

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: ORANGEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Michelle Pescatrice

SAC Chair: Mindi Simon

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Michelle Pescatrice	MSEd Certification in Early Childhood, Elementary Education, School Principal, ESOL endorsed	7	10	<p>Principal of Orangewood 2011-12 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 68% Science Mastery: 65% Writing Mastery: 89%</p> <p>Principal of Orangewood 2010-11 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 86% Math Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 64% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading: SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>Principal of Orangewood 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math Mastery: 84% Science Mastery: 71% Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged,</p>

					and SWD sub groups did not make AYP in Reading. Black and SWD sub-groups did not make AYP in Math.
Assis Principal	Darcia Borel	EdS Educational Leadership All Levels M Ed Elementary Education K-6 ESOL Endorsed			2011-2012: Grade: B Reading: 54% Math: 52% Science: 45% Writing: 81% Reading Learning Gain: 74% Math Learning Gain: 58% Reading lowest 25%: 79% Math lowest 25%: 59%

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) is used to recruit and/or retain high quality, highly qualified teachers to the school. PLC is an on-going process used to establish a school wide culture that is based on a fundamental belief in building teacher leadership in school improvement efforts. Through participation in PLCs, teachers will enhance their leadership capacity as they work as members of ongoing, high-performing, collaborative teams that focus on improving student learning through data-based decision making.	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Professional Development aligned with school goals.	A+ Team	Ongoing	
3	Regular meetings with new teacher and APPLES mentor.	Principal	Ongoing	
4	Provide in-service opportunities that are relevant to curriculum requirements and common core standards.	A+ Team	Ongoing	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
1	Provide Professional Development Opportunities Provide mentoring opportunities Provide opportunities for observation of other classroom teachers in our school

## Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	2.2%(1)	6.5%(3)	32.6%(15)	58.7%(27)	23.9%(11)	95.7%(44)	2.2%(1)	10.9%(5)	65.2%(30)

## 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
Angela Ownbey	Remey Kaufman	Mrs. Kaufman is an experienced teacher, teaches on the same grade level as Mrs Ownbey, and she is very nurturing and supportive.	Planned bi-weekly meetings to discuss curriculum, teaching plans, and understanding and the needs/requirements of the new educator

## 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, Title II and other programs coordinate through the SIP process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effective use of resources. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between schools and departments. This collaboration ensures that all programs support schools.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include after school tutorials in reading and math; health services; and literacy workshops for parents as a result of the coordination of these funds. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

Title I, Part D

The facilities and schools coordinate with health services (mental and physical) and other social services to meet the need of students returning back to their assigned educational facility. The district Health Services, Student Services, Title I, Title III and ESE departments are all a part of the collaborative effort. For example: social workers from student services has the process and procedures in place to assist students and their families with social services for food stamps and other health services; the ESE Department has established a memorandum of understanding for assistance with housing and counseling services through Ruth Cooper and the Lutheran Service; vocational instructors establish partnership with businesses so students will have an opportunity to continue to develop their vocational skill.

Title II

Title I coordinates with other programs funded under NCLB through the SIP (School Improvement Plan) process. Within this

plan, schools complete a Professional Development Plan in collaboration with Title II. The PDP is concentrated in reading, math, science and writing to meet the needs of the targeted subgroups not making annual AMO targets. The PDP includes teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators. As part of the School Advisory Council, parents are included in this planning process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. This collaboration ensures that all programs funded under NCLB use funds to support schools, not supplant district obligations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effectiveness. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between agencies. Each school's SIP is reviewed by all stakeholders and submitted to the Board for approval. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Title III

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title III to expand academic enrichment opportunities for ELLs. These services include after school tutorials, professional development, supplemental scientifically research based resources and materials. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Title X- Homeless

Title X coordinates with Title I, Part A, to provide comparable services to homeless children who are not attending Title I schools. By providing ongoing collaboration between Title X and Title I, Part A, program staff, the same services for homeless students in Non-Title I schools are provided to homeless students in Title I schools. In addition to serving homeless students not enrolled in Title I schools, set-aside funds are used to provide services to homeless students who are attending Title I schools. Homeless students who attend Title I school-wide or targeted assistance schools may have unique challenges that are not addressed by the regular Title I program at these schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions may not have a quiet place to study at the end of the day and may require extended after-school library time; tutoring and/or accessibility to tutoring as needed, school supplies, expedited evaluations, extended days/ learning opportunities, Saturday schools, summer academic camps, coordination of services with shelters or other homeless service providers, or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services. Through Title I, Part A, or Title I, Part A, in conjunction with Title X, McKinney-Vento funding homeless students can take part in services that enable them to benefit more from a school's Title I program.

#### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI is used to provide unique learning programs at schools. SAI funds are also used to fund summer school programs throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

The rest of our SAI funds will be expended for our very effective After School tutoring program (Math and Reading camp) focusing on FCAT Math and Reading.

#### Violence Prevention Programs

The Youth Coalitions within Lee County provide opportunities for partnerships between the District and other social services. These social services assist all at-risk students through after-school programs that include academic, social, and health services. Anticipated outcomes include a safe environment for children and increased academic achievement. Bullying prevention programs are offered throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Nutrition Programs

Food and Nutrition Services offers healthy meals to all students. This includes ensuring that families are offered free and reduced lunch applications throughout the year. All students receive free breakfast at all school locations. Many Title I schools have also developed "Backpack Programs" in which nutritious food is sent home in a backpack each weekend to struggling families to ensure that children and families have food throughout the week. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Housing Programs

#### Head Start

Blended Head Start/Title 1/VPK/Migrant early childhood classrooms will be located on the school's campus. High risk students will attend a year long, high quality early childhood program that serves four year old children. The goal of the program is to prepare children for kindergarten by meeting the federal Head Start Framework for School Readiness and State Standards for Four Year Olds that are aligned with the Common Core Standards. The expected outcome is that enrolled children who complete the program will be deemed ready for kindergarten on the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS).

## Adult Education

Adult Education partners with several Title I schools to offer ESOL classes for parents to learn English. Adult Education partners with Title I, Part A to offer paraprofessional classes to prepare paraprofessionals to take the qualifying test, ParaPro. Adult Education instructors review reading, math and writing skills, as well as test administration. Title I paraprofessionals benefit by becoming highly qualified as defined by NCLB. The benefit of these classes is to help the monolingual parents learn English so that they can become more self-sufficient. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Career and Technical Education

The district provides extensive opportunity for Career and Technical Education including Industry Certification. Each attendance zone also includes a comprehensive high school with career academies.

## Job Training

The district provides extensive opportunity for Career and Technical Education including Industry Certification. Each attendance zone also includes a comprehensive high school with career academies.

## Other

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team for Orangewood Elementary consists of the following members:

Michelle Pescatrice – Principal  
Darcia Borel – Assistant Principal  
Karen Deaver – Guidance Counselor  
Christie Pecore – School Psychologist  
Maurice Gilmore – School Social Worker  
Jill Lorenz – Speech Pathologist  
Amy Warren - ESE Teacher

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

The MTSS Problem-Solving team at type name of school here meets on a weekly, monthly, as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to identify students in need of further support and monitor the progress of students receiving interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are being met within a multi-tiered system of student supports. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's MTSS Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

Choose appropriate members and roles below; and add any additional roles/responsibilities each may have.

Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by MTSS Team for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports.
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Implement supplemental and intensive interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotes of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports.
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with supplemental and intensive interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

Principal/Assistant Principal

- Facilitate implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process in your building

- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- Often MTSS Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSS process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary MTSS forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports & on all students receiving intensive supports
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review & interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral & when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding intensive interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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

The MTSS Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

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.

Orangewood Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RtI (MTSS) process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RtI (MTSS) process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Identify and target low performing/behavioral students and place them in the appropriate tiered program.  
Conduct monthly MTSS meetings with team to progress monitor data and evaluate on-going interventions.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team at Orangewood Elementary is made up of teachers from the school with representatives from administration, intermediate, primary and ESE.

Principal - Michelle Pescatrice

Assistant Principal - Darcia Borel

Chairperson - Amy Warren (ESE)

Intermediate - Robyn Peer

Intermediate - Katira Wrenn

Primary - Sara Girard

Speech Pathologist - Jill Lorenz

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

The LLT at Orangewood Elementary will meet bi-monthly to set and implement goals to increase parent involvement and reading mastery of students on all grade levels. Tamy Warren will facilitate the meetings. Roles will be assigned for individual projects and events.

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

The LLT at Orangewood Elementary will research Best Practices for Reading Instruction. The LLT will also promote reading at home through Family Reading Nights. At the Family Reading Nights, parents/families will be instructed on implementing specific reading strategies. After instruction, families will have the opportunity to practice implementing the specific strategies taught. Coaching and assistance will be provided by teachers during the practice sessions. Parents will also receive training on Accelerated Reader, Parent Link, and other software for tracking student progress.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/4/2012)

### \*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.

Scheduled days are provided for Pre-K students to spend time in kindergarten classroom settings to familiarize the students with the environment of a kindergarten class.

Orientation meetings will be held prior to the start of the school year for kindergarten students and their families to familiarize them with the school, staff, and the expectations of kindergarten.

All students are assessed prior to, or upon, entering within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students, and groups of students or individual students, who may need intervention beyond core instruction.

### \*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.

NA

### \*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?

NA

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?

NA

## 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](#)

NA



## 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:	In 2011-12 64% (198) of all students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Reading. In 2012-13 we will improve to 67% (207) as measured by the AYP Goals Worksheet.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (198)	67% (207)

#### 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	Decoding skills	Increased used of pragmatics	Classroom Teachers	Read Alouds	FAIR, FLKRS
2	Fluency	Fluency Checks	Classroom Teacher	Fluency Checks	Weekly Fluency Checks FAIR 2
3	Comprehension	AR "Best Buddies" Comprehension skills taught in a thematic approach across grade level and subjects.	Classroom Teacher	AR tests/Read Alouds Monthly skill tests	AR Tests Progress Monitoring of skill tests FAIR 2 FCAT Reading
4	Background Knowledge	Field Trips Realia Experiences Non Fiction Reading Kagan Intereactive Structures Read Alouds	Classroom Teacher	Weekly Assessments Unit Tests AR scores	Weekly Assessments Unit Tests AR scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	In 2011-12 37% (79) of all students scored at Level 4 or higher in FCAT Reading. In the 2012-13 we will improve to 42% (130) as measured by the AYP Goals Worksheet.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (79)	42% (130)

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	Fluency	Fluency Checks	Classroom Teacher	Renaissance Place Oral Fluency Guidelines	Weekly Fluency Evaluations
2	Comprehension	Comprehension skills taught in a thematic approach across grade level subject areas	Classroom Teacher	Accelerated Reading Tests Read Alouds, and Monthly Skill Reviews	AR Tests Progress Monitoring of Skills FAIR Assessment FCAT Reading

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In 2011-12 68% (150) of all students in Grades 4 & 5 made learning gains in reading. In 2012-13 we will improve to 71% (157) as measured by the School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(150)	71%(157)

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	Parent Involvement	Increase Family Reading Events	Administration Reading Leadership Team Reading Camp Facilitator Classroom Teachers	Monitoring of common assessment data Attendance records	FCAT Scores
2	Attendance to Reading Camp for struggling students	Adjust Reading Camp schedule	Administration Reading Leadership Team Reading Camp Facilitator Classroom Teachers	Monitoring of common assessment data Attendance records	FCAT Scores
3					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-2012 65% (36) of the lowest 25% of 4th and 5th graders made learning gains in Reading. In 2012-13 we will improve to 68% (38) as measured by the Florida School Grades Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65%(36)	68%(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	Parent Awareness	Administration or the classroom teacher will meet at least once a quarter with parents and students identified in the bottom 25%.	Administration and Classroom Teacher	Monitor data from common assessments, report cards and interims	FCAT Scores
2	Phonological Awareness/ Phonics Weaknesses	K-5 use of Spalding phonics	Classroom teachers	FAIR results, FCAT Weekly Assessments, Fluency Checks	FCAT Scores

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 #					
	64% of students were proficient in the 2011-12 school year, 36% of students were non-proficient in the 2012-2013 school year. Following the guidelines for the six year school achievement plan, by the 2016-17 school year, we will					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	64%	73%	75%	78%	81%	

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 2011-12 44% (53) of Black students scored a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading. In 2012-13 we will improve to 49%(59) as measured by the AYP Goals Worksheet.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (53)	49% (59)

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	Vocabulary Skills	Direct/Explicit instruction of vocabulary using the Florida Reading model and scaffolding instruction Reading Camp	Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers Administration	Monitor common assessment results PLC data meetings Teacher observation	Weekly and Unit Assessments Weekly fluency checks FCAT Results

		Rtl			
2	Prior Knowledge	Direct/Explicit instruction of vocabulary using the Florida Reading model and scaffolding instruction	Classroom teachers ESE teachers	Monitor common assessment results PLC data meetings Teacher observation	Weekly and Unit Assessments Weekly fluency checks FCAT Results
3	Oral Language	Direct/Explicit instruction of vocabulary using the Florida Reading model and scaffolding instruction Reading Camp Rtl	Classroom teachers ESE Teachers	Monitor common assessment results PLC data meetings Teacher observation	Weekly and Unit Assessments Weekly fluency checks FCAT Results
4	Fluency	Weekly Fluency Checks	Classroom Teachers	Monitor common assessment results PLC data meetings Teacher observation	Weekly and Unit Assessments Weekly fluency checks FCAT Results
5	Decoding Skills	Direct/Explicit instruction of vocabulary using the Florida Reading model and scaffolding instruction Reading Camp Rtl	Classroom Teachers	Monitor common assessment results PLC data meetings Teacher observation	Weekly and Unit Assessments Weekly fluency checks FCAT Results

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	In 2011- 12 26% (13) of Students With Disabilities scored at Level 3 higher in FCAT Reading. In 2012- 13 we will improve to 32% (15) as measured by the AYP Goals Worksheet.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(13)	32%(15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Students have been identified with severe processing deficits and are functioning 2 or more levels below grade level.	Direct/Explicit instruction using SRA Reading	Classroom Teachers	Monitor Common Assessments results data	Treasures weekly assessments
2	Prior knowledge	After school tutoring	Grade Level teams	PLC meetings	Unit Assessments
3	Individualization of assignments	Increase individualized attention  Use of signal response with classroom "clickers" for immediate feedback	Grade Level teams	PLC meetings	Teacher selected 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 reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	In 2011-12 56% (121) of Economically Disadvantaged Students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Reading . In 2012-2013 we will improve to 60% (130) as measured by the AYP Goals Worksheet.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(121)	60%(130)

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	Vocabulary and comprehension	Daily use of Elements of Vocabulary Reading Buddies	Reading Teacher, Classroom Teacher	Weekly Assessment, FAIR, Additional Weekly Vocabulary Quizzes	FAIR (1 & 2) FCAT Reading

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						

Reading Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
READY Reading Common Core Program	The program provide rigorous instruction that is not just aligned to the Common Core Reading Standards, but built for the Common Core Standards.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

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



Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of CELLA Goals*

---

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2011-12 66%(205) of all students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2012-13 we will improve to 69% (214) as measured by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(205)	69%(214)

### 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	Daily schedule	Revamp daily schedule	Schedule committee	PLC meetings and Evaluation of topic tests	District Math Tests Topic Tests Teacher made tests FCAT Math
2	Assistance for struggling students other than classroom teachers	Use of Paraprofessionals	Administration	PLC meetings and Evaluation of topic tests	District Math tests Topic tests Teacher made tests FCAT Math

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

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	In the 2011-12 37% (116)of tested students scored at or above Level 4 in mathematics. In 2012-13 we will improve to
--	---

Mathematics Goal #2a:	42% (130) as measured by the School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (116)	42% (130)

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	Extension of Math Skills	Provide advanced activities and games	Classroom Teacher	Test Data and Extension Skills Scores	FCAT Scores District Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	In the 2011-12 68% (212) of students made learning gains in mathematics. In the 2012-13 we will improve to 71% (220) as measured by the School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (212)	71% (220)

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
	Basic Math Facts	Direct/Explicit Instruction	Classroom Teacher	Response Systems for	FCAT Scores

1	SRA Number Worlds After School Tutoring	immediate Feedback	enVision Math Assessments District 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	In the 2011-12 82% (255) of tested students made learning gains in mathematics. In the 2012-13 we will improve to 84% (261) as measured by the School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(255)	84%(261)

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	Knowledge of Basic Math Facts	Direct/Explicit Instruction SRA Number Worlds After School Tutoring	Classroom Teacher	Use of Response System for Immediate Feedback	enVision Assessments District Assessments FCAT Scores

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 # 68% of students were proficient in the 2011-12 school year, 32% of students were non-proficient in the 2012-2013 school year. Following the guidelines for the six year school achievement plan, by the 2016-17 school year, we will
--	--

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66%	69%	72%	75%	78%	

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 2011-12 52% (63) of Black students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2012-13 we will improve to 56%(68) as measured by the AYP report. In 2011-12 68% (43) of Hispanic students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2012-13 we will improve to 72% (45) as measured by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 52%(63) Hispanic: 68%(43)	Black: 56%(68) Hispanic: 72%(45)

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	Fluency in math facts	FAST Math Math Minute Math Camp attendance RTI intervention groups Accelerated Math	Classroom teachers	Monitor FAST Math Reports and Common Assessment data Data binders PLC meetings Test Data	FCAT Scores District baseline & midyear assessments STAR math Accelerated Math reports
2	Prior knowledge	FAST Math Math Minute Math Camp attendance RTI intervention groups Accelerated Math	Classroom teachers	Monitor FAST Math Reports and Common Assessment data Data binders PLC meetings Test Data	FCAT Scores District baseline & midyear assessments STAR Math Accelerated Math reports
3	Vocabulary	Math Camp Attendance RTI intervention groups	Classroom Teachers	Monitor FAST Math Reports and Common Assessment data Data binders PLC meetings Test Data	FCAT Scores District baseline & midyear assessments STAR Math Accelerated Math reports

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-12 28%(12)of students with disabilities scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2012-13 we will improve to 36%(16) as measured by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%(12)	36%(16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have severe process deficiencies and are functioning 2 or more grade levels below	Direct/Explicit instruction SRA Number Worlds After school tutoring Peer programs between Gen Ed and ESE students Use of Signal Response systems for immediate feedback	Classroom Teachers	Monitor common assessments data PLC meetings Data folders IEP's Parent conferences	FCAT Scores enVision math assessments District Baseline and Midyear assessments
2	Basic facts	Direct/Explicit instruction SRA Number Worlds After school tutoring Peer programs between Gen Ed and ESE students Use of Signal Response systems for immediate feedback	Classroom teachers	Monitor common assessments data PLC meetings Data folders IEP's Parent conferences	FCAT Scores enVision math assessments District Baseline and Midyear 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 2010-11 61% (132) of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at Level 3 or higher in FCAT Math. In 2011-12 we will improve to 65% (141) as measured by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%(132)	65%(141)

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
	Fluency in Math facts	FAST Math	Classroom	Monitor of FAST Math	FCAT Scores

1		Math Minute Timez Attack software Kagan strategies	Teachers	reports and Common Assessment Data	Math Fact tests Topic Tests
2	Parent Involvement	Mentor Program Parent Teacher Communication	Classroom Teachers	Review of report cards and interim reports Student Led Conferences	FCAT Scores

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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CAMS/STAMS: Differentiated Mathematics Instructional Practice	The material focus completely on foundational math skills needed by students to master before moving on to the next grade level.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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: \$1,000.00

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	In 2011-12, 62% (71) of 5th graders scored Level 3 or

Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	higher on FCAT Science. In School Year 2012-13, 66% (76) of 5th graders will score Level 3 or above on FCAT Science as measured by the Florida School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (71)	66% (76)

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	Proficient use of science vocabulary	FCAT Explorer Focus Measure UP! Loose in the Lab Hands on Science activities Use of Kagan structures to teach vocabulary Fun with Science on Saturdays	Classroom Teachers Saturday teacher volunteers	Monitor Common Assessment Data results Teacher observation Formal and informal evaluations Saturday sign in sheets	FCAT Scores Chapter Assessments Experiment Rubrics
2	Knowledge of scientific method	FCAT Explorer Focus Measure Up! Loose in the Lab Hands on Science activities Science taught consistently at all grade levels	Classroom Teachers	Monitor Common Assessment Data results Teacher observation Formal and informal evaluations	FCAT Scores Chapter assessments Experiment Rubrics

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	2011-12, 28% (32) scored Levels 4/5 on FCAT Science. In School Year 2012-13, 36% (42) of 5th grade students will score Levels 4/5 on FCAT Science as measured by the school grade report.
---	---



2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
28% (32)			36% (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	Knowledge of scientific method	FCAT Explorer Focus Measure Up! Loose in the Lab Hands on Activities Science concepts taught consistently at all grade levels	Classroom teacher	Monitor common assessments Teacher observation Administrative review of science lesson plans Formal and informal teacher evaluations of concepts	FCAT Scores Chapter Assessments Experiment rubrics
2	Knowledge of Science vocabulary	FCAT Explorer Focus Measure UP! Loose in Lab Hands on Activities Direct Instruction using Science Text Use of Kagan structures to teach vocabulary	Classroom Teacher	Monitor Common Assessment results Teacher observation Administrative review of science lesson plans Formal and informal teacher evaluations of concepts	FCAT Scores Chapter Assessments Experiment rubrics

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

*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.		In 2011-12, 89% (94) of 4th graders scored Level 3.0 or above on FCAT Writes. In School Year 2012-13, 91% (89) of 4th graders will score Level 3 or above on FCAT Writes as measured by the school grade report.			
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
89% (94)		91% (97)			
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
	Prior Knowledge	Breakfast Writing Club Kagan structures to	Classroom Teacher	Monthly writing prompts and Write Score results	FCAT Scores

1		increase background knowledge Increase oral language development through reading discussions and writing responses Weekly Writer's Workshop	Administrative team		
2	Accurate scoring of classroom prompts	Contract with Write Score to provide detailed feedback on writing needs	Administration Classroom Teachers	Write Score results analysis	FCAT Scores
3	Familiarity with new scoring standards	Inservice training by Administration and Guidance Counselor	Administration Classroom Teachers	Monthly prompts scored by Administrative Team based on new scoring standards	FCAT Scores Monthly progress monitoring Baseline and mid-year writing assessment scores
4	Parent knowledge and understanding of writing requirements	FCAT Writes Information Night	4th grade teachers	Attendance Increase parent involvement with homework	FCAT Scores
5	Common editing format throughout grade levels.	School wide editing training. Implementing editing guidelines. Writer's Workshop.	Classroom Teachers K-5 Administrative team	Write Score results analysis and monthly writing prompts.	FCAT Scores Monthly progress monitoring Baseline and mid-year writing assessment scores

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Corrective Writing using Editing Marks	School-wide K-5		All Teachers K-5	October - November	Editing Mark student use updates will be given during grade level PLC meetings	PLC Teams and Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write Score: Student Writing Evaluation Program	This Program allows our teachers to submit writings prepared by the students and receive a level for the student based on their writing.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,150.00
			Subtotal: \$1,150.00
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: \$1,150.00

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:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
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						

Attendance Budget:

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

## 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:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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>	In the 2011-12, Orangewood reported 70% (413) parent involvement volunteers in school activities. In School Year 2012-13 attendance at parent involvement activities will increase from 70% to 73% (430), which will be a 3% increase, and measured by sign in sheets.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
70% (413)	73% (430)

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 who work Monday-Friday are not able to attend our annual "Meet Your Teacher" event.	We will hold our annual "Meet Your Teacher" event on Saturday morning to allow parents who work Monday-Friday to attend.	Administration and teachers	Monitoring of attendance sheets by teachers	Attendance Sheets
	One form of communication is not	Teachers and Administration will use	Administration and teachers	Monitoring of attendance at events	Attendance sheets

2	effective for meeting all parents. To reach all parents, more than one form of communication is needed, i.e., phone calls and email.	Parent Link on a regular basis to notify parents of upcoming events at the school. Notices will also be sent home in the monthly newsletter.			
3	Parents need explanation and clarification of report cards, reports and data sent home about their child's progress to effectively help them improve.	Hold parent conferences on the first Professional Duty Day to accommodate all parents	Administration and teachers	Monitoring number of Parent Conferences Held	Recorded Sheet of parent conferences held

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:				
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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>



## Additional Goal(s)

In the 2011-12 school year, Orangewood reported no instances of bullying. In the 2012-13 school year, we will like to maintain our anti-bullying program, with students reporting no instances of bullying. 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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of In the 2011-12 school year, Orangewood reported no instances of bullying. In the 2012-13 school year, we will like to maintain our anti-bullying program, with students reporting no instances of bullying. Goal(s)*

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	READY Reading Common Core Program	The program provide rigourous instruction that is not just aligned to the Common Core Reading Standards, but built for the Common Core Standards.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	CAMS/STAMS: Differentiated Mathematics Instructional Practice	The material focus completely on foundational math skills needed by students to master before moving on to the next grade level.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,000.00
Writing	Write Score: Student Writing Evaluation Program	This Program allows our teachers to submit writings prepared by the students and receive a level for the student based on their writing.	School Improvement Funding	\$1,150.00
				Subtotal: \$3,150.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$3,150.00

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/28/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the

statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

In the 2012-13 school year, the SAC will be providing support to the school in the areas of decision making, school improvement planning, parent involvement, and activities that will take place throughout the school year. The SAC will also discuss topics of concern related to our school and assist in the outcomes, discuss topics from the DAC committee, and increase the awareness of school and district policies.

# 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

Lee School District ORANGEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	86%	83%	90%	64%	323	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	77%	73%			150	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	62% (YES)			119	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					592	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District ORANGEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	84%	84%	71%	320	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	64%	76%			140	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?	55% (YES)	70% (YES)			125	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					585	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested