

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: MICHIGAN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Diane Crook-Nichols

SAC Chair: Mary Lawson

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/10/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Diane Crook-Nichols	BS-Elementary Education, Concord College, Master's Degree in Educational Leadership at the University of Central Florida		13	This is my first year as Principal at Michigan Avenue Elementary (MAE). I transferred to MAE after serving 5 successful years as Principal at Reedy Creek Elementary (RCE) While at RCE, I maintained an "A" rating for 6 consecutive years. In this past school year, 2012 FCAT, RCE increased their A rating by 67 points and lead Osceola School District as the strongest A rating at 600 points; beating the closest A rated elementary school by 29 points.
					As Assistant Principal of Michigan Avenue Elementary for 10 school years, our school has made 8 "A's" on the State Report Card and two "B's" including the 2010-2011 school year. In 2008-2009 the school made AYP for the first time.. On the 2008-2009 FCAT, our Reading Proficiency levels increased from 81% to 83%, our 4th and 5th Grade learning gains increased from 68% to 74%, and our lowest 25% of 4th and 5th grade students increased their learning gains in Reading from 51% to

Assis Principal	Edward Toothe	BA, Science, Florida Atlantic University LLB, Laws, University of London Master's Degree of Science, Educational Leadership Nova, South Eastern University	10	10	73%. Our Math Proficiency Levels decreased from 81% to 76%, our Math Learning Gains decreased from 72% to 70% and the lowest 25% of 4th and 5th Grade students decreased in Math learning gains from 76% to 69%. Science Proficiency Levels decreased from 61% to 57%. Our 4th Grade Writing Proficiency Levels increased from 81% to 95%. On the 2009-2010 FCAT, 83% of 3rd-5th Grade students were proficient in Reading; they were 80% proficient in Math, and 86% proficient in Writing. 68% of 4th and 5th Grade students made learning gains in Reading and 60% learning gains in Math. Our lowest quartile of 4th and 5th Grade readers dropped 26% from 73% to 47%! Since we were below 50%, our school dropped to a "B". The lowest 25% of 4th and 5th Grade Math students decreased their learning gains from 69% to 57%--a drop of 12%! In Science, 67% of 5th Grade students achieved proficiency--an increase of 10%. On the 2010-2011 FCAT, our school achieved an "A" and 613 points--the highest points among the district's K-5 Elementary Schools. 85% of 3rd-5th Grade students achieved Reading Proficiency and 76% Math Proficiency. 92% of 4th Graders made proficiency with a "4" and higher. In Science we dropped 1% from 67 to 66% in 5th Grade Proficiency. 73% of 4th and 5th Grade students achieved learning gains in Reading and 67% learning gains in Math. 75% of our Lowest Quartile of 4th and 5th Grade Readers made learning gains--a 28% increase! 79% of our Lowest Quartile of 4th and 5th Grade Students made learning gains in Math--an increase of 22%!
-----------------	---------------	--	----	----	--

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)
Elementary Education	Mary Tumbleson	Elementary Education, Bachelor's Degree from University of Central Florida, Masters Degree, University of Central Florida, Certification Educational Leadership, Stetson University, ESOL Endorsed, Reading Endorsed, ESE Certified, Middle School General, National Board Certified 1999.	1	2	Mary Tumbleson has been in the educational field for 24 years. She has worked with students from Pre-K through high school. Her administrative experience enables her to understand the workings of the school inside and out. She has 17 years experience in the classroom where she utilized best practices to lead her students to gains in all areas. Using data to drive instruction has always been her mode of operation. Her National Board Certification allowed her to work with legislatures and governments to bring educational reform to the table. This is Ms. Tumbleson's second year as a reading coach. She has worked with high poverty schools and raised the lowest quartile through the RtI process that targeted student's needs and remediated these students in their specific area to improve their reading. Ms. Tumbleson attends Columbia University in the summer and works with the Teacher College Reading and Writing Project. Through this week long intensive training she embraces the Common Core State Standards to help bring these standards to the school level.

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	District and school policy mandates that all new teachers hired are highly qualified. Monitor yearly or as needed staffs Professional Teaching Certificate for compliance.	District Personnel Department, School-based Administration.	On-going	
2	Vacancies are posted on the District Vacancy Hot Line and District Website. Interested applicants contact the Principal of each school when openings become available. The Principal and Assistant Principal review resumes and interview prospective candidates looking for individuals who will be a good fit for their school vision and mission. When you know what you are looking for and project this vision during the interview, with the types of questions asked, it establishes and sets a tone for what each building level Administrator expects and wants for all stakeholders. Accepting a position and coming into the job knowing and understanding expectations, vision, and culture is less threatening and therefore leads to buy in and retention.	Greg White, District Recruiting Specialist, Diane Crook-Nichols, Principal, and Edward Toothe, Assistant Principal	On-going	
3	New teachers go through the Preparing New Educators program. At the school site, a mentor is assigned to each new teacher. A school mentor is assigned to every new teacher to MAE even if it is not their first year teaching. Procedures and policies change from school to school, district to district, and state to state.	PNE Lead (Preparing New Educator)	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	0.0%(0)	8.7%(4)	34.8%(16)	56.5%(26)	34.8%(16)	100.0%(46)	13.0%(6)	2.2%(1)	78.3%(36)

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
Rebecca Palmer	4th grade team Grade Level Chair: Kirsten Macky	Mentee is an experienced teacher but is new to MAE and 4th grade.	Teachers new to a grade level meet with the Grade Level Team to learn about team and grade level discipline procedures as well as academic goals as reflected in the School Improvement Plan. Additional support is provided by the Reading Coach and Administration in the areas of curriculum and lesson development.

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

2 ESOL Paraprofessionals are provided through Title III funding.

Title X- Homeless

Local funds and support are provide for students who are homeless. These families receive support and resources throught FIT (Families In Transition) program and Coordinator, Meredith Griffin.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

S.A.I. funds have been dedicated to six remediation/enrichment programs which operate before and after-school. These programs target the lowest quartile of students, grades (3-5) in Reading and Math. These programs operate 5 days per week and will end in April 2013.

The students will receive remediation/enrichment through Voyager, Truimphants, Ticket to Read, and small group instruction.

Violence Prevention Programs

MAE has a Bully Prevention Committee and brings strong awareness to positive interactions with others through a school wide initiative implemented at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year; How Full is Your Bucket. Each Instructional Staff member and department was provided a copy of the book and encouraged to be bucket fillers for others which in return fills their own bucket. When people use kind words and give compliments, it makes people feel good about themselves, a sense of self worth, and fills their bucket. In return, when we fill someone's bucket, we fill our own. It is truly a win win for everyone.

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Our school-based RtI Leadership Team is actually our Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) and members are: Diane Nichols, Edward Toothe, Pam Strickland, Jean Duval, Mary Tumbleson, Anne Seely-MacLeod

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 IAT meets once a week to meet with individual teachers whose students are in Tier 2/Phase 1, Tier 2/Phase 2, and Tier 3. The IAT problem solves and makes decisions on interventions for the students at these tiers. Students who are in Tier 3 must have the most intensive individual interventions. The IAT progress monitors the academic success of the students with the specific interventions recommended. If the interventions are not successful based on graphing and documentation, the IAT and teachers decide to move the students to Tier 2/Phase 2, Tier 3, (with different interventions) or recommend to have a psychological evaluation for Tier 3 students. The IAT reviews the teachers' packets complete with graphs and evidence of documentation of the interventions implemented for the Tier 3 student and the packet is sent to Student Services. The IAT also analyzes and monitors the grade levels' Oral Reading Fluency Probes (Curriculum Based Measurement) for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students.

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 role is to analyze data, monitor students' academic progress, recommend a variety of interventions and strategies to increase our students' achievement and learning gains. Members of our School Advisory Council also analyze students' academic data to write its School Improvement Plan. School Advisory Council members also monitor our SIP's goals, strategies, and specific interventions. The Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) aligns the variety of interventions at Tier 2 and 3 with the SIP. Specific members of the School Advisory Council also serve on the IAT Team. Both SAC members and the IAT look for trends in student data and problem solve.

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 sources: Oral Reading Fluency Probes, formative assessments in Science and Math, FAIR AP1, AP2, and AP3, Osceola Writes, GO Math, Treasures Weekly Benchmark Tests, FCAT, LLI, Triumphs, TERMS and ODMS for behavior

Management systems: PMRN for FAIR, ODMS for FAIR, ODMS for FCAT, Data Director for Math and Science, TERMS and ODMS for behavior ORF Tracker and Triumphs Tracker

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The training of staff is an on-going process. On Thursday, August 30, the RtI Coach discussed how to implement the RtI process. The teachers reviewed the three tiered process, paperwork, data tracking tools, student progress monitoring plans, collection of data, interpretation of data, policies, and procedures. Next, the core RtI Intervention Assistance Team members will meet with individual teachers to determine where their new students are in the RtI process, brainstorm interventions within the tiers, and review expectations for the tracking of student data. Each quarter, the principal will send out grade level spreadsheets on their RtI students. Teachers respond to the principal so she can update the data for the IAT. There is a RtI system in place which responds with trainings and support data gathered at monthly grade level PLC meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Tier 2 Phase 1 students will receive Triumphs for 30 minutes at the end of the day. Tier 2 Phase 2 students will be remediated during block with a PE waiver using the LLI program. Tier 3 students will be pulled for 20 minutes a day and administered FCRR and practice with their specific intervention. There will be monthly meetings for each grade level where the IAT will

discuss and review data and make decisions based on the data collected throughout the month.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mary Tumbleson-Literacy Coach
Cindy Roon-Kindergarten Teacher
Stephanie Johnson-First Grade Teacher
Casey Aun-Second Grade Teacher
Irene Russ-Third Grade Teacher
Amy Whetstone-Fourth Grade Teacher
Maura Timmerman-Fifth Grade Teacher
Linda Smith-Media Specialist
Charlotte Bass-Gifted
Bettye Hobbs-Principal

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

Our school's Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet monthly to analyze the school's grade level curriculum-based oral reading fluency probes measurement data. The LLT will also analyze FAIR data each AP to look for strengths and areas of improvement across grade levels. Based on this data, the LLT will plan grade level appropriate professional development that will improve classroom instruction and increase students' reading learning gains. During the State Literacy Week, the LLT will plan and coordinate schoolwide reading activities and events, including a Family Literacy Night.

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

Our LLT will plan an aggressive professional development schedule based on the needs obtained from FAIR and the oral reading fluency probes measurement data. Professional Development will include workshops on how to effectively use our core reading program, how to design an effective 90-minute Reading block, effective use of learning centers, effective guided reading groups, and book studies that focus on research-based reading teaching strategies.

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.

NA

*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?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Since 2002 our percentage of 3rd-5th Grade students scoring 3 and above on FCAT Reading have increased except for the 2006-2008 school years. In the 2009 and 2010 FCAT Reading, 83% (226) of our students in 3rd-5th Grades scored a Level 3 and above. On the 2011 FCAT, 85% of our students in 3rd-5th Grades scored a Level 3 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (226) of 3rd-5th Grade students achieved Proficiency (Level 3-5) on the 2012 FCAT Reading.	On the 2013 FCAT Reading, 85% of students in Grades 3-5 will achieve Proficiency.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL learners acquiring the English language, students' attendance in school, students' behavior, parental involvement, equity of technology, vocabulary, background knowledge, student motivation, varying reading abilities in the classroom, ESE students' instructional level, "Gifted Endorsed Teachers	guided reading, differentiated instruction in center time, 3rd Grade Bookmark Buddies, STEAL, Countdown to FCAT, motivation techniques, (Accelerated Reader (AR) Challenge); before, during, and after school remediation programs, Professional Learning Communities to manipulate and make instruction relevant (based on ongoing data) to the students, administration encourages interested teachers to obtain Gifted certification, utilize PE Waivers during 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade BLOCK, schedule a school-wide enrichment time to be conducted from 2:30 - 3:00 pm on MTTF, schedule and conduct a Literacy Night, CCSS Training for all teachers, and technology connections.	School Literacy Coach, Administration, Reading Teachers, Media Specialist, RtI school Leadership Team, all Paraprofessionals, BLOCK teachers and office support staff.	Share best strategies at PLCs on Wednesdays, Marzano Classroom Walkthroughs, progress toward AR Goal per grade levels, attendance at the before and after school programs, documentation of Gifted Endorsed teachers	FAIR; Weekly FCAT Benchmark Tests, Compass Reports, Oral Reading Fluency Checks (ORF), AR Reports, Running Records, Thinking Maps, FCAT Explorer usage reports, and use of ODMS to analyze data.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	MAE's goal is to have 80% of the 8 ASD students testing scoring at a Level 4 or above in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

MAE did not have the population for students being tested via FAA until this year; 2012-13.		80% of the FAA students tested are expected to score at a Level 4 or above performance level.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	30% of the 3rd - 5th grade students score Level 4 or above on the 2012 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd grade Level 4 and above - 33% 4th grade Level 4 and above - 31% 5th grade Level 4 and above - 27%	On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 50% and more of students in Grades 3-5 will achieve Levels 4 and 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	Rigor and Relevance in the 3rd-5th Grade Reading classes; With fidelity, K-5 Reading Teachers facilitate whole group and small group instruction	Differentiated instruction within guided reading time; materials and resources for enriched and gifted students; before, during, and after school acceleration; school-wide iii/enrichment time, and Literacy Night.	Literacy Coach, Administration, K-5 teachers, teachers working on their "Gifted" endorsement, utilize Block teachers, office personnel, and all paraprofessionals in school wide iii time.	analysis of FAIR data, Marzano administrative walkthroughs, school Literacy Leadership Council	FAIR, weekly FCAT Benchmark Assessments, projects with rubrics
2					
3					

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	MAE's goal is to have 100% of the 8 ASD students score a Level 7 or above in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
MAE did not have a population for this data during the 2012 school year.	MAE expects to have 85% of the ASD students scoring a Level 7 or above 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	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
2	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
3	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
4	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
5	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
6	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA
7	behaviors background knowledge and limited experiences student motivation	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Literacy Nights	Administration, Educators, and Literacy Coach	FAA results	FAA

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:	From 2002- 2010 our Percentage of students making Learning Gains in FCAT Reading have fluctuated. In 2003 our learning gains increased, in 2004-2006 learning gains decreased, in 2007 learning gains increased significantly, in 2008 decreased slightly, in 2009 increased, and in 2010 our students learning gains decreased to 68% (142). In 2011, our 4th and 5th Grade students increased their Learning Gains by 5% going from 68% to 73%. In 2012, our 4th and 5th grade students decreased their Learning Gains by 7%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Reading, our 4th and 5th Grade Learning Gains increased to 66% - a 7% decrease from the previous year.	On the 2013 FCAT Reading, our 4th and 5th Grade students will increase their learning gains from 66% to 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	comprehension skills not at students' instructional level, students acquiring the English Language, behavior and attendance, word study skills, background knowledge, motivation, attitude	guided reading with differentiated instruction, learning centers differentiation, Countdown to FCAT, Block Remediation, Before, during, and after school with STAR Reading and STAR Math assessments, Ticket to	Administration, Literacy Coach, Reading Teachers, BLOCK teachers, office personnel, All paraprofessionals.	progress monitoring with Oral Fluency Checks, classroom walkthroughs, PLC discussions	Oral Fluency Reports, FCAT Explorer, and FCAT Reading, AR Reports

		Read, AR Challenge, and FCAT Explorer, implement school wide iii/enrichment time.			
2					
3					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	From 2002 to the 2010 FCAT Reading, the learning gains of our lowest quartile of 4th and 5th Grade students have fluctuated. From 2002-2003 our lowest quartile significantly increased their learning gains by 17%! In 2004 our lowest quartile significantly decreased (20%) their learning gains in Reading. In 2005 our lowest quartile increased. However from 2006-2008 our lowest quartile of readers dropped. In 2009 our lowest quartile of readers significantly increased learning gains by 22%! However in 2010 our lowest quartile significantly dropped below the 50% with 47% (60) of them making learning gains. This drastic drop in gains caused our school to drop from an A to a B. On the 2011 FCAT Reading, the Lowest 25% of students increased their gains from 47% to 75%, an increase of 28%! On the 2012 FCAT Reading, the Lowest Quartile decreased from 75% to 63%; 12% decrease.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Reading, 63% of our lowest quartile of 4th and 5th Grade students achieved learning gains.	On the 2013 FCAT Reading, we want 75% of our lowest quartile of students make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
ELL students acquiring the English Language,	motivational activities, Promote Accelerated	Administration, Literacy Coach,	Marzano classroom walkthroughs, progress	FCAT Reading Learning gains of

1	FCAT Text below the instructional level of students, need for text leveling, parent support, motivation and attitude of students	Reader and incentives, before, during, and after school remediation programs, metacognitive activities, think alouds, Thinking Maps, Literacy Nights, iii/enrichment time.	Reading Teachers, Rtl Leadership Team, BLOCK teachers, all paraprofessionals, and office personnel.	monitoring oral fluency checks, weekly reading assessments, differentiated instruction, PLC Discussions	lowest quartile, Oral Fluency Checks, AR Reports, Ticket to Read, STAR Reading and STAR Math assessments 3 times per year, FCAT Explorer Reports
2					

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 # MAE had 73% of its 4th and 5th grade students making learning gains in Reading as determined by the 2011 FCAT. MAE had 66% of the 4th and 5th grade students making learning gains as determined by the 2012 FCAT. Our goal for 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66%	85%	90%	95%	100%	

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:	MAE's goal is to have a 5% decrease in the percent of students who are not making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
# and percent of students who are not proficient in Reading: White 41% (255) Black 43% (23) Am. Indian 38% (22) Asian 39% (7) Multi Racial 25% (7)	MAE's expected Level of Performance is to increase the percent of students who are proficient 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
1	ELL students acquiring the English Language, comprehension of the FCAT Reading is difficult because the text is not on many of our 3rd-5th Grade instructional level	Before, during and after school remediation programs in Reading, differentiated instruction	Administration, Literacy Coach, Reading Teachers, Rtl Leadership Team	walkthroughs, remediation program reports such as Compass Odyssey, Kid Biz, Rtl data analysis meetings, PLC Discussions	Compass Reports, KidBiz Reports, FAIR data, FCAT data, AYP Report

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:	MAE's goal is to increase the percent of ELL students who are proficient in Reading (Level 3 or above) by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

55% of the ELL (85) of ELL students are not proficient in reading.			MAE's goal is to decrease the percent of ELL students who are not proficient in the area of Reading 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
1	ELL students acquiring English Language, vocabulary development, instructional level lower than FCAT Reading text	Before, during, and after school remediation programs for ELL students from September, 2011 to March 31, 2012, differentiated instruction	Administration, Literacy Coach, ELL Paraprofessionals, Reading Teachers	FAIR Reports, Oral Fluency Assessments, RtI Leadership Team Meetings, PLC Discussions	FAIR Data, Oral Fluency Probes, 2012 FCAT Reading data, 2012 AYP Reading Report

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:	MAE's goal is to increase the percent of students proficient in reading by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (50) of the ESE students are not making satisfactory progress in reading (not proficient).	MAE expects to decrease the percent of students who are not proficient in reading by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	difficulty of the FCAT Reading text, difficulty of the FCAT vocabulary, attendance and behavior, attendance at our remediation programs, motivation	ESE inclusion with support facilitation, before, during and after school remediation	ESE teachers, administration, Reading Teachers	remediation program reports, PLC analysis of ESE students' Reading data, Oral Fluency probes	FAIR, Treasures Benchmark Tests, FCAT Reading, AYP Reading Proficiency Target Achieved
2					

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:	MAE's goal is to increase the percent of economically disadvantaged students who are proficient by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (191) of the students on free or reduced lunch are not making satisfactory progress in Reading (not Level 3 or above).	MAE expects to decrease the percent of students who are not proficient by 10%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	attendance at our before and after school remediation programs, motivation, behavior, text too difficult, vocabulary development,	Before, during, and after school reading remediation programs such as Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, and KidBiz	Literacy Coach, administration, remediation teachers, Reading Teachers	Analyze FAIR APs, curriculum based oral fluency probes, RtI Leadership Team Meetings, PLC Discussions	FAIR data, FCAT Reading, FCAT Weekly Benchmark Tests, AYP Reading Proficiency Target

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
Book Study: CCSS SEM-R DRA Guided Reading Leveled Readers	K-5th	Literacy Coach - Book Study and SEM-R PLC Leaders from each Grade Level	All Highly Qualified Educators	Early Release Wednesdays for PD and PLC's	Implementation with Fidelity, Class Walk Throughs,	Administration, Literacy Coach, PLC Facilitators, Reading Specialist

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Introduce teachers to the Common Core and how to implement them into the curriculum.	Pathways to the Common Core	Regular Budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress Monitoring, Extended Learning	STAR Reading, Ticket to Read, Ren Place,	Budget and SPIRIT Program	\$3,969.00
			Subtotal: \$3,969.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide teachers time to create and implement CCSS in the curriculum.	12 subs to cover classes during the school day.	budget	\$960.00
			Subtotal: \$960.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$5,429.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		MAE's goal is to increase the percentage of ELL who are proficient in listening/speaking.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
Kindergarten: 4 out of 25 - 16% 1st Grade: 12 out of 22 - 55% 2nd Grade: 18 out of 21 - 86% 3rd Grade: 1 out of 13 - 8% 4th Grade: 2 out of 7 - 29% 5th Grade: 4 out of 7 57%					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	language, background experiences, economically disadvantaged, high mobility rate, vocabulary knowledge/background	ELL Paraprofessionals one on one support, Emersion PE Waiver Individual instruction More time on task modification of curriculum Extended Learning Opportunities before and after school (ELO)	Literacy Coach, Administration, ESOL Endorsed educators	CELLA and FCAT	CELLA and 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:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:					

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Ren Place Ticket to Read STAR Math and Reading	Reading Program Progress Monitoring	see below	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STAR Math STAR Reading Ren Place Ticket to Read	Progress Monitoring and Reading Program	School Budget	\$6,400.00
			Subtotal: \$6,400.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STAR Reading STAR Math Ren Place - Generating Reports	Progress Monitoring tools Reading Program		\$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: \$6,400.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2012, 54% of our students in grades 3rd-5th achieved proficiency with an FCAT score of Level 3 or greater. This is a 22% decrease from the 2011 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 54% of our students grades 3rd-5th achieved proficiency with an FCAT score of Level 3 or greater.	On the 2013 FCAT Math, we want 70% of our 3rd-5th Grade students to achieve Level 3 and above.

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	Moving children from concrete to analytical, staggered ability levels, limited technology, time, motivation, attitude	before and after-school remediation PE Waivers for Remediation, FCAT Explorer, Think-Central SOAR, and Countdown to FCAT, implement a school wide iii/enrichment time from 2:30 - 3:00 p.m., and Math Nights.	Administration, Math Specialists at each grade level.	Formative assessments, Chapter Assessments, STAR Math, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	FCAT Math Levels 3-5, Benchmark Assessments, Data Director and Think-Central Progress Monitoring Assessments, ODMS generated Data Chats.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	For grades 3-5, 21% of our 3rd - 5th grade students were Level 4 and above. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is
--	---

Mathematics Goal #2a:	to have 30% of the 3rd - 5th grade students at a Level 4 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% of the 5th grade students were Level 4 or above. 22% of the 4th grade students were Level 4 or above. 14% of the 3rd grade students were Level 4 or above.	The 2012 expected level of performance is to raise level 4 and 5 FCAT test scores to 35% Level 4 and above

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	Moving children from concrete to analytical, parental support, staggered ability levels, limited technology, attitude, motivation	STAR Math, Voyager Math, FCAT Explorer. Increase differentiated small group, implement GIFTED strategies, Implement after-school/evening outreach programs to introduce/involve parents to the math curriculum and Math Nights.	Math Teachers, RtI Team, Administration	Progress monitoring with formative assessments, STAR Math, GO Math assessments, Voyager Math, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	FCAT Math Levels 4-5, Formative Math Assessments,

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	MAE's goal is to have 80% of the students scoring above Achievement Level 7 in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8 students during the 2012-13 school year will receive the Florida Alternate Assessment. Prior to this year, MAE did not have a population for this format of testing.	MAE's goal is to have 100% of our Florida Alternate Assessment students demonstrating competency

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 behaviors Motivation Vocabulary development	Behavior Modification Plan Celebrating Success	ASD Educators Administration	2013 Florida Alt. Assessment results	FAA

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:	From 2002- to 2011, our FCAT Math Learning Gains have fluctuated. In 2002, 66% of our 4th and 5th Grade students made learning gains, this rose to 74%, and then for three years, increased, dropped and then in 2009 increased to 74%. On the 2011 FCAT Math, our 4th and 5th Grade learning gains increased by 3% from the previous year to 71.5%. Learning Gains in Mathematics were sustained at 71% from the 2011 to 2012 FCAT year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Math, 71% of our 4th and 5th Grade Students made Learning Gains.	For the 2013 FCAT Math, we want 75% of our 4th and 5th Grade students to make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	motivation, understanding of higher order math skills, parents understanding of higher order math activities, attitude	hands on exploration, math vocabulary focus, remediation programs, differentiated instruction, school wide iii/enrichment time with BLOCK, office personnel, and all paraprofessionals working with at risk students.	Administration, Math Specialist Teachers	remediation program reports, formative assessments, STAR Math, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	2013 FCAT Math Learning Gains

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:	MAE's goal is to have 100% of the FAA students tested make one year's growth as determined from the comparison of results from 2012 to 2013 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
MAE did not have a population for FAA in the 2012 school year.	MAE expects 100% of the ASD students to 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	Behaviors, background knowledge, attendance,	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Highly Qualified Educator, Behavior Specialist	Administration, ASD Teachers	FAA test results - data analysis from one year to next.	FAA

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:	Since the lowest quartile of math students was added to the FCAT criteria, our lowest quartile percentages have fluctuated. Starting in 2007, our lowest quartile of students making math learning gains increased 4%, and in 2009 dropped 7%. On the 2011 FCAT Math, we increased our learning gains 22% from 57% the previous year to 79%. On the 2012 FCAT, we decreased our learning gains by 12%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Math, 67% of our lowest quartile of 4th and 5th Grade students made learning gains.	On the 2013 FCAT Math, we want 75% of our 4th and 5th Grade lowest quartile to make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	attendance, motivation,	remediation programs,	Administration,	ongoing progress	2013 FCAT Math

1	behavior, computation skills, higher order word problem solving ability, instructional reading ability of students	motivational incentives, iii/enrichment school wide from 2:30 - 3:00 p.m.	Math Specialist Teachers	monitoring with formative assessments, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	lowest quartile making learning gains.
---	--	---	--------------------------	--	--

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 # MAE had 67% of the students making learning gains in 2010-11 and 71% making learning gains in 2011-12. This was a 4% increase in the number of students making learning gains in Mathematics. MAE's goal is to increase the percent of				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71%	80%	90%	95%	95%	

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:	MAE will realize a decrease of 5% in the number of students in each subgroup not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
By ethnicity (%,# not making satisfactory progress). White 47% (255) Black 67% (23) Am. Indian 60% (22) Mult-Racial 8% (7)	% of students making satisfactory progress by subgroup. White 53% (255) Black 33% (23) Am. Indian 40% (22) Mult-Racial 92% (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	understanding of the math vocabulary and higher order benchmarks	differentiated instruction, remediation program, ongoing progress monitoring	Math Teachers, administration	formative assessments, Odyssey, Go Math assessments, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	2012 AYP Summary Report of the subgroups in Math

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	On the 2011 AYP Summary Report,our English Language Learners did not count for AYP because of the few numbers of ELL students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2011 AYP Summary Report,our English Language Learners did not count to be documented for AYP purposes.	On the 2012 AYP Summary Report, our English Language Learners will achieve the targeted proficiency 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	understanding of the math vocabulary and text, concrete to abstract learning	remediation, GO Math differentiated instruction, progress monitoring	Math Teachers, Title III Parapro, administrators	progress monitoring with formative assessments, GO Math assessments, RTI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	2012 AYP Summary Report of ELL achieving high standards in math
---	--	--	--	--	---

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	On the 2011 AYP Summary Report,our Students with Disabilities did not count to be documented for AYP purposes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2011 AYP Summary Report,our Students with Disabilities did not count to be documented for AYP purposes.	On the 2012 AYP Summary Report, our Students with Disabilities will achieve Proficiency 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	Behavior/frustration, wide range of ability levels, poor math vocabulary, difficulty in moving from concrete to abstract	Implement workshops that provide ESE strategies to mainstream teachers, provide before, during, and afterschool remediation by direct instruction and C.A.I., Increase differentiated small group instruction,Implement Scholastic (Do the Math) program	ESE Teachers, Math Teachers RtI Team, Administration	progress moinitoring with formative assessments, GO Math assessments,Scholastic Do the Math Program, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats	2012 AYP Summary Report of (SWD) achieving high standards in math

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	On the 2011 AYP Summary Report,53 of our Economically Disadvantaged (ED)students scored an average of 70%, therefore as a sub-group did not achieve the targeted proficiency in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2011 AYP Summary Report, our Economically Disadvantaged (ED) subgroup scored an average of 70%, thus not achieving the targeted proficiency in Mathematics.	On the 2012 AYP Summary Report, our Economically Disadvantaged sub-group will achieve proficiency 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	Attendance,Behavior/frustration, wide range of ability levels, poor math vocabulary, difficulty in moving from concrete to abstract, parent involvement	provide before, during, and afterschool remediation with Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer,Increase differentiated small group instruction,Implement after-school/evening	Math Teachers, RtI Team, Administration	progress moinitoring with formative assessments, GO Math assessments, RtI Leadership Team, PLC Data Chats, Parent attendance logs	2012 AYP Summary Report of(Economically Disadvantaged) achieving high standards in math

outreach programs to introduce/involve parents to the math curriculum.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Smartboard training, Kagan Structures training,	K-5th grade	Administration, PLC Facilitator, District Math Resource Teacher, MAE teacher designee who attends monthly District Math Mtgs.	K-5 Math Specialist.	Wednesday afternoon	PLC Minutes, Inservice Records, Lesson Plan review,	Administration, Math Specialist (teachers)

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STAR Math	Progress Monitoring for Math: assessment	budget	\$1,331.52
			Subtotal: \$1,331.52
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,331.52

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.

On the Science FCAT 2012, results demonstrated that students decreased their Proficiency Level one

Science Goal #1a:	percentage point from 66% to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Science, 65% of our 5th Grade Students achieved a Level 3 and above in Science.	On the 2013 FCAT Science, we want 70% of our 5th Grade students achieving a Level 3 and above.

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	motivation, understanding of science vocabulary, new science series, higher level scientific inquiry. adjusting grade level responsibilities to new curriculum.	Hands-on inquiry learning, remediation programs, inservices on responsibilities for each grade level on new science curriculum, teacher specialization at grade levels (2-5) for teaching science, AIMS Workshop, Smartboard Activities Workshop, Data Conference with parents, and Science Night.	Administration, Science Specialist Teachers	District Formative Assessments , weekly benchmark progress monitoring, Professional Development records	2012 FCAT Science Proficiency Levels, Formative Assessment results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	MAE had a 5% increase in Level 4 and 5's from 2011 to 2012 Science FCAT administration.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
MAE had 21% of the 5th grade students scoring Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Science FCA	MAE expects to have 25% of the 5th grade students scoring Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Science FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Understanding of science, vocabulary, higher level scientific inquiry, adjusting on grade level responsibilities to new curriculum and prior knowledge.	Hands on inquiry, ability grouping, differentiated instruction, remediation programs, PLC Mtgs. Professional Development offering on AIMS Science activities.	Administration, Science Specialist, PLC Facilitator	Classroom Walk Throughs, District Formative Assessment Test conduct 3 times per year, weekly benchmark offering, progress monitoring, Professional Development records	2013 FCAT Science Proficiency Levels, Formative Assessment results scoring 4 or higher

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:	Test data from the Spring 2012 FCAT Science showed 16 students scoring Level 4 and 5 students scoring Level 5. This was a 5% increase from 2011 to 2012.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
MAE had 21% of the 5th grade students scoring Level 4 or above on the 2012 Science FCAT.	On the 2013 FCAT Science, we expect 25% of the 5th grade students to score Level 4 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	understanding of science vocabulary, higher level scientific inquiry. adjusting on grade level responsibilities to new curriculum, prior knowledge	Targeted inservices and PLC meetings, ability group for differentiated instruction, hands-on inquiry learning, remediation programs, science mission lab, inservices on responsibilities for each grade level on new science curriculum	Administration, Science Teachers, PIC chairpersons,	Classroom walkthroughs, District Formative Assessments, weekly benchmark progress monitoring, Professional Development records	2012 FCAT Science Proficiency Levels, Formative Assessment results scoring 4 or greater

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:	MAE's goal is to have 60% of the ASD students scoring at Level 7 in Science.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA - MAE did not have population for FAA.	MAE expects to have 60% of the ASD students scoring at a proficient level of performance (Level 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	behavior, exceptionalities, background experience, background knowledge, Science vocabulary	Behavior Modification Plans, Celebrating Success, Exposure to hands on experiences, use of Smartboard and Safari (digital learning), build science vocabulary	Administration and ASD teachers	FAA analysis	FAA

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
professional development for use of AIMS curriculum,how to write and integrate labs in the elementary classroom,and use of smartboard technology in the science classroom. PLC by science team on content specific curriculum at grades (3-5).	AIMS use: K-5 Curriculum integration grades 3-5,	Administration, School science leaders,OCSD science curriculum specialists	Aims curriculum school-wide grades (K-5), Curriculum Intergration grades (3-5)	Science Team monthly,teacher workdays,	Professional development records,PLC meeting notes	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide targeted evidence based programs and materials based on needs assessments	AIMS science curriculum	school budget, SAC	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide Smartboards and laptops in all classrooms/ science labs	Smartboards, laptops, and necessary software	school budget and District support	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide professional development based on needs assessments.	Aims inservice (K-5) Smartboard training Inservice on scaffolding science content across grade levels (3-5)	school budget, SAC	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$4,100.00

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.	State standards dropped to Level 3 and above due to the overwhelming percentage of students who's did not score Level 4 or above. MAE had 90% of the 4th grade

Writing Goal #1a:	students scoring Level 3 or above. 64% scored Level 4 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% of our 4th grade students scored a Level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT.	The expected level of performance is to increase the percent of Level 3 and above by 1%. State standards will return to Level 4 and above - MAE would like to have 80% of the students at Level 4 or above. 2012 results showed 64% were Level 4 or above.

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	Motivation, attendance at school, out of county and out of state students not familiar with PDA Writing, vocabulary development, conventions	Mentor new teachers in the PDA Writing, ability grouping in the 4th Grade, writing specialization in 2nd-4th Grade, and strong emphasis on conventions. Apply spelling rules correctly, focus on spelling, punctuation, capitalizations, grammar, verb tenses, and paragraphs.	Administration, writing teachers, Literacy Coach	Osceola PDA Writes, PDA Consultant School House Rocks TV Announcements Daily Oral Language Academic Games Technology Connections	FCAT Writing, AYP Summary Report

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Core Connections, Conventions, grammar, punctuation, spelling	K-4	Mary Tumbleson	School-wide	Wednesday - Early Release	Osceola Writes Florida Writes	Educators, Administration Literacy Coach

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Connections			\$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
Core Connections	Literacy Coach and Consultant (Core Connections)		\$0.00
Conventions, spelling, grammar, etc...	Daily Oral Language Write Away		\$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 Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our school's Goal for Attendance is to meet and or exceed the District ADA of 95%. We also want to reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 10%. We also want to reduce the number of students with excessive tardies by 10%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
During the 2011-2012 School Year, our Average Daily Attendance was "97%".	For the 2012-13 School Year, we want our students' Daily Average Attendance to meet and/or exceed the District's average of 95%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
During the 2011-12 school year, MAE had 205 (34%) students with 10 or more absences.	For the 2012-2013 school year, we want to reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 10%.

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
During the 2011-12 school year, MAE had 114 (19%) students with 10 or more tardies.		For the 2012-2013 School Year, we will reduce the number of students with excessive tardies by 10%.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	parental support, student motivation, Poor communication with parents due to non-viable phone numbers and addresses.	Attendance incentives,truancy meetings, monitor students' attendance, improve parent communication by an increase of home visits by Student Services personnel, Administration,School Resource Officer.	Administration, Attendance School Committee, Student Records Clerk	Weekly reports generated by Student Records Clerk from TERMS database, Monthly District reports	End of the Year ADA report, excessive absences report, and tardies 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
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Comparative analysis of Discipline Data over the past two years shows that there has been a steady drop in the use of both In-school and Out-of-School Suspension. In-School Suspension has dropped from 3.9% (32/818) in 2009-2010 to 2.8% (20/714) in 2010-2011. Out-of-School Suspension data shows in the school year in 2009-2010 there was a 1.5% (12/818) use of Out-of-School Suspension. This was reduced to .8% (6/714) in the 2010-2011 school year. The Suspension Goal for the (2011-2012) school year is to reduce the In-School Suspension rate to 2.5% and the Out-of-School Suspension rate to be less than .5%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
In the 2012 school year, MAE had 23 incidents where students were assigned to ISS.	In 2011-2012 our target goal is to reduce our In-School-Suspension rate to 2.5%
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In the 2012 school year, MAE had 16 different students who were suspended for school.	The 2012 expected number of In School Suspended children will be 2.5%(15).
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In 2011, the number of Out-of-School Suspensions with a student population of 640 was 12 students, (1.5 %).	In 2011-2012, we target the number of Out-of-School Suspensions to be less than 0.5(3) %
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In 2011 the number of Out-of-School Suspensions with a student population of 640 was 6 students(.8%),	In 2011-2012, we target the number of Out-of-School Suspensions to be less than 0.5(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	communication concerns with parents due to non-working phone numbers and incorrect addresses. Students with limited experiences in school either by poor attendance or repeatedly moving schools	Efforts to get correct telephone numbers and addresses with home visits by administration, SRO, social services assistant, guidance counselor. Administration and Guidance will target attendance to increase academic success.	School Discipline Committee; RtI Committee for students on Tier 2 and 3 for behavior; Guidance Counselor, administration, social service assistant	Quarterly analysis of discipline data by grade level discipline committee, Guidance, and administration	District databases: TERMS, ODMS.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>We want to have FCAT Nights to show parents resources and materials that will equip them to help their children prepare for FCAT. We also want to continue our SAC's initiatives of All Pro Dad's and iMom's Breakfasts. We also want to continue our Family Literacy Night. Additionally, we will conduct a Family Math and Science Night to showcase curriculum.</p>

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In the 2011-2012 school year, we sponsored 3rd-5th Grade FCAT Parent Nights to equip them with resources and materials to help their child prepare for FCAT. (30) Each month we sponsored either an All Pro Dad's or iMOM Breakfasts. (100) We held a Family Literacy Night (65) however did not have the Family Math Night. We plan to continue these activities and best practices for the 2012-13 school year.	For the 2012-2013 school year, we want to have two FCAT Parent Nights. In the second semester, we will have an FCAT Family Night where the parents and their child work on FCAT Reading, Math, and Science questions and answers. We will also sponsor a Family Math and Science Night as well as a Family Literacy Night. We will to continue with the success of our All Pro Dad's and iMOM Breakfasts.

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 - language barrier, wrong phone number/ no phone/ messages do not travel home Poverty-single family households results in tired or busy parents.	Enlist county ESOL department to translate all communication home. use the IRIS and school website to better communicate activities and events	Administration, ELL Specialist	Attendance at FCAT Parent Nights, Family Math and Science Night, Family Literacy Night, and All Pro Dad's and iMom's Breakfast; parent surveys	Attendance at educational events and activities

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
SAC Cadre Training	Training for participation on school School Advisory Committee	Administration	Parent, teachers, and Administrators	one training day, monthly meetings	Successful monthly SAC meetings	Administration, SAC Chairperson

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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		NA		
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)

Character Education Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Character Education Goal Character Education Goal #1:		MAE's goal is to encourage good character, feed the soul, boost self esteem, and strive to be "bucket fillers."			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
NA		Positive climate whereby teachers use common language (Are you being a bucket filler or a bucket dipper?, Are you making good choices? etc...).			
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	Positive role models and peer pressure		Administration, Guidance Counselor, Teachers,	Faculty/Staff Climate Survey results and Student Climate Survey	NA

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

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

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

Budget:

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
How Full is Your Bucket (book)	book	school budget	\$900.00
			Subtotal: \$900.00
			Grand Total: \$900.00

End of Character Education Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Introduce teachers to the Common Core and how to implement them into the curriculum.	Pathways to the Common Core	Regular Budget	\$500.00
CELLA	Ren Place Ticket to Read STAR Math and Reading	Reading Program Progress Monitoring	see below	\$0.00
Mathematics	STAR Math	Progress Monitoring for Math: assessment	budget	\$1,331.52
Science	Provide targeted evidence based programs and materials based on needs assessments	AIMS science curriculum	school budget, SAC	\$1,000.00
Writing	Core Connections			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$2,831.52
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Progress Monitoring, Extended Learning	STAR Reading, Ticket to Read, Ren Place,	Budget and SPIRIT Program	\$3,969.00
CELLA	STAR Math STAR Reading Ren Place Ticket to Read	Progress Monitoring and Reading Program	School Budget	\$6,400.00
Science	Provide Smartboards and laptops in all classrooms/ science labs	Smartboards, laptops, and necessary software	school budget and District support	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$13,369.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Provide teachers time to create and implement CCSS in the curriculum.	12 subs to cover classes during the school day.	budget	\$960.00
CELLA	STAR Reading STAR Math Ren Place - Generating Reports	Progress Monitoring tools Reading Program		\$0.00
Science	Provide professional development based on needs assessments.	Aims inservice (K-5) Smartboard training Inservice on scaffolding science content across grade levels (3-5)	school budget, SAC	\$100.00
Writing	Core Connections	Literacy Coach and Consultant (Core Connections)		\$0.00
Writing	Conventions, spelling, grammar, etc...	Daily Oral Language Write Away		\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,060.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Character Education	How Full is Your Bucket (book)	book	school budget	\$900.00
				Subtotal: \$900.00
				Grand Total: \$18,160.52

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority

jn Focus

jn Prevent

jn NA

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/7/2012)

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.



No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Recruiting efforts will be take place at various school wide events (i.e. Meet the Teacher event, Open House, Reading events, Parent Involvement events, etc...). MAE was blessed to have many parents in attendance at the August 30, 2012 meeting. One teacher from each grade level volunteers to serve on the council. A majority of the members in attendance were parents. New members will be voted in at the September 11 meeting. We will strive to be in compliance with the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by MAE. IRIS (automated voice recorded out dial calls) Alerts will be recorded and sent out by the Principal encouraging parents to attend. A quarterly newsletter will update parents on current SAC events and encourage parent participation. The monthly meeting will also be placed on the School marquee 1 - 2 weeks in advance of meeting date.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The 2012-13 School Advisory Council (SAC) will meet monthly. The council will assist the Principal, Mrs. Diane Crook-Nichols, as she makes critical decisions that impact the overall function of MAE. The SAC meets in July of each year to analyze FCAT data and to establish the upcoming SIP for the school year ahead. A mid year SIP review will take place whereby members review the goals and strategies set forth in the 2012-13 SIP. The student/parent climate survey will be reviewed with input given to the Principal on matters that need addressed.

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

Osceola School District MICHIGAN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	85%	76%	92%	66%	319	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	73%	67%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	75% (YES)	79% (YES)			154	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					613	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Osceola School District MICHIGAN AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	80%	86%	67%	316	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	68%	60%			128	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?	47% (NO)	57% (YES)			104	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					548	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested