

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: ROMEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Marion

Principal: Jane Ashman

SAC Chair: Mr. Jess Burton

Superintendent: Mr. James Yancey

Date of School Board Approval: November 8, 2011

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

| |
|--|
| 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 | Jane Ashman | Master Education Leadership, University of Florida; Trained in Continuous Improvement Model; Facilitate Leadership; Target Teach (Evans-Newton); High Schools That Work; Performance Based Assessment; Classroom; Walk-Through (CWT); Power Standards Leadership; Learning Focused Schools – Max Thompson. | 1 | 14 | Principal of Dunnellon Middle School 2011 - 2012: Grade "C" 2010 - 2011: Grade "C" 2009 – 2010: Grade "A" 2008 – 2009: Grade "A" 2007 – 2008: Grade "C" 2006 – 2007: Grade "B"; 2005 – 2006: Grade "A" 2004 – 2005: Grade "B" Learning Gains 2010: 62% Reading 72% Math Lowest 25%: 71% Reading 68% Math |
| | | | | | Greenway |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| Assis Principal | Luann Clark | Elementary Education BS Degree Educational Leadership MS Degree School Principal Educational Leadership, Gifted Endorsement | 7 | 7 | 2012 C 2011 C AYP Criteria 87% AYP - No (M - W, B, All) Yes - Rdg, Writing 2010 C AYP Criteria 79% AYP - No (W,B,H,SWD,ED) 2009 B AYP Criteria 85% AYP - No (B, SWD, ED) 2008 B AYP Criteria 95% AYP - No (B) 2007 A AYP Criteria 92% AYP - No (SWD) Program Coordinator College Park Elementary 2006 B AYP Criteria 97% |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reading Coach | Caron Reid | BA Elem. Ed. MA Ed. Leadership | 1.5 | 1.5 | Romeo Elementary 2011-2012: School Grade C Wyomina Park made AYP and received an "A" in 2009-2010. Reading growth in her Learning Community class was 1.06 and .96 in Math. 2010-2011 School Grade-C AYP- N (T,W,H,ED,ELL) Reading- 76% of students scored on or at grade level. Math -76% of students scored at or above grade level. Learning Gains- 63% of students increased in Reading and 53% in Math. Lowest 25%- 52% of students made a year's worth of growth in Reading and 47% in Math. |
| Academic Coach | Marie Hoehn | Specialist Degree in Ed Leadership Masters Degree in Early Childhood BA in Elementary Education Reading Endorsed ESOL Endorsed | 13 | 9 | 2011-2012 - School Grade C 2010-2011 - School Grade C 2009-2010 - School Grade B 2008-2009 - School Grade A 2007-2008 - School Grade A 2006-2007 - School Grade A 2005-2006 - School Grade A 2004-2005 - School Grade 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 | Post positions on the online District Job Board as available | Principal | On-going | |
| 2 | Partner teachers with a peer | Principal | 08/2012 | |
| 3 | District electronic application process allows candidates to apply for positions from across the nation | Debra Mueller | On-going | |
| 4 | District new teacher orientation | Dianna Thompson | On-going | |
| 5 | Teacher mentor program for teachers new to the professional and new to the school | Principal Assistant Principal | School Year 2012-2013 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
| Alicia Tank - 5th Grade | Taking certification courses Working closely with Reading Coach and Administration |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 49 | 0.0%(0) | 26.5%(13) | 49.0%(24) | 24.5%(12) | 14.3%(7) | 100.0%(49) | 2.0%(1) | 4.1%(2) | 71.4%(35) |

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 |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| Marie Hoehn | Heather Davis 5th grade Continuing Sub Carol Maciejewski Kindergarten Continuing Sub | Resource Teacher | Planning, Curriculum needs and Daily procedures |

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 A- Romeo is a Title I school and spends the majority of the budgeted dollars on people. An in-house resource person is paid for out of these funds. She is a reading specialist and assists with new teachers, staff development, student assessment and evaluation, and a plethora of other duties. Five paraprofessionals were hired to tutor students that need extra assistance and to provide support to various remediation programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part C – Migrant students are a part of Romeo's population and district funds are used to provide a Migrant Liaison that works with schools and families. School supplies and extra accommodations are also provided to these students as they are needed.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Title II- PART A -District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.

Title II Part D—District receives supplemental funds for improving their basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. Technology in classrooms is provided that will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students and early childhood students.

Title III

Title III—Services are provided through the District for education materials and ELL district support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

Title X – Homeless-Romeo receives District funds to assist with homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs- Safe and Drug Free Schools—District receives funds for programs such as Red Ribbon Week, and DARE in grade 5 that support the prevention of violence in and around school and that teach prevention of alcohol, tobacco, and drug use.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Our MTSS/RtI Leadership Team includes the Jane Ashman-Principal, Luann Clark - Assistant Principal, Victoria Thomas-Dean, Rosemary Burnett-Guidance Counselor, Marie Hoehn Resource Teacher, and may also include the classroom teacher, the district provided Reading Coach-Caron Reid, and other various district support personnel.

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 basic function of this team will be to correlate strategies and materials to deficits and to carefully monitor student progress. As data becomes available, meetings may become more frequent, but a monthly meeting is a minimum. The basic process of meetings:

Identify the problem

Attempt to determine why the problem is occurring

Design an intervention to address the problem

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/RtI Leadership Team provides support in the following ways: (1) strong administrative support to ensure commitment and resources (2) strong teacher support to share in the common goal of improving instruction and/or behavior and (3) leadership team to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time. As students progress is monitored, as strategies are determined that would best meet the students, when student needs are established and analyzed, then student needs are included in the SIP.

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.

Data management systems assist in decision rules: The gap is closing. The SAT is able to extrapolate the point at which targeted students will "come in range" of the target—even if this is long range. The level of "risk" for these students will lower over time. We will use various data sources to chart this: Performance Matters, FCAT, District Benchmark, PMRN, FAIR, as well as research based assessments.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained in grade level collaboration meeting with the assistance of the Reading Coach.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team includes the Jane Ashman-Principal, Luann Clark - Assistant Principal, Rosemary Burnett-Guidance Counselor, Marie Hoehn- Resource Teacher, Victoria Thomas-Dean, Caron Reid -Reading Coach.

The role of the team is to provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures implementation of the intervention in the classroom during III remediation time, assists teachers in completing paperwork; including documenting intervention strategies, and ensures students identified as non-proficient during PMP meetings are referred through the SAT process.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team provides support in the following ways: (1) strong administrative support to ensure commitment and resources (2) strong teacher support to share in the common goal of improving instruction and/or behavior and (3) leadership team to build staff support, internal capacity, and sustainability over time.

The RtI Leadership Team, which is the problem solving team or SAT (Student Assistance Team) follows the following process:

Step 1: Problem Identification – identify and define the target problem
Step 2: Problem Analysis – attempt to determine why the problem is occurring
Step 3: Intervention Design - decide what is going to be done about the problem
Step 4: Response to Intervention –Monitor progress and determine “Is it working?”
The implementation of SAT is a well-defined process which begins with the completion of the SAT Request (STS # 35). The Marion County Student Assistance Team Packet steps the team through the process.

The Rtl leadership team or SAT team will meet twice a month, dates to be established by the school psychologist.

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

Determining needs from the FAIR results and District Benchmark Assessments to assist with increasing learning gains in Reading.

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.

VPK programs were not held at Romeo Elementary this year, but we provided information to our parents of the program at Dunnellon Elementary.

As parents registered students, they were offered a short tour of the school to familiarize them with the campus and to help students feel comfortable in the school environment.

The Stagger Start program will be used at Romeo this year to help students develop close bonds with their new surroundings. For the first 3 days of school the classes will be divided by 3 so that only one third of the students will be in class for each of the 3 day program. This gives teachers a chance to assess these students, determine strengths and weaknesses, and to build relationships with the students prior to having the whole class in attendance.

*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: | Students scoring at level 3 on FCAT will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 21% (25) of students in grade 3 scored Level 3 on FCAT, 26 (36) students in grade 4 and 28% (32) students in grade 5 scored Level 3 or FCAT. | 48% (178) of students will score Level 3 on FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Lack background knowledge | exposure to a variety of literature | Classroom Teacher | Monitor enhanced vocabulary and language through the use of communication skills. | FCA's , FAIR,FCAT, DBMA |
| 2 | Adequate time to teach skills needed to master reading strategies | Maintain a consistent, uninterrupted 90 or 120 minute Reading Block with whole group and differentiated instruction District FCA Calendar | Administration, Reading Coach, Academic Coach, Teachers | Schedule uninterrupted Reading Block Reading Block Monitored through teacher lesson plans and walk-throughs | Master Schedule Lesson Plans Classroom walk-throughs |
| 3 | Lack of enrichment instruction. | Use enrichment activities during iii time each day. Provide higher level activities in reading to encourage critical thinking strategies. | Administration, Teachers | Monitor guided reading and literacy centers for quality instruction, monitor iii | District Benchmark FCAT Classroom walk-throughs |
| 4 | Limited number of paraprofessionals available to work with students | Limited number of paraprofessionals available to work with students | Administrators Reading Coach Curriculum Coach Teachers | Schedule uninterrupted Reading Block Reading Block Monitored through teacher lesson plans and walk-throughs Monitor reading instruction and literacy centers | 90 minute Reading Block in Lesson Plans and on Master Schedule Classroom walk-through documentation |
| 5 | Differentiated curriculum to meet the needs of all students. | Determine core instruction needs by reviewing assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based Reading instruction/interventions. | Administration, Academic Coach, teachers | Lesson Plans must reflect researched based differentiated instruction (monitor) | FAIR OPM will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | Instructional Strategies | | | FCAT District Benchmark |
| 6 | Parent Involvement | Parent workshop to teach skills to help their child improve in reading. Make and take activity so that parents have teaching materials to assist students with NGSSS | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, Teachers | Attendance of parents/students, Students increase in reading skills | FAIR FCAT FCA's |
| 7 | Time for planning | Data meetings weekly to discuss data and best practices to increase student knowledge | Administration | PLC Documentation Teacher conversations with administration | FCA's FCAT District Benchmark |

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: | Alternately Assessed students will increase one level in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) students scored a level 4, 5 or 6 in reading. | 50% (1) of students will scores a level of 4, 5 or 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Differentiated curriculum to meet the needs of all students. | Determine core instruction needs by reviewing assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/interventions Instructional Strategies | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, teacher | Lesson Plans must reflect researched based differentiated reading instruction (monitor) | FAIR OPM will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3 Access Points |
| 2 | Deficient reading skills | Plan specific interventions for students not responding to core and supplemental instruction. Interventions will be prescriptive to individual student needs, will be researched based and provided in addition to the core curriculum. | Administrators Teachers Reading Coach Curriculum Coach | Monitor instruction to ensure students are receiving one-on-one meaningful and appropriate instruction. | Fast ForWord Earobics SuccessMaker Wateford Access Points |
| 3 | Student frustration level | Plan interventions for student success, Problem Solving Model and progress monitor for RtI Guided Reading | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, Teachers | Progress monitor | IEP Access Points |

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. | Students scoring level 4 or above in reading will increase by |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| Reading Goal #2a: | 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28% (108) of the students scored at or above Level 4 on FCAT. | 38% (141) will score at or above Level 4 on 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 | Challenging students to a higher level of critical thinking. | Provide more chapter books, problem solving and hands on activities. | Classroom Teacher | Mastering skills on FCA Ongoing Progress Monitoring | FCA, DBMA, Successmaker, FAIR |
| 2 | Lack of enrichment instruction. | Use enrichment activities during iii time each day. Provide higher level activities in reading to encourage critical thinking strategies. | Administration, Teachers | Monitor for quality instruction, monitor iii for enrichment activities | District Benchmark FCAT FCA's Classroom walk-throughs |
| 3 | Teacher planning higher level center activities | Use higher level reading activities such as Literacy Circles, Graphic Organizers, etc. Collaborative planning for teachers | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, Teachers | Monitor guided reading and literacy centers for quality instruction | District Benchmark FCAT Classroom walk-throughs |

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: | Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading will increase by 50%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% (1) student scored at or able Achievement Level 7 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment. | 50% (1) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiated curriculum | Use researched based, differentiated instruction (other than core curriculum) to target specific skills in weak areas | Administration Teachers Academic Coach | IEP Meetings Data Review Grade Level/PLC Meetings | Florida Alternate Assessment Access Point |
| 2 | Deficient reading skills | Plan specific interventions for students not responding to core and supplemental instruction. Interventions will be prescriptive to individual student needs, will be researched based and provided in addition to the core curriculum. | Administrators Teachers Reading Coach | Monitor reading block and remediation to ensure students are receiving one-on-one meaningful and appropriate instruction. | Florida Alternate Assessment Access Point |

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 in grades 3 - 5 making learning gains in reading will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 62% (230) of the students made learning gains in reading. | 72% (267) of the students will make learning gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | Students need additional time to practice skills. | Computer labs will open before and after school for extra time to practice skills | Resource Coach, Lab Manager Administration | Monitor the program and usage. | FCA's DBMA 80+ club FCAT |
| 2 | Funding for tutoring for students of all grade levels | After-School Tutoring to remediate students. Use researched based, differentiated instruction (other than core curriculum) to target specific skills in weak areas | Administrators Tutors, Academic Coach | PMP Meetings SAT Process District Benchmark FCAs Data Team Meetings | Pre/Mid/Post Test FCAT FCAs District Benchmark FAIR OPM |
| 3 | Differentiated curriculum | Use researched based, differentiated instruction (other than core curriculum) to target specific skills in weak areas | Administration Teachers Academic Coach District Personnel Teachers | PMP Meetings Data Meetings Grade Level/PLC Meetings | FCAT FCA's District Benchmark SuccessMaker Fast ForWord |
| 4 | Students maintaining or increasing current reading levels. | All students will practice reading skills daily. Focus Calendar Assessments and remediation will be monitored on a regular basis. | Classroom Teacher | Mastery of Focus Calendar Assessment skills and Daily reading practice | Grades, FAIR, Focus Calendar Assessments and District Benchmark 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 reading. Reading Goal #3b: | Alternately Assessed students making learning gains will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% (1) of students make learning gains in reading. | 50% (1) of students will make learning gains in reading based on the Florida Alternate Assessment. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | Deficient reading skills | Plan specific interventions for | Administrators Teachers | Monitor reading block and iii remediation to ensure | Florida Alternate Assessment |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|
| 1 | students not responding to core and supplemental instruction. Interventions will be prescriptive to individual student needs, will be researched based and provided in addition to the core curriculum. | students are receiving one-on-one meaningful and appropriate instruction. | Access Point |
|---|---|---|--------------|

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: | Romeo will increase the total number of students making learning gains by 5% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (252) of the students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading. | 73% (271) of the lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students lack background knowledge of concepts/problem-solving skills. | Word walls, preview skills, journals, SuccessMaker in computer lab | Classroom Teachers Administration Reading Coach, Resource Teacher Lab Manager | Ongoing Progress Monitoring, Mastery of skills | FCA's, District Benchmark, FCAT |
| 2 | Processing issues impedes student progress. | Scientific Learning program Fast ForWord | Lab Manager, Resource Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Reading Coach, Principal | Ongoing progress monitoring of individual students | FCA's, FCAT, District Benchmark, Class grades |
| 3 | Deficient reading skills | Plan specific interventions for students not responding to core and supplemental instruction. Interventions will be prescriptive to individual student needs, will be researched based and provided in addition to the core curriculum. | Administrators Teachers Reading Coach Academic Coach | Monitor reading block and iii remediation to ensure students are receiving one-on-one meaningful and appropriate instruction. | FCA's, FCAT, District Benchmark, Class grades |

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, Romeo Elementary will reduce our achievement gap by 50%, from an average of 55% to 75% performing satisfactorily. | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 55 | 60 | 63 | 68 | 72 | |

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: | Student subgroups by ethnicity will increase reading skills to level 3 or higher by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Reading scores decreased by 6% (23). Black students decreased from 40% (8) to 33% (7), White students decreased from 68% (163) to 60% (144), Hispanic students decreased from 52% (93) to 46% (82). | Black students will increase from 33% (7) to 43% (9), White students will increase from 60% (144) to 70% (168), Hispanic students will increase from 46% (82) to 56% (100) and all are expected to score at or above Level 3 on the reading portion of 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 | Limited background knowledge/problem solving skills | Preview Vocabulary, Word Walls Word of the Week on the morning show Dictionaries/Thesauruses Successmaker Program | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, ESE Teacher/ESE Para, Reading Coach, Academic Coach | Ongoing Progress Monitoring | FCA's FAIR DBMA Weekly assessments FCAT |
| 2 | Motivate students to increase reading skills | Honor Roll recognition in 3rd-5th, Terrific Kids , acknowledge students on WPKN | Principal Assistant Principal | monitor grades and mastery of skills every 9 wks | Report cards, Portfolio |
| 3 | Limited number of paraprofessionals to assist with small subgroups | Acceleration by providing scaffolding for new learning, before concepts introduced | Administration Teachers Reading Coach Academic Coach | PMP Meetings Data Meetings FCA's | FCAT FCA's District Benchmark SuccessMaker |

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: | English Language Learners scoring a level 3 and above on the FCAT will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 34% (18) of the students scored a level 3 and above on the FCAT. | 43%(22) of the students will score a level 3 and above on the 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 | Limited Background knowledge/problem solving skills | Word Walls Word of the Week on the morning show Dictionaries/Thesauruses/Successmaker Program | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, Reading Coach, Resource Teacher and Lab Manager | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of skills | FCA's, FAIR, DBMA, Weekly Assessments, FCAT |
| 2 | Students lacking background knowledge in the area of vocabulary | Exposure to word walls, word of the week, provide a spanish-English dictionary and utilize ESOL paras to assist with translations. | Classroom Teacher/ESOL para | On going progress monitoring of skills mastered | Focus Calendar Assessments, District Benchmark and 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:

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | Students with Disabilities scoring a level 3 and above on the FCAT will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at or above level 3 on FCAT will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51%(153) scored at or above level 3 on FCAT. | 61% (183) of the students will score at or above level 3 on 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 | Limited background knowledge/problem solving skills | journals, timed tests, word walls, successmaker program, previewing vocabulary, promote reading chapter books/informational text. | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, ESE Teacher/Parea, Reading Coach, Resource Teacher, Media Specialists and Lab Manager | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of skills | FCA's, DBMA, FAIR, FCAT, Weekly Assessments |
| 2 | Students lacking computer resources at home. | Open computer labs before and afterschool. Send CD's home for access to reading materials for computers without internet hook up. | Lab Manger/Assistant Principal | Observation of number of students using the lab and total number of cd's checked out. | Mastery of skills |

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 |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Grade Level PLC which include data review | All grade levels and special area teachers | Teachers Administration | Teachers in PLC setting | No fewer than 3 times a month | Record minutes of PLC meetings | Administration |
| Reading with Differentiated Instruction | All grade levels | Administration Grade Level Leaders Academic Coach Reading Coach | Teachers | Grade level planning after student day Early Release Preplanning | Classroom walk-throughs | Administration |
| Writing Essential Questions Summarizing | All grade levels | Learning Focused Administration | Teachers | Oct. 26, 2012 Monthly | Classroom walk-throughs Vertical team meetings | Administration |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| After School Tutoring | Staff, Remediation materials | Title I | \$3,556.50 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,556.50 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Remediation & Enrichment | IMac computers and cameras | Title 1 | \$10,000.00 |
| Classroom Instruction | Smart Board Replacement Engaged Classroom Replacement bulbs | Title I | \$3,800.00 |
| Remediation Program | License Renewal for Fast Forward | Title I | \$3,800.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$17,600.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Academic Learning Gains | Representative from Learned Focus | Title I | \$3,000.00 |
| Specific Intervention | Instructional Paraprofessionals | Title I | \$56,223.00 |
| Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$38,585.50 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$97,808.50 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent Center Resources | Reading Games | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Parent Resource Personnel | Parent Involvement | Title I | \$2,800.00 |
| Core Reading Instruction | Consumable Supplies | Title I District Funds | \$1,446.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,746.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$123,711.00 |

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: | Students will increase proficiency on the spring Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) by 10% |
|---|--|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Proficiencies are as follows:
 K - 9% (3)
 1 - 56% (18)
 2 - 88% (29)
 3 - 33% (8)
 4 - 29% (5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | Parents have limited English and students have more difficult time learning English | ELL students placed with ELL certified teachers, along with para support All correspondence sent home in Spanish | Teachers Administration | Classroom monitoring Assessments | CELLA FAIR FCA FCAT |

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: | Students will increase in reading proficiency by 10%. |
|--|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Proficiencies are as follows:
 K - 0% (0)
 1 - 41% (13)
 2 - 70% (23)
 3 - 42% (10)
 4 - 41% (7)

3 -

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | Parents have limited English and students have more difficult time learning English | ELL students placed with ELL certified teachers, along with para support All correspondence sent home in Spanish | Teachers Administration | Classroom monitoring | CELLA FAIR FCA FCAT |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: | Students scoring on the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) will increase by 10%. |
|--|--|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Proficiencies are as follows:

K - 0% (0)
 1 - 34% (11)
 2 - 58% (19)
 3 - 38% (9)
 4 - 41% (7)

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 of parents/guardians | ELL students placed with ELL certified teachers, along with para support All correspondence sent home in Spanish | Teachers Administration | Classroom monitoring Assessments | CELLA FAIR FCA FCAT |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Small group instruction | Hands-on materials | Title I | \$100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$100.00 |
| 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: \$100.00 |

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: | The percentage of students scoring Level 3 on FCAT will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30%(116)of the students scored Level 3 on FCAT | 40% (148) of students in grades 3-5 will score 3 in Mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Limited number of paraprofessionals available to work with students | Limited number of paraprofessionals available to work with students | Administrators Reading Coach Curriculum Coach Teachers | Schedule uninterrupted Reading Block Reading Block Monitored through teacher lesson plans and walk-throughs Monitor reading instruction and literacy centers | 90 minute Reading Block in Lesson Plans and on Master Schedule Classroom walk-through documentation |
| 2 | Differentiated curriculum to meet the needs of all students. | Determine core instruction needs by reviewing assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based math instruction/interventions. | Administration, Academic Coach, teachers | Lesson Plans must reflect researched based differentiated instruction (monitor) | FCAT District Benchmark |
| 3 | Time for planning | Data meetings weekly to discuss data and best practices to increase student knowledge | Administration | PLC Documentation Teacher conversations with administration | FCA's FCAT District Benchmark |
| 4 | Additional time in the schedule for remediation time for teachers and tier 3 students | Plan targeted interventions for students not responding to core curriculum supplemental instruction using problem-solving process Interventions will be matched to individual student needs and be researched based | Administration Classroom Teachers | PMP Meetings, including graphs and data Data Meetings | FCAT FCA's District Benchmark Lesson Plans |
| 5 | Deficiency of skills (Basic math facts, 4th-Geometry, Algebraic thinking; 5th-Data analysis, Algebraic thinking) | Hands-on math manipulatives | Administrators Teachers | Math Block Monitored through teacher lesson plans and walk-throughs Monitor for quality instruction | Lesson Plans Classroom walk-through documentation |

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: | Students scoring 4, 5, or 6 on Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by 50% (1). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% (1) scored a level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment. | 100% (2) students will score a level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Differentiated curriculum to meet the needs of all students. | Determine core instruction needs by reviewing assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction/interventions Instructional Strategies | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, teacher | Lesson Plans must reflect researched based differentiated reading instruction (monitor) | FAIR OPM will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3 Access Points |
| 2 | Student frustration level | Plan interventions for student success, Problem Solving Model and progress monitor for Rtl Guided Reading | Administration, Reading Coach, Curriculum Coach, Teachers | Progress monitor | IEP Access Points |

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: | Students in grades 3-5 scoring level 4 in mathematics will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% (78)of the students scored Level 4 or above on FCAT | 30% (111) of the students will score a Level 4 or above on FCAT mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Challenging students to a higher level of critical thinking. | Provide more chapter books, problem solving and hands on activities. | Classroom Teacher | Mastering skills on FCA Ongoing Progress Monitoring | FCA, DBMA, Successmaker, FAIR |
| 2 | Lack of enrichment instruction. | Use enrichment activities during iii time each day. Provide higher level activities in reading to encourage critical thinking strategies. | Administration, Teachers | Monitor for quality instruction, monitor iii for enrichment activities | District Benchmark FCAT FCA's Classroom walk-throughs |

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: | Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics will increase by 50% (1). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) students scored at Level 7 in mathematics. | 50% (1) will score a level 7 in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Lack of math skills | Daily math practice at instructional level Small group instruction Inclusion setting | Administration Teachers ESE Teachers | IEP Access Points | Alternate Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | Students in grades 3-5 making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53%(197) of the students made learning gains on FCAT in 2011-2012. | 58% (215)of the students in grades 3-5 are expected to make learning gains on FCAT in 2012-2013. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Students need additional time to practice skills. | Computer labs will open before and after school for extra time to practice skills | Resource Coach, Lab Manager Administration | Monitor the program and usage. | FCA's DBMA 80+ club FCAT |
| 2 | Funding for tutoring for students of all grade levels | After-School Tutoring to remediate students. Use researched based, differentiated instruction (other than core curriculum) to target specific skills in weak areas | Administrators Tutors, Academic Coach | PMP Meetings SAT Process District Benchmark FCAs Data Team Meetings | Pre/Mid/Post Test FCAT FCAs District Benchmark FAIR OPM |
| 3 | Differentiated curriculum | Use researched based, differentiated instruction (other than core curriculum) to target specific skills in weak areas | Administration Teachers Academic Coach District Personnel Teachers | PMP Meetings Data Meetings Grade Level/PLC Meetings | FCAT FCA's District Benchmark SuccessMaker Fast ForWord |
| | Students utilizing the new standards and | All 3rd-5th students will practice math skills daily | Classroom Teacher,Paras, lab | Monitor labs and ongoing progress monitoring | Sucessmaker reports |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|
| 4 | concepts from the math materials. | in the successmaker lab and/ or classroom. Focus Calendar Assessments and remediation will be monitored on a regular basis | manager and Administration | FCA's DBMA |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|

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: | Students making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50% (1) of students make learning gains in mathematics. | 50% (1) student will make learning gains in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of math skills | Daily math practice at instructional level Small group instruction Inclusion setting | Administration Teachers ESE Teachers | IEP FasttMath | Alternate Assessment FasttMath |
| 2 | Funding Training to use manipulatives effectively | Hands-on math manipulatives | Administration Classroom Teachers | IEP | Alternate Assessment Weekly grades |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | Students in grades 3 - 5 in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53% (52) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT in 2011-2012. | 58% (54) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Students lack background knowledge of concepts/problem-solving skills. | Word walls, preview skills, journals, SuccessMaker in computer lab | Classroom Teachers Administration Reading Coach, Resource Teacher Lab Manager | Ongoing Progress Monitoring, Mastery of skills | FCA's, District Benchmark, FCAT |
| | Additional time in the | Plan targeted | Administration | PMP Meetings, including | FCAT |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2 | schedule for remediation time for teachers and tier 3 students | interventions for students not responding to core curriculum supplemental instruction using problem-solving process Interventions will be matched to individual student needs and be researched based | Classroom Teachers | graphs and data Data Meetings | FCA's District Benchmark |
|---|--|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|

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, Romeo Elementary will reduce our achievement gap by 20%, from an average of 55% to 75% performing satisfactorily. 5A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | |

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: | | Students in each subgroup will increase proficiency in FCAT by 10%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 59% (147) White students, 50% (10) Black students and 45% (80)Hispanic students scored proficient on FCAT. | | 69%(166) White students and 60% (107) Black students and 55% (98) Hispanic students will score proficient on 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 | Limited background knowledge/problem solving skills | Preview Vocabulary, Word Walls Word of the Week on the morning show Dictionaries/Thesauruses Successmaker Program | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, ESE Teacher/ESE Para, Reading Coach, Academic Coach | Ongoing Progress Monitoring | FCA's FAIR DBMA Weekly assessments 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: | | ELL students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT will increase by 10%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 34% (61) of the ELL students scored a level 3 or higher on | | 44%(79) of ELL students will score a level 3 or higher on | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| FCAT | 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 | Limited Background knowledge/problem solving skills | Word Walls Word of the Week on the morning show Dictionaries/Thesauruses/Successmaker Program | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, Reading Coach, Resource Teacher and Lab Manager | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of skills | FCA's, FAIR, DBMA, Weekly Assessments, 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:

| | |
|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | Students with Disabilities will show an increase in their FCAT level by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33% (17) of Students with Disabilities scored Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math. | 43% (22) of Students with Disabilities will score proficient on FCAT Math. |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | Economically Disadvantage students will be increase by 10% on FCAT Math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51%(153) of the Economically Disadvantage students will be proficient on FCAT. | 61% (183) of the Economically Disadvantage students will be proficient on FCAT Math. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Limited background knowledge/problem solving skills | journals, timed tests, word walls, successmaker program, previewing | Administration Classroom Teacher ESOL Para, | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of skills | FCA's, DBMA, FAIR, FCAT, Weekly Assessments |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | | vocabulary, promote reading chapter books/informational text. | ESE Teacher/Parea, Reading Coach, Resource Teacher, Media Specialists and Lab Manager | |
|---|--|---|---|--|

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Grade level PLC/ Vertical Team PLC | All grade levels | Selected Teachers | All Teachers | No fewer than 2 times per month | Record of minutes of PLC meeting | Administration |
| Essential Questions Summarizing | All grade levels | Representative from Learned Focus Administration | All Teachers | October 26, 2012 Monthly | Classroom walkthroughs Lesson Plans | Administration |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| After School Tutoring | Staff, materials | Title I | \$3,556.50 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,556.50 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Engaged Instruction | Smart Board, Document Camera, Projector | Title I | \$2,500.00 |
| Enrichment and Remediation | IMac Computers, cameras | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$12,500.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$28,585.50 |
| Specific Interventions | Instructional Paraprofessionals | Title I | \$56,223.00 |
| Academic Learning Gains | Representative from Learned Focus | Title I | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$86,808.50 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Core Math Instruction | Consumable Materials (Paper, Ink) | Title I | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$104,365.00 |

* 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 level 3 in science will increase by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38%(46) of students Level 3 on FCAT. | 48%(54) of students a level 3 on FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | Students lack background knowledge of science concepts | Word walls Journals, Science Fair Projects | Classroom Teachers | Monitoring | FCA's, District Benchmark |

| | |
|--|---|
| 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: | Alternately Assessed students will increase by 5% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 100% (1) of students scored level 4, 5, or 6 in science. | 50% (1)of Alternately Assessed students will increase by 5% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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: | 5th grade students will increase their science RCAT to level 4 and above by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 16%(18) of the students scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT. | 26% (29) of the students in 5th grade will score a level 4 or 5 on 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 to allow exploration in science | Science Fair projects Hands on experience | Classroom Teacher | progress monitoring | FCA's, District Benchmark |

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

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|---|
| Scientific Process | K - 5 | Academic Coach | All teachers | December 2012 | Classroom Observation Lesson Plans | Administration Academic Coach |

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 |
| Science Fair | Science Boards | Title I | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | | Students will show a 5% increase in writing on the FCAT. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 75%(89) of the students scored a level for 3 or higher on FCAT. | | 80%(109) of the students will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students struggle with focus of the topic, organization and support | Writing logs/journals Shared writings | Classroom Teacher | ongoing progress monitoring | Demand Writings |
| 2 | Time | Writing Journals, integrate writing into all academic areas. | Classroom Teacher | ongoing progress monitoring | Demand Writings |
| 3 | Student difficulty organizing writing, using planning too | Small group instruction with teacher | Teachers | Monthly Demand Writing District Demand Writing | Monthly Demand Writings District Demand Writings FCAT |

| | |
|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | Students scoring a 4 or higher on the Florida Writing Alternate Assessment will increase by 100%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) of students scored a 4 or higher on the Florida | 100% (1) of students will score a level 4 or higher on the |

| Alternate Assessment. | | Florida Alternate Assessment. | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student difficulty organizing writing, using planning tool | Small group instruction with teacher | Teacher | Monthly Demand Writing District Demand Writings | IEP |
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge | Students write throughout all subject Background knowledge addressed in guided reading groups with multiple topics | Teacher | Monthly Demand Writing District Demand Writings | IEP |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Essential Questions Summarizing | K-5 | Representative from Learned Focus Administration | All teachers | October 26, 2012 Monthly | Classroom walk-throughs Lesson Plans | Administration |

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 |
| Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$10,000.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Grade Level Appropriate writing paper | Writing paper | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Core Writing Instruction | Consumable Materials (paper, cardstock, pencils) | Title I | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |

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 | | Student attendance will increase by 1%. | | | |
| Attendance Goal # 1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| Attendance for 2012-2013 was 94% (741). | | Attendance is expected to rise to 95% (699) of our students attending school on a daily basis. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| 349 students had excessive absences. | | Expected number of students with excessive absences for this year will be 275 students. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| 103 students had excessive tardies. | | Expected number of students with excessive tardies will be 75. | | | |
| 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 | Illness | Provide hand sanitizer to students to help reduce the spreading of germs. Attendance Incentives | Guidance Clerk, Classroom Teacher Administration | Monitoring of Attendance | Attendance Report |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| NA` | NA | NA | NA | NA | Na | NA |
| NA` | NA | NA | NA | NA | Na | NA |

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | Suspensions will decrease by 1% |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| The total number of in-school suspensions in 2012 was 2% (15) on the student population. | The total number of in-school suspensions expected this year is roughly 1%(8) of the student population. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| There were 17 students who received in-school suspension in 2011-2012. | It is anticipated that 8 students will have in-school during the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| The total number of out of suspensions was 2%(16) of the student population. | The total number of out of school suspensions expected for the 2012-2013 year is 1%(8) of the student population. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| There were 16 students who received out-of-school suspension in 2011-2012. | The total number of students expected to be suspended in the 2012-2013 school this year is 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 | Inappropriate behavior | Post and review school wide expectation rules. Provide a motivation program for repeated offenders. | Dean Teachers Administration | Classroom Behavior System | Behavior Chart SMS Report |
| 2 | Misunderstanding of the school expectations | Teachers will teach school-wide procedures | Dean Teachers Administration | On-going Monitoring Posted procedures Discipline Referrals Classroom Observation | Behavior Chart SMS Report |
| 3 | Teachers lacking effective classroom management | Teachers will develop class management plan | Dean Teachers Administration | On-going Monitoring Posted procedures Discipline Referrals Classroom Observation | Behavior Chart SMS Report |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | | | Parent involvement will increase by at least 10%. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | |
| Parent involvement for 2011-2012 including volunteers, chaperones, and evening activities was 32%(271). | | | Parents involvement is expected to increase to 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 | Communication | Monthly Newsletters, Weekly Classroom newsletters, Alert Now messages, School & Class Website, marquee, phone calls and ESOL translations | Administration | increased parent involvement | Parent Surveys |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent Communication | Planners Monthly Newsletters | Title I | \$4,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,500.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| Professional Development | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent supplies and resources | paper, envelopes, stamps | | \$509.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$509.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$5,009.00 |

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 | | NOT REQUIRED FOR ELEMENTARY | | |
| 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 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | After School Tutoring | Staff, Remediation materials | Title I | \$3,556.50 |
| CELLA | Small group instruction | Hands-on materials | Title I | \$100.00 |
| Mathematics | After School Tutoring | Staff, materials | Title I | \$3,556.50 |
| Attendance | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Parent Communication | Planners Monthly Newsletters | Title I | \$4,500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$11,713.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Remediation & Enrichment | IMac computers and cameras | Title 1 | \$10,000.00 |
| Reading | Classroom Instruction | Smart Board Replacement Engaged Classroom Replacement bulbs | Title I | \$3,800.00 |
| Reading | Remediation Program | License Renewal for Fast Forward | Title I | \$3,800.00 |
| Mathematics | Engaged Instruction | Smart Board, Document Camera, Projector | Title I | \$2,500.00 |
| Mathematics | Enrichment and Remediation | IMac Computers, cameras | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$30,100.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Academic Learning Gains | Representative from Learned Focus | Title I | \$3,000.00 |
| Reading | Specific Intervention | Instructional Paraprofessionals | Title I | \$56,223.00 |
| Reading | Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$38,585.50 |
| Mathematics | Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$28,585.50 |
| Mathematics | Specific Interventions | Instructional Paraprofessionals | Title I | \$56,223.00 |
| Mathematics | Academic Learning Gains | Representative from Learned Focus | Title I | \$2,000.00 |
| Writing | Academic Coach | Instructional Support | Title I | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$194,617.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Parent Center Resources | Reading Games | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Reading | Parent Resource Personnel | Parent Involvement | Title I | \$2,800.00 |
| Reading | Core Reading Instruction | Consumable Supplies | Title I District Funds | \$1,446.00 |
| Mathematics | Core Math Instruction | Consumable Materials (Paper, Ink) | Title I | \$1,500.00 |
| Science | Science Fair | Science Boards | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Writing | Grade Level Appropriate writing paper | Writing paper | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Writing | Core Writing Instruction | Consumable Materials (paper, cardstock, pencils) | Title I | \$500.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Parent supplies and resources | paper, envelopes, stamps | | \$509.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$8,255.00 |

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.

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/21/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|--|------------|
| Leveled Readers to enhance guided reading Teacher grants Benchmark Assessments | \$4,000.00 |

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

The School Advisory Committee will be actively engaged in the school data so that they might help plan and implement the SIP. The committee will be kept abreast of school activities, events and student data.

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

| Marion School District ROMEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 76% | 76% | 70% | 46% | 268 | 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 | 63% | 53% | | | 116 | 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? | 52% (YES) | 47% (NO) | | | 99 | 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 | | | | | 483 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Marion School District ROMEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 82% | 78% | 82% | 51% | 293 | 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 | 65% | 51% | | | 116 | 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? | 58% (YES) | 44% (NO) | | | 102 | 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 | | | | | 511 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |