on core, curricular targets is discussed and attention is focused on deficient areas.

Topics for discussion include, but are not limited to, the following:

- FCAT scores and the lowest 25%
- At-risk subgroups, AMOs with specific attention to subgroups not making satisfactory progress
- strengths and weaknesses of supplemental and intensive intervention programs
- mentoring, tutoring, and other services

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.

Tier 1 Data:

- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
 - Curriculum Based Measurement
 - Palm Beach County Diagnostics
 - Palm Beach Writes
 - K-4 Literacy Assessment System
 - Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)(select students only)
 - * Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)
 - Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
 - Office Discipline Referrals
 - Retentions
 - Absences
 - Staff/Student Surveys
- Parental Input

Tier 2 Data:

Data is collected weekly or every two weeks of the results from supplemental interventions. Data includes probes/assessments based on individual student needs. Data is collected from AIMSWeb, Reading Plus, K-4 Assessment System, Foundations, and Curriculum Based Assessments. Data is also reviewed from other sources such as Scholastic Reading Inventory, Core K-12 Assessments, Palm Beach Writes, Palm Beach County Diagnostics, and Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR) to monitor the progress of students on Tier 2. Behavior data is collected using individual student behavior plans. All data is collected, graphed and reviewed at school-based team meetings to monitor students' responses to the interventions.

Tier 3 data:

Data is collected weekly or every two weeks of the results from supplemental interventions. Data includes probes/assessments based on individual student needs. Data is collected from AIMSWeb, Reading Plus, K-4 Assessment System, Foundations and Curriculum Based Assessments. Data is also reviewed from other sources such as Scholastic Reading Inventory, Core K-12 Assessments, Palm Beach Writes, Palm Beach County Diagnostics, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR) to monitor the progress of students on Tier 2. Behavior data is collected using individual student behavior plans. Functional Behavior Assessments are also completed on students in Tier 3 for behavior. All data is collected, graphed and reviewed at school-based team meetings to monitor students' responses to the interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based professional development team provides opportunities to the faculty on designated professional development days (PDD) and/or at Faculty Meetings. These opportunities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Effective School Based Teams
- RtI and the Problem Solving Process
- School- wide Positive Behavior Support (Sw-PBS)
- How to Interpret Data (Making Informed Decisions)

- Research Based Interventions
- AIMS Web training

Individual professional development is provided to classroom teachers, as needed.

The SBT leader attends district training to support the implementation of the team.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

An administrator will be present at every School Based Team meeting to be an active member of the team. The administrators will meet with the Professional Development Team to plan meaningful professional development activities. The administrators will regularly meet with individual classroom teachers to discuss any student concerns and to assist in developing a plan of action to address the concerns.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Team Members include:

Suzanne Gibbs, Principal; Kelly Mullen, Assistant Principal; Katherine Tierney, Kindergarten teacher; Marci Frank, 1st grade teacher; Sally Loder, 2nd grade teacher of gifted; Cheryl Kenney, 3rd grade teacher of gifted, Beth Reed, 4th grade teacher; Lea Wimer, 5th grade teacher; Lois Fiser, SAI teacher; Tracy Roiger, 4th/5th grade teacher of gifted, Kay Doering, PE teacher; Wendy Eissey, ESE teacher; Jill Sherptis, Media Specialist.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) creates capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focuses on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, assistant principal, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees serve on the team. The LLT meets at least once a month.

The administration meets with the LLT at least once a month. Agenda topics include the discussion of the team's goals and progress, as well as identification of new strategies and activities to implement. As additional needs and concerns arise, the LLT investigates the concerns, studies and plans a course of action, implements the action, analyzes its effectiveness, and reflects on the process. This is a continuous process throughout the entire school year.

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

The LLT plays an integral role in fostering a rich literacy environment at the school for all students and staff. The team builds professional conversations; promotes collegiality, collaboration, and a literacy culture. Initiatives are based on literacy-related data and needs assessments related to the school, including literacy achievement, motivation, and building a community of readers, both at school and home on the process. This is a continuous process throughout the entire school year. The team will focus on the effective use of the K-4 Literacy Assessment and the implications for instruction with the use of the Continuum of Literacy. There will be an additional focus this year on the implementation of the Common Core Standards in K and 1 and future implementation of the PARCC and how that affects classroom assessments.

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.

N/A

*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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 will increase by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28%(108)of the students achieved level 3 on the 2012 Reading FCAT. | 30%(135)of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Some students are performing below grade level in reading. | The school will follow agreed upon Scope and Sequence by grade level and subjects. Teachers will implement Balanced Literacy including Guided Reading with appropriate leveled books, differentiated instruction, and independent reading. Teachers will collaborate to share effective strategies. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Review of classroom performance, Diagnostics, FCAT, Common Assessments. Core K-12 assessments. Administration review of lesson plans. | Classroom performance, Diagnostic Test, FCAT, Common Assessments, Core K-12 assessments, K-4 Literacy Assessment LTM notes and Grade Level meeting notes. |
| 2 | Using data to provide differentiated instruction and support best practices. | Teachers will analyze data to provide support instruction and determine interventions matched to student needs (differentiated instruction for all students). Single School Culture for academic processes will be utilized during Learning Team meetings. Data chats will be held with all students. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Learning Team Facilitators, Teachers | LTM agenda and meeting notes. Review of classroom performance, Diagnostics, FCAT, Curriculum based assessments, teacher observations, data chats, data folders, portfolios. | FCAT, Diagnostics, K-4 Literacy Assessment, Common Assessments, Core K-12, SRI |
| 3 | Gaps in phonetics skills in students, resources, teacher training in Foundations. | Students in grades K-2 will be supported by Foundations to provide a foundation for phonetic decoding. | Teachers trained in Foundations, Principal, Assistant Principal | Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focus on fidelity implementation of Foundations. Review of lesson plans. | Foundations assessments, Curriculum based assessments, K-4 Literacy Assessment |
| 4 | Limited Resources that inhibit full implementation of initiatives. | Ensure classroom libraries and media center consists of fiction and factual texts that are gender and culture specific and incorporate students' cultural knowledge into the literacy curriculum through the use of | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist | Review of available materials in classrooms and media center by administration and Media Specialist. | Survey of materials |

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: | The number of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * Less than 15 atudents took the FAA | * |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Cognitive deficits affect learning | Teachers will utilize the Unique Learning System | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans, Data Sheets | Unit 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:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | Student achieving at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading will increase by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 52% (202)of students achieved levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 Reading FCAT. | 54% (230)of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | Professional Development is not aligned to classroom performance | Provide quality professional development in identified areas of weakness and provide support. | PDD Team Principal, District Staff | Classroom Walkthroughs, PD Agendas, Lesson Plans, LTM's | Diagnostic Tests, FCAT, Core K-12, Common Assessments, Teacher observations, Projects |
| 2 | Challenge of utilizing Webb's Depth of Knowledge with fidelity and incorporate it in planning. | Teachers will utilize Webb's Depth of Knowledge in planning for instruction, Literacy Circles, Reader's Theater and assessments. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Administrators will review lesson plans and conduct focused classroom walkthroughs. | Classroom walkthroughs to determine fidelity of implementation, student work samples. |
| 3 | Professional Development to support higher level questioning and thinking process, and resources. | Teachers will provide challenging instruction using differentiated instruction to match the needs of each child's ability. Teachers will collaborate to identify best practices. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Gifted Teachers, Teachers with advanced students | Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs, | Diagnostic Tests, Classroom Walkthroughs, student work samples. |

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: | The number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * Less than 15 students took the FAA | * |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | Cognitive deficits impedes processing ability | Teachers will utilize the P.C.I. Reading Program | Principal , Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Chapter worksheets, Lesson Plans | Unit Tests, Mastery 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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | Students making learning gains in reading will increase by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 76%(195)of students made learning gains on the 2012 Reading FCAT. | 78% (213) of the students will make learning gains in reading on the FY 2013 FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Time constraints | Student data chats and individual goal setting will be conducted with all students following assessments. | Principal, Teachers, Assistant Principal | Administrators will review data folders during classroom walkthroughs. | FCAT Diagnostics, Common Assessments, Core K-12, EDW Data Reports |
| 2 | Monitoring and using data to assess instructional needs, and match interventions. | Teachers will use technology to reinforce and enhance reading strategies, using FCAT Explorer, Breakthrough to Literacy, Destination Reading, Reading Counts, and Reading Plus. This will be done during computer time, iii time, and during the reading block. | Teachers, ITSA, Principal, Assistant Principal | Administration will review lesson plans and computer generated reports. | Printouts, Diagnostics, Core K-12, FCAT |

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | There will be increase in the percentage of students making learning gains in reading on the FAA. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * Less than 15 students took the FAA. | * |

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 | Intellectual impariments impedes reading ability | Teachers will continue to find new and different visual and auditory strategies. Differentiated instruction will be implemented to address individual levels of needs. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Review of classroom assessments, teacher observation | Brigrance Inventory of Basic Skills, Classroom 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:

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | The percentage of lowest 25% students making learning gains in reading will increase by 4%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 64% (39)of students in lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 Reading FCAT. | 68% (48)of the students in lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Scheduling conflicts, limited personnel, poor student attendance | Targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Student progress will be assessed using bi-monthly assessments for all students receiving supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmarks will be calculated and discussed in Learning Team meetings. | Common and benchmark assessments, diagnostics, Core K-12, K-4 Literacy Assessment, along with DAR data when appropriate will be used to determine progress. |
| 2 | Time constraints of staff. | Administration and teachers will conduct data chats with lowest 25% students following assessments and set individual goals. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom teachers | Data Chat folders and review of diagnostics, PBW, Core K-12, SRI results. | FCAT results, Diagnostic results, SRI results, Core K-12. |
| 3 | Enough support staff and teachers to implement interventions with fidelity | Students in the lowest 25% will receive tutoring to remediate their areas of weakness. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Tutorial Lists, Data collected to determine the academic progress review during LTMs. | Diagnostics, EDW Reports, classroom assessments |
| | Time Constraints | Students in the lowest | Teachers, | Data collected to | Reading Plus |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 4 | 25% with no phonics deficiencies will utilize the Reading Plus program 90-120 minutes per week. The program will be used in the computer lab, iii time, tutorial and during the reading block. Program will also be used in SACC program. Incentives will be given to students achieving goals. | Principal, Assistant Principal | determine the academic progress will be reviewed during LTMs and LLT meetings. List of targeted students in SACC. | reports, Diagnostic results, FCAT 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%. | | Reading Goal # In six years school will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. | | | | |
| 5A : | | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 77% | 79% | 81% | 83% | 85% | |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | In 2013, the school will meet the AMO targets of students not making satisfactory progress in reading for each subgroup. The percentage of White students not making satisfactory progress will reduce by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: In grades 3-5, 17% of White students, 42% of Black students and 27% of Hispanic students did not meet satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT. The school met the AMO targets for Black and Hispanic students but did not meet the target for White students. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In 2013, the percentage of students in each subgroup not making satisfactory progress in reading will be as follows: 15% of White students, 42% of Black students and 33% of Hispanic students. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Lack of resources, lack of parental support and/or involvement, financial issues | Implement a mentoring program to target struggling students with a focus on black and Hispanic students. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Chairs | List of students and mentors. Review data of targeted students. | Core K-12 assessments, diagnostics, benchmark assessments, attendance. |
| 2 | Lack of parental support and involvement, financial issues, personnel shortage | Students will be provided supplies, nutritional meals, tutoring, mentoring, Parent Technology Night, Community Events | Principal, Assistant Principal, school police, teachers, school support staff | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback |
| 3 | Time constraints, lack of personnel | As determined appropriate for each student, identified students will utilize the Reading Plus program at a minimum of 90-120 minutes per week. | Teachers. Principal, Assistant Principal | Data collected to determine the academic progress will be reviewed during LTMs and LLT meetings | Reading Plus data |
| | Scheduling conflicts, limited personnel, poor | Targeted intervention for students not responding | Teachers. Principal, Assistant | Student progress will be assessed using bi- | Common and benchmark |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------|---|--|
| 4 | student attendance | to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction. | Principal | monthly assessments for all students receiving supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmarks will be calculated and discussed in Learning Team meetings. | assessments, diagnostics, Core K-12, K-4 Literacy Assessment, along with DAR data when appropriate will be used to determine progress. |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------|---|--|

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: | Insufficient number of students in this subgroup for AMO targets. The percentage of ELL students meeting proficiency in reading will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| School data indicated only 5 ELL students tested. There was insufficient data for this subgroup. | Insufficient number of students in this subgroup for AMO targets. The percentage of ELL students meeting proficiency in reading will increase. |

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 | Language barriers, limited support from home | Teachers will utilize ESOL strategies to meet the needs of the ELL student such as graphic organizers, vocabulary development, chunking, guided reading, read alouds, pre-post reading activities, prediction, phonics, and context clues. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Diagnostics, Core K-12, SRI |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | In 2013, the school will meet the AMO target for students with disabilities. The percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will reduce by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT. 54% of the students scored satisfactorily therefore the school did not meet the AMO target of 55%. | In 2013, the percentage of the students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will be 41%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Lack of training for personnel, lack of funds for training, lack of personnel to provide interventions with fidelity | Use of cooperative learning strategies, Foundations/Wilson Reading System, Kagan Strategies small group tutoring, planning | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Lesson plans will be reviewed by administration. Review of Core K-12 assessments, Benchmark assessments, | Core K-12 Assessments, Benchmark assessments, Diagnostics, SRI,FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | differentiated lessons based on students abilities and needs | | Diagnostics,SRI, FCAT | |
| 2 | Time challenges between ESE and general education teachers | Teachers will continue to monitor progress after each diagnostic and/or classroom assessment to align instruction. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Review during LTM, Core K-12 assessments, Diagnostics, Benchmark assessments | Core K-12 assessments, Diagnostics, Benchmark assessments |
| 3 | Time constraints, lack of personnel | As determined appropriate for each student, SWD Students will utilize the Reading Plus program for a minimum of 90-120 minutes per week. | Teachers, Principal,Assistant Principal | Data collected to determine the academic progress will be reviewed during LTMs and LLT meetings. | Reading Plus reports, Diagnostics, FCAT |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | In 2013, the school will meet the AMO target for economically disadvantaged students of 38%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 36% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT. The school met the AMO target for this subgroup. | In 2013, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be 38%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Lack of parental support and involvement, financial issues, personnel shortage | Students will be provided supplies, nutritional meals, tutoring, mentoring, Parent Technology Night, Community Events | Principal, Assistant Principal, school police, teachers, school support staff | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback |
| 2 | Lack of reading material at home to provide reading support. | Teachers will model reading for life long learning. | Teachers. Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson plans, reading logs, Classroom walkthroughs by administration | SRI Testing, Diagnostics |
| 3 | Time constraints, lack of personnel | As determined appropriate for each student, ED Students will utilize the Reading Plus program a minimum of 90-120 minutes per week. | Teachers. Principal, Assistant Principal | Data collected to determine the academic progress will be reviewed during LTMs and LLT meetings. | Reading Plus data, SRI, Diagnostics, FCAT |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | Use of AIMS Web for | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| AIMSWeb Training | All | District trainer | School-wide | By Dec. 2012, one training | progress monitoring of students in RTI process will be monitored by the SBT | Administration, School Base Team |
| Foundations Training and Support | K-2 reading teachers | District trainer | Training for new primary reading teachers; on-going support to all K-2 reading teachers | Sept. 2012 for new teachers; on-going support 3 times per year- first session in Oct. 2012 | Schedule of trainings, Lesson Plans and walkthroughs | Administration |
| Common Core Standards Training | Overview all teachers, content focused K-1 teachers | PDC, District trainers | Overview all teachers, content focused K-1 teachers | Pre-school, Sept. 2012 PDD | Schedule of trainings, Agenda, Sign-in sheets | PDC, Administration |
| Higher Order Questioning Strategies | All | PDC | All teachers | By Jan. 2013 PD | Schedule of trainings, Lesson Plans and walkthroughs | PDC, Administration |
| Lesson Study Marzano strategies | All | PDC | All teachers | On-going, Sept. - May, PDD and Faculty meetings | Learning Team Meeting agendas and notes, Faculty Meeting agendas, activities, IObservation | Administration |
| Reading Plus training | 3-5/Reading | PDC, Reading Plus Contacts | All 3-5 reading teachers | By Oct. 2012, PDD or PD | Schedule of trainings, Agenda, Sign-in sheets, Reading Plus logs | PDC, Administration, Reading Plus Contacts |
| Standards Based Report Card Training | K-1 | PDC | All K-1 teachers | Aug. 2012 preschool, Sept. PDD, LTMs, on-gong throughout the year | Schedule of trainings, portfolios, record books | PDC, Administration |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Students in K-2 will be supported by Foundations | Updated teacher manuals | School Recognition Funds | \$350.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$350.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Students will utilize the Reading Plus program at a minimum of 90-120 minutes per week. The program will be used in the computer lab, iii time and during the reading block. Program will also be used in SACC program. | Reading Plus program- tutorial stipend | SACC budget, School Recognition Funds, School Improvement Funds | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Students in gr. K-2 will be supported by Foundations to provide a foundation for phonetic decoding. | Substitute funding | School Substitute budget | \$880.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$880.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Tutorial program | Tutorial stipends for teachers | School Improvement Funds, School Recognition Funds, Community School K-12 Initiative | \$5,000.00 |
| Reading Plus incentives | Incentives for students making goals on Reading Plus. | General Activities Account | \$700.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$5,700.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$8,930.00 |

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: | | The percentage of students scoring proficient in the listening/speaking section of CELLA will increase to 55% (9). | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| In gr. K-5, 40%(6)of the students scored proficient in Listening/Speaking on the CELLA. | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Limited exposure to the English language at home | Teachers will implement activities that enhance listening comprehension, pronunciation, and intonation such as graphic organizers, paraphrasing, chunking, story telling, read alouds, modeling, visuals, props, gestures. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, teacher observation, classroom assessments | Classroom assessments |

| 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: | | The percentage of students scoring proficient in reading on the CELLA will increase to 31%(5). | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | | |
| In gr. K-5, 13%(2)of the students scored proficient in reading on the CELLA. | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of materials at home, lack of support at home due to limited English speaking ability of parents | Teachers will utilize strategies to meet the needs of the ELL student such as graphic organizers, vocabulary development, chunking, guided reading, read alouds, pre-post reading activities, prediction, phonics, and context clues. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, review of data | Classroom Assessments, K-4 Assessments, SRI, Core K-12, CELLA |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Computer assisted instruction will also be used. | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: | The percentage of students scoring proficient in writing on the CELLA will increase to 25% (4). |
|--|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In gr. K-5, 13%(2)of the students scored proficient in writing on the CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Limited English negatively impacts writing skills | Teachers will utilize ESOL strategies to build writing skills such as immediate feedback, modeling, balanced literacy, peer buddies, graphic organizers, integration of oral and written instruction, and the use of Read, Write, Gold. | Principal. Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, review of portfolios | Palm Beach Writes, classroom assessments, CELLA |

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a: | The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in math will increase by 3% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 26% (102)the students achieved scored at Achievement Level 3 on the 2012 Math FCAT. | 29%(131)will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 Math FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Implementation of the math series with fidelity. | Provide additional trainings, as needed, on the Go Math series. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson plans, Go Math assessments | Go Math Assessments, Diagnostics, Core K-12 |
| 2 | Monitoring and interpreting all the data generated by many different programs | Go Math,FCAT Explorer, Riverdeep, and technology related to math will be utilized. | Principal, Assistant Principal,Teachers,ITSA | Lesson Plans and classroom walkthroughs. | Reports from computer programs, Diagnostic scores, FCAT |
| 3 | Implementation of the math series with fidelity | Teach math vocabulary in context. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson Plans, Go Math Assessments | Go Math Assessments, Diagnostics, FCAT, Core K-12 |
| 4 | Limited time and resources | Utilize Sunshine Math program and V-Math (computer program)to support problem-solving skills across grade levels. | Math team, Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson Plans, LTM meetings | Classroom assessments, FCAT, V Math reports, Core K-12 |
| 5 | Students don't know how to generalize knowledge to real life situations. | School will hold a Family Math Night at the local Publix. A worksheet for each grade level with real-world problems will be completed by the students. Incorporate the Sparks program through the physical education classes to increase math skills used in real life. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Sign in sheets from Math Night, Completed worksheets | Completed Worksheets |

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: | The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4,5, and 6 in mathematics will increase |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

*Less than 15 students took the FAA

*

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 | Difficulty in processing the mathematical process | Teachers will utilize the Equals Math Program. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans, Classroom Review | Data Sheets, Unit 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.
Mathematics Goal #2a:

The percentage of students scoring at and above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase by 2%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

49%(193)of students scored at or above achieved Levels 4 on the 2012 Math FCAT.

51% (230)will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Math FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Professional Development may not be aligned to classroom performance and instructional strategies to support higher learners | Provide quality professional development in identified areas of weakness and strengths to maximize gains. | PDD Team Principal Teachers | Classroom Walkthroughs, PD agendas, Lesson Plans, Classroom projects | Diagnostic Tests, FCAT, Core k-12 |
| 2 | Time constraints, staff | Utilize data to identify students who need interventions and enrichment. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | LTMs agendas, Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs | Diagnostics, FCAT, Core k-12 |
| 3 | Challenge of providing support and time to students who excel in math. | Teachers of Gifted and high achieving students will utilize Webb's Depth of Knowledge in planning instruction and assessments. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans | Diagnostic Tests, FCAT, Core k-12 |

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.

The percentage of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics will increase.

Mathematics Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

*Less than 15 students took the FAA

*

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 | Difficulty in comprehending mathematical processes | Teachers will utilize the Equals Math Program | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans with hands on manipulatives | Chapter Tests, Unit 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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase by 4% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72% (187)of the students made learning gains on the 2012 Math FCAT. | 76% (207) of the students will make learning gains on the 2013 Math FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Time constraints | Student Data Chats and Individual goal setting will be conducted with all students following assessments. | Principal, Teachers Assistant Principal | Adminstrators will review data folders during classroom walkthrougths. | FCAT Diagnostics,Core k-12 , EDW Data Reports |
| 2 | Time Constraints, Resources | Teachers will model and use manipulatives to solve math problems. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson Plan, Classroom Walkthroughs | FCAT, Diagnostics, Core k-12 |
| 3 | Attendance of students in this population | Students who need additional help will have access to computer programs to do at home and teachers will send home additional assignments to complete at home to help support learning. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Computer Para, Classroom teacher | Attendance records | FCAT, Diagnostics, Teacher made assessments |
| 4 | Transfer of math assignments between the computer and the paper | Teachers will model how to transfer information between the computer to a math worksheet and back again. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, Computer Para | Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs | FCAT, Teacher made Assesments, Core K-12 |

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: | The percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| *Less than 15 students took the FAA | * |

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 | Inability to process number sense | Teachers will utilize new and different manipulatives, provide continued repetition of needed skills, whole group instruction and small group instruction to facilitate math gains. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Review of classroom assessments, teacher observation | Brigance Inventory of Basic Skills, Daily Checklist |

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: | The percentage of the lowest 25% students making learning gains will increase by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 57%(39)of lowest 25% students made learning gains on the 2012 Math FCAT Math. | 60%(41)of the lowest 25% students will make learning gains on the 2013 Math FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Scheduling conflicts, limited personnel, poor student attendance | Targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Student progress will be assessed using monthly assessments for all students receiving supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmarks will be calculated and discussed during Learning Team meetings. | Benchmark tests, Core K-12, diagnostics, FCAT |
| 2 | Scheduling conflicts, limited personal, poor student attendance | Tutoring will be offered to students not responding to core curriculum. Interventions will be matched to student needs. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Tutorial list and schedule, Math Probes, Diagnostics, Core k-12, Benchmark Assessments | FCAT, Diagnostics, Core K-12 |

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 # In six years the school will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 75% | 77% | 79% | 81% | 84% | |

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 2013, the school will meet the AMO targets of students not making satisfactory progress in math for each subgroup. The percentage of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress will reduce by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 18% of White students, 45% of Black students and 37% of Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT. The school did not make the AMO target for Hispanic students but met the targets for White and Black students. | In 2013, the percentage of students in each subgroup not making satisfactory progress in math will be as follows: 19% of White students, 42% of Black students and 27% of Hispanic students. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Lack of resources, lack of parental support and/or involvement, financial issues | Implement a mentoring program to target struggling students with a focus on black and Hispanic students. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Chairs | List of students and mentors. Review data of targeted students. | Core K-12 assessments, diagnostics, benchmark assessments, attendance. |
| 2 | Time constraints, lack of resources, lack of student practice | Teachers will model and use manipulatives to solve math problems. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson Plan, Classroom Walkthroughs | FCAT, Diagnostics, Core K-12 |
| 3 | Scheduling conflicts, limited personnel, poor student attendance | Targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using the problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Student progress will be assessed using monthly assessments for all students receiving supplemental instruction. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmarks will be calculated and discussed during Learning Team meetings. | Benchmark tests, Core K-12, diagnostics, FCAT |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | Insufficient number of students in this subgroup for AMO targets. The percentage of ELL students meeting proficiency in math will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| School data indicated only 5 ELL students tested. There was insufficient data for this subgroup. | Insufficient number of students in this subgroup for AMO targets. The percentage of ELL students meeting proficiency in math will increase. |

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 | Limited Reading skills negatively impact math | Teachers will utilize ESOL strategies such as an emphasis on academic vocabulary, computer-assisted learning, using manipulatives, cooperative learning, rehearsing test taking | Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Go Math Assessments, Core K-12, Benchmark Assessments, Classroom Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | strategies, and the Read,Write, Gold program | | | |
| 2 | Limited understanding of math vocabulary | Train parents on math strategies and math signs that are culturally different through worksheets that have been translated into another language. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Teachers, Bilingual volunteer | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Core K-12, Classroom 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: | In 2013, the school will meet the AMO target for students with disabilities. The percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math will reduce by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 47% of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT. 53% of the students scored satisfactorily therefore the school did not meet the AMO target of 54%. | In 2013, the percentage of the students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in math will be 42%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of training for personnel, lack of funds for training, lack of personnel to provide interventions with fidelity | Teachers will utilize cooperative learning strategies, Touch Math, Number World, Kagan Strategies small group tutoring, planning differentiated lessons based on students abilities and needs. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Diagnostics, Core K-12, Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Throughs | Core K-12, Diagnostics, FCAT, Go Math Assessments |
| 2 | Teachers face the challenge of utilizing data for differentiated instruction and best practices. | Provide differentiated instruction and increase the use of cooperative learning strategies. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Core k-12, Diagnostic Tests, Classroom walkthroughs | Diagnostics, FCAT, Core K-12, Go Math 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:

| | |
|--|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | In 2013, the school will meet the AMO target for economically disadvantaged students. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math will reduce by 8%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 42% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT. 58% of the students scored satisfactorily therefore the school did not meet the AMO target of 62%. | In 2013, the percentage of the economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math will be 34%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Lack of parental support and involvement, financial issues, | Students will be provided supplies, nutritional meals, tutoring, and | Principal, Assistant Principal, teachers, school support | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback | Attendance sign in sheets, parental feedback |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | personnel shortage | mentoring. Parent Technology Night, Community Events will be offered to parents. | staff | | |
| 2 | Students don't know how to generalize knowledge to real life situations | Teachers will model strategies and outcomes to real world problems. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs | Go Math Assessments, Core k-12, Diagnostics, FCAT |
| 3 | Students also are poor readers unable to decode word problems. | Pre-teach math vocabulary, in addition to key concept words. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Teacher observations, Classroom walkthroughs | FCAT, Diagnostics, Go Math, Core k-12 |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Effective implementation of the math series | K-5 math teachers | District trainer | All math teachers | PDD Day for a one time class | Individual lesson plan made that is targeted towards each grade level, class assessment-test scores on a pre and post test | Administration, Math Teachers |
| Differentiated Instruction in math | K-5 math teachers | District trainer, School Representatives | All math teachers. Representatives will attend district training and then train peers. | By Jan. 2013 PDD | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration |
| Higher Order Questioning Strategies | All | PDC | All teachers | By Jan. 2013 PDD | Schedule of trainings, Lesson Plans and walkthroughs | PDC, Administration |
| Standards Based Report Card Training | K-1 teachers | PDC | All K-1 teachers | Aug. 2012 preschool, Sept. PDD, LTMs, on-gong throughout the year | Schedule of trainings, portfolios, record books | PDC, Administration |
| Common Core Standards Training | Overview all teachers, content focused K-1 teachers | PDC, District trainers | Overview all teachers, content focused K-1 teachers | Pre-school, Sept. 2012 PDD | Schedule of trainings, Agenda, Sign-in sheets | PDC, Administration |
| Lesson Study Marzano strategies | All | PDC | All teachers | On-going, Sept.-May, PDD and Faculty meetings | Learning Team Meeting agendas and notes, Faculty Meeting agendas, activities, IObservation | PDC, Administration |

Mathematics Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Additional training on the Go Math series | Substitute funding | School Substitute budget | \$1,600.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,600.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Tutorial Program | Tutorial stipend for teachers | School Recognition Funds, School Improvement Funds | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$4,600.00 |

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: | | Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science will increase by 4%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 30% (42) of the students scored at Achievement Level 3 in science on the 2012 Science FCAT. | | 34% (46) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 Science FCAT. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Some students are performing below grade level in reading which affects their performance in science. | The school will follow agreed upon Scope and Sequence by grade level and subjects. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teachers | LTM notes, Review of lesson plans, Classroom performance, Diagnostics, FCAT, Common Assessments | Classroom performance, Diagnostic Test, FCAT, Core K-12, classroom assessments |
| 2 | Time Constraints in covering the content in depth. | Students will participate in hands on activities utilizing the scientific method. | Classroom Teachers, Science Contact, Principal, Assistant Principal | Class projects and experiments | Completed projects, observation of students presenting projects |
| 3 | Resources and time constraints | Teachers will use labs and/or hands-on materials weekly to allow students to experience science concepts. | Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans | Classroom evaluations, Diagnostics, FCAT |
| 4 | Transfer scientific theory and experiences into real world uses. | All students will participate in a school-wide Science Buddies activity. Student scientists explain the classroom projects (incorporating the scientific method) to | Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Committee | Student Projects, Student participation | Projects, Diagnostics, Science FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | other students. | | | |
| 5 | Time Constraints in covering the content in depth. Gaps in science instruction for the lower performing students due to iii, SAI requirements. | Teachers will review skills from prior years to ensure all the skills are covered. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teachers | Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans, LTM notes, Review of Diagnostics, Core K-12 , classroom assessments | Classroom performance, Diagnostic Test, FCAT, Core K-12 assessments, classroom 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:

| | |
|--|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b: | Students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science on the FAA. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * less than 15 students took the FAA (1) | * |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Inability to read grade level texts | Incorporate Hands on Activities throughout lessons | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Lesson Plans, Classroom Review | Student/Teacher created materials from lessons taught |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | The percentage of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science will increase by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (56)of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2012 Science FCAT. | 43%(58)of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 on the 2013 Science FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Professional Development is not aligned to classroom performance | Provide quality professional development in identified areas of weakness, and differentiated instruction. Teachers will implement strategies in their classroom. | PDD Team, Principal, teachers | Classroom walkthroughs focused on the implementation of the PD strategies. | Administrative observation of fidelity of implementation of the strategies. |
| | Time and resources | Teachers will | Principal, | Lesson Plans, | Lab |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | to offer enrichment. | provide opportunities for students to plan and complete activities involving the scientific process. | Assistant Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, Curriculum Assessments | notebooks, worksheets, Diagnostics, FCAT |
| 3 | Challenge of utilizing Webb's Depth of Knowledge with fidelity and incorporate it in planning. | Teachers will utilize Webb's Depth of Knowledge in planning for instruction and assessments. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Administrators will review lesson plans and conduct focused classroom walkthroughs | Classroom walkthroughs to determine fidelity of implementation |

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: | The percentage of student scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science on the FAA will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * Less than 15 students took the FAA in 2012 | * |

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 | Inability to process the scientific method | Teachers will utilize Unique Learning-Science component | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Teacher Observation, Lesson Plans, Hands on with Manipulatives | Unit Tests |

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Hands-on Science activities | K-5/Science | PDC or district trainer | All K-5 science teachers with an emphasis on 5th grade teachers | By Jan. 2013 PDD | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Administration, PDC |
| Science Content Area Training, Think Central Training | K-5 Science | District trainings | Science Teachers, K-5 | On-going trainings throughout the year scheduled by the district | Lesson Plans, Classroom walkthroughs, | Administration |

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | The percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher will increase by 2%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 92% (120)of the students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on 2012 FCAT Writing. | 94% (128)of the students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on 2013 FCAT 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 | Some students are performing below grade level in writing. | Students will use the writing process daily; using a variety of writing opportunities and conventions. Journals, notebooks, or work folders for monitoring of growth across time. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers | Student work samples, shared writings with peers and teachers. | Results will be recorded using the FCAT rubric. Progress will be monitored from month to month to assure that students are making progress in all areas measured by the FCAT Writes. |
| 2 | Students coming into 4th grade are deficient in writing skills | Teachers will conference 1-on 1 with students to give descriptive feedback. | Writing Teachers. Principal, Assistant Principal | Student work samples, shared writings with peers and teachers. | FCAT Writing, Palm Beach Writes |
| | Lack of parental | Teachers will provide | Writing Teachers, | Tutorial lists, review | FCAT Writes, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 3 | support and involvement | tutoring for those students not proficient in writing. | Principal. Assistant Principal | PBW data to monitor progress of students. | Palm Beach Writes |
| 4 | Time constraints | Use computer generated feedback, Read, Write, Gold, where needed. | Classroom writing teachers | Student work samples, PBW | FCAT, PBW |
| 5 | Some students are performing below grade level in writing. | Students will participate in a school-wide Poetry Parade tied in with Dr. Seuss' Day in March. | Writing Team | Schedule | PBW |
| 6 | Students coming into 4th grade are deficient in writing skills | Teachers will develop common terminology to be utilized at all grade levels. | Writing Team | Terminology List, Administration observing use of common terminology in classrooms. | Terminology used consistent at all grade levels. Palm Beach Writes results |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | The percentage of students scoring at 4 or higher in writing on the FAA will increase. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| * less than 15 students took the FAA | * |

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 | Deficits in fine motor skills | Use Hands on Activities and the Handwriting Without Tears program | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher | Classroom Observation and Lesson Plans. | Student produced writing samples |

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 instruction | Grade 4 Writing, K-5 writing | District trainers | All 4th grade writing teachers, one writing teacher at each grade level K-5 | Pre-school, fall district trainings, follow-up at LTMs, 3 Cohort trainings | LTM notes, classroom walkthroughs | LTM leaders, Administration, writing teachers |
| Upcoming changes in writing assessments/ writing across the curriculum | K-5 Writing | PDC and District training | All K-5 teachers | Sept. PDD, fall district trainings, follow-up at LTMs | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Administration, PDC, writing teachers |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Writer's Workshop | 2-5 Writing | Writing teachers/PDC | All 2-5 teachers | Oct. PD | Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans | Administration, PDC, writing teachers |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

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 |
| Teachers will provide tutoring for those students not proficient in writing. | Tutorial stipend for teachers | School Improvement funds, School Recognition funds | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,000.00 |

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | In FY13, the attendance rate will increase or the percentage of students absent for more than 10 days will decrease. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| According to the School Improvement Planning Report the attendance rate for 2012 was 79% | In FY 13, the attendance rate will increase to 83%. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| In FY 12, the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) was 183 students. | In FY13, the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) will decrease to 153 students. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| In FY12, 97 students were tardy 10 days or more. | In FY13, the number of students tardy 10 days or more will decrease to 88 students. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Parents keep the students home for reasons that are unexcused. | A school-wide incentive program will be developed and implemented. | Attendance Clerk, Pride Team (Pos. Behavior Support Team) | Attendance reports will be generated and analyzed on a monthly basis. | Monthly attendance reports |
| 2 | Parents keep the students home for reasons that are unexcused. | Educate parents on the importance of regular attendance and promptness in school and classroom newsletters. | Administration, classroom teachers | Attendance reports | Attendance records |
| 3 | Parents do not bring students to school or bring them late. | Call parents when students are absent or tardy (automated system). Increase teacher awareness and timely calls to parents. | Attendance Clerk, Teachers | Attendance reports | Attendance records |
| 4 | Parents do not bring students to school or bring them late. | Letters will be sent home to parents of students with excessive absences or tardiness. Guidance counselor will meet with parents of students with excessive absences or tardiness. | Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselor, Administration | Attendance reports | Attendance records, Attendance conference records |
| 5 | Parents keep the students home for reasons that are unexcused. | Students will be recognized for perfect attendance every trimester. Reward monthly perfect attendance by announcing names on morning news. | Administration, teachers | Review of trimester attendance reports. | 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1: | The goal for 2013 is to reduce the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| According to the School Improvement Planning Report, in FY12 the number of in-school suspensions was 6. | The number of in-school suspensions will be reduced to 3. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| According to the School Improvement Planning Report, in FY12 the number of students suspended in-school was 5. | The number of students suspended in-school will be reduced to 3. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| According to the School Improvement Planning Report, in FY12 the number of out-of-school school suspensions was 13. | The number of out-of-school suspensions will be reduced to 7. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| According to the School Improvement Planning Report, in FY12 the number of students suspended out-of-school was 12. | The number of students suspended out-of-school will be reduced to 8. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | Frustration over lack of academic skills | Provide academic support through tutoring | teachers tutoring | class work, common assessments, diagnostics | suspension rate, FCAT |
| | Teachers have a | A school-wide Positive | Pride Team | Monthly meetings to | Discipline reports, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|----------------------|
| 2 | variety of expectations. | Behavior Support Plan will be expanded. A team of staff members will meet to review school-wide behavior plan and revise as necessary. Teachers will teach the school-wide expectations at the beginning of the school year with reminders throughout the year. A school-wide reinforcement system will be developed and implemented. | (school-wide positive behavior support team) | review discipline data | school surveys |
| 3 | Students sent to the office for behavior missing instructional time. | School-wide establishment of Major vs. Minor Infractions with consequences including modeling positive behavior, time out in class or another class, parent contact. Utilize Behavior Tracking Form. | Pride Team and all school personnel | Teachers modeling positive behavior, observations of positive behavior Pride Team observational data | Discipline Referrals |
| 4 | Students not understanding what bullying looks/sounds like and how it affects others. | The school-wide bully prevention program will be reinforced with all the students. Students will be informed of the methods of reporting bullying incidents. | Pride team and all school personnel | Referral for bullying behavior documentation. | Bullying Forms |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | The number of volunteers participating/attending school activities will increase by 5%. The number of volunteer service hours will increase by 2%. The school will continue to receive the Golden School Award and the 5 Star School Award. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| In FY 12, 239 volunteers participated/attended school activities putting in approximately 9416 hours. The number of families involved in family activities ranged from 110-625 per event which ranged from 16-93% of the families. | The number of volunteers participating/attending school events will increase by 5% (251). The number of volunteer hours will increase by 2% (9604). |

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 | Childcare constraints and many demands on parents' time limit their ability to participate in school activities. | School will host a Parent Technology Night to educate parents on the various programs accessible at home and school for students and parents. | Administration | Record number of participants. | Participant Sign in sheets |
| 2 | Awareness of school activities | Communication of academic strategies and school activities to parents via Curriculum Night, school newsletter, flyers, Edline, PTO newsletter, and PTO Ambassador Program. | Administration, Teachers, PTO Board Members | Newsletters, Edline | VIPS and Sign in sheets |
| 3 | Parents are unaware of what they can do to assist their children academically. | School will host events that promote literacy and application of math skills(Literacy Nights - reading and writing together, Books A Million Night, Book Fair Events, Family Math Night at Publix) | Reading Team, Writing Team, Math Team, Administration, Media Specialist | Record number of participants | Sign in Sheets |
| | Language barrier of | Provide verbal and/or | Administration | Record number of | Copies of written |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| 4 | some parents | written communication to parents in their native language if possible. | participants at school events. | correspondence, sign in sheets for events |
|---|--------------|--|--------------------------------|---|

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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 |
| Reading | Students in K-2 will be supported by Foundations | Updated teacher manuals | School Recognition Funds | \$350.00 |
| Attendance | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$350.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Students will utilize the Reading Plus program at a minimum of 90-120 minutes per week. The program will be used in the computer lab, iii time and during the reading block. Program will also be used in SACC program. | Reading Plus program-tutorial stipend | SACC budget, School Recognition Funds, School Improvement Funds | \$2,000.00 |
| Attendance | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Students in gr. K-2 will be supported by Foundations to provide a foundation for phonetic decoding. | Substitute funding | School Substitute budget | \$880.00 |
| Mathematics | Additional training on the Go Math series | Substitute funding | School Substitute budget | \$1,600.00 |
| Attendance | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,480.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Tutorial program | Tutorial stipends for teachers | School Improvement Funds, School Recognition Funds, Community School K-12 Initiative | \$5,000.00 |
| Reading | Reading Plus incentives | Incentives for students making goals on Reading Plus. | General Activities Account | \$700.00 |
| Mathematics | Tutorial Program | Tutorial stipend for teachers | School Recognition Funds, School Improvement Funds | \$3,000.00 |
| Writing | Teachers will provide tutoring for those students not proficient in writing. | Tutorial stipend for teachers | School Improvement funds, School Recognition funds | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$9,700.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$14,530.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent | <input checked="" 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.

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 |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Tutorial Program | \$4,177.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of Limestone Creek Elementary School. Listed below are some of the activities of SAC for the upcoming year:

- * Reach out to community to obtain more partners
- * Assist in organization of Family Math Night and Literacy Nights (Reading and Writing)
- * Work with PTO to continue to increase parent involvement
- * Increase parent communication sent home in native language
- * Form relationship with Big Dog Ranch for Service Learning Project
- * Partner with the Green Team to increase recycling program and reduce energy consumption

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

| Palm Beach School District LIMESTONE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 88% | 90% | 92% | 81% | 351 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 69% | 68% | | | 137 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 64% (YES) | 70% (YES) | | | 134 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 622 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Palm Beach School District LIMESTONE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 91% | 89% | 89% | 78% | 347 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 71% | 70% | | | 141 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 65% (YES) | 65% (YES) | | | 130 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 618 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |