FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Angela Lettiere

SAC Chair: Laura Russo

Superintendent: Dr. Patton

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Angela Lettiere	B.S. Degree Elementary Education: College of St. Joseph Master's Degree in Special Education: College of St. Joseph Certification: Specialist Degree in Leadership, Nova University	1	13	In 2011, the school score was 454. In 2012, the school score was 488. Even though the school maintained a grade of C, the school made a 34 point gain and is 7 points from a B. Previous to 2011, served as a principal of an A graded school.
		B.A. Degree Elementary Education: Purdue University Master's Degree in Special			The school has performed at an A, B, and C level. In 2011, the school score was 454.

Assis Principal	Elizabeth Alvarez	Education: Florida Gulf Coast University Educational Leadership Certification: Florida Gulf Coast University	9	4	In 2012, the school score was 488. Even though the school maintained a grade of C, the school made a 34 point gain and is 7 points from a B.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading/Writing	Debra Phillips	BS Elementary Education, Finley University, Ohio MS Degree in Education, emphasis on Reading University of South Florida Reading Endorsement	9	4	The school has performed at an A, B, and C level. We have implemented many changes to insure that our lowest quartile and highest performing children are challenged with appropriate RtI interventions for targeted areas of need.

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	Co-teaching opportunities with mentor teacher and new teacher.	Principal, mentor teachers.	On-going	
2	Selection process of new staff will consist of thorough review of applications and references.	Principal	On-going	
3	Provide new teachers with mentor teacher.	Principal	On-going	
4	Monthly Orientation Meetings with mentor teacher and administration	Principal	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
No data submitted	

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	4.3%(2)	37.0%(17)	50.0%(23)	15.2%(7)	41.3%(19)	69.6%(32)	2.2%(1)	0.0%(0)	67.4%(31)

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
Wendy Frields	Ashley Buckley	Mrs. Frields is an experienced kindergarten teacher who is able to provide appropriate support.	The mentors and mentees meet weekly to discuss strategies and to review student data and specific challenges and needs of the mentee's instructional practices. Additionally, all mentors and mentees meet monthly for the purposes of beginning teacher staff 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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Intervention support specialist, principal, assistant principal, psychologist, reading coach, media specialist, speech pathologist, school counselor, English Language Learners teacher, and grade level representation from each grade level

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

> The MTSS Leadership team meets monthly or as needed for on-going staff development, progress monitoring through data review, analysis, discussions and problem solving for Tier 1, 2, and 3 levels of intervention to determine area of need and identification of effective strategies for student improvement. This information and training is shared with grade level teams by the grade level MTSS representative. Additionally, administration, intervention specialist, and reading coach meet monthly with the grade level teams to review and analyze progress monitoring data. Communication with parents is monitored through Collier's Data Warehouse in grade level parent conference notes.

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?

> Each member of the MTSS Leadership Team participated in the development of the MTSS plan in order to include components specific to grade level concerns and implementation. The MTSS Leadership Team will provide data to the School Advisory Council after each quarter to monitor the effectiveness of the school improvement strategies that are being implemented to increase student achievement. Each member of the MTSS team participates in cross-grade level Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups that are organized by content area. Discussion of goals, strategies, and data analysis are discussed at these meetings and brought forth to the MTSS LT and SAC groups for input and finalization.

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.

> Teachers are involved with the data warehouse component of the MTSS process through completion of the following activities: Developing progress monitoring plans, documenting parent conferences, creating custom assessments for progress monitoring, entering custom assessment data, making graphs for individual students with data entered, recording of PLC meeting notes, recording observations, reviewing data for a grade level through multiple assessment summaries, etc.
> The MTSS building contact is responsible for overseeing all of the data and the process for each grade level. She is also responsible for overseeing the process of any students who are entering Tier 3 level of support. She provides daily support

and training for teachers as needed. She attends PLC meetings regularly at all grade levels to provide training and support. Additionally, TERMS and Student Pass are utilized to collect attendance and behavior data. This information is accessed by administration as needed in the development of progress monitoring plans.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Teachers that are new to the district will have initial training given by the Intervention Support Specialist and the new teacher orientation meetings. All staff is provided MTSS updates through staff meetings and grade level MTSS representatives.
Teachers meet with grade level PLCs once a week to review data collection and analysis that is stored in the district's Data Warehouse program. Through this process, the MTSS grade level team representative provides continuous guidance and training. Data Warehouse also provides directions and video clips in the various steps and procedures in MTSS that may be accessed by teachers at any time.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The leadership team will meet monthly with grade level teams to view tier level data or as needed. During the monthly data chats, determination will be made, based on data analysis and interventions, of any additional supports necessary to provide effective interventions/instruction for all students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Reading Coach, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist, one classroom teacher from each grade level, ESE teachers.

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

The LLT meets in PLC meetings at least monthly or as needed for professional development and to review ongoing progress monitoring data in literacy. The team analyzes literacy data to determine areas of intervention and support. Grade level team representatives then share this information with grade level teams. Additionally, the LLI provides assistance and training in balanced literacy to new teachers.

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

The LLT, in collaboration with the RtI team, will monitor the implementation of a school-wide initiative to provide daily 30 minute reading intervention to students that scored less than a 3 on the FCAT reading or less than the 50th% on the SAT 10. All resource teachers will provide push-in support by meeting with small groups during this 30 minute intervention time. Progress monitoring data will be collected and reviewed weekly. The LLI and RtI team will analyze this data monthly with the grade level teams in order to determine strategies that are effective and to determine areas that require additional support and/or literacy training.

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.

*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.

*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:	Last year 28% (68) students scored level 3 on FCAT Reading. This year 29% (76) students will score at level 3 on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 28%(68 students) scoring level 3 on FCAT Reading.	2013 expected level of performance is 29% (76 students) scoring level 3 on FCAT 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	Rigor - Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student

2	aligned to the standards.	show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.		Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	interviews
3	Use of Informational Text across all content to teach reading and writing skills and strategies - Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support in the use of the close reading model. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings.	Teachers, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, and School Administrators	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Last year 29% (70) students scored levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading. This year 32% (84) students will score at levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 29% (70 students) scoring Level 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading.	2013 expected level of performance is 32% (84 students) scoring level 4 and 5 on FCAT 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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning	Classroom teachers, administrators and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

	2		opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.			
	3	Use of Informational Text across all content to teach reading and writing skills and strategies - Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support in the use of the close reading model.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Administrators Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Last year 60% (98) students made learning gains on FCAT Reading. This year 64% (110) students will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 60% (98 students) making learning gains on FCAT Reading.	2013 expected level of performance is 64% (110 students) making learning gains on FCAT 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	Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessment that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. During classroom observations, administrators will determine that learning goal is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the learning goal and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standards/benchmark.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Student interviews to determine understanding of the learning goal and scale.	CTEM observations, student interviews, student work samples.
2	Data-driven planning, instruction, and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions, and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	School-level data chats (monthly); administrator to teacher or team (weekly); teacher to student a minimum of one time quarterly.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed.	Formative and summative assessments, student data notebooks.
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	CTEM observations, student interviews, student work samples.

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

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:	Last year 56% (23) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Reading. This year 60% (26) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 56% (23 students)in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	2013 expected level of performance 60% (26 students)in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the gradual release model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Content area teachers will routinely utilize both fiction and non-fiction texts to develop analytic and evaluative thinking	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators'

		and comprehension strategies. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations		working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
3					

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 # During the 2012 – 2013 school year, we will increase the number of students achieving proficiency from 65% to 68%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	Last year 45% (22) of Hispanic students demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 51% (45) of Hispanic students will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading. Last year 63%(83) of white students demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 67% (84) of white students will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading. Last year 45% (15) of American Indian students demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 51% (10) of American Indian students will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading. Last year 73% (8) of black students demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 76% (10) of black students will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance for Hispanic students is 45% (22 stduents). 2012 current level of performance for white students is 63% (83 students). 2012 current level of performance for American Indian students is 45% (15 students). 2012 current level of performance for black students is 73% (8 students).	2013 expected level of performance for Hispanic students is 51% (45 students). 2013 expected level of performance for White students is 67% (84 students). 2013 expected level of performance for American Indian students is 51% (10 students). 2013 expected level of performance for black students is 76% (10 students).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to higher order questions.	Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
				provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews, teacher checklists
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area of reading. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher scaffolding techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 46% (22) of English Language Learners demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 51% (24) of English Language Learners will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of proficient performance on FCAT Reading for English Language Learners is 46% (22 students).	2013 expected level of proficient performance on FCAT Reading for English Language Learners is 51%(24 students).

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to higher order questions.	Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated, research-based strategies, predetermined and identified within the lesson plan, to remove the barrier.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

					understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning
2	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the gradual release model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area of reading. ELL strategies will be noted in lesson plans. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher scaffolding techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 33% (13) of students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 40% (18) students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of proficient performance for students with disabilities on FCAT Reading is 33% (13 students).	2013 expected level of proficient performance for students with disabilities on FCAT Reading is 40% (18 students).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations working in small group or individually with students to support improved skills. Provide lesson plans in a	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

		central database to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.		and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	
2	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the gradual release model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
3	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 51% (75) of Economically Disadvantaged students demonstrated proficiency on FCAT Reading. This year 56% (104) of Economically Disadvantaged students will demonstrate proficiency on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of proficient performance is 51% (75 students) on FCAT Reading.	2013 expected level of proficient performance is 56% (104 students)on FCAT 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
Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to	Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments;

1	higher order questions.	associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.		instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews, teacher checklists
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Content area teachers will routinely utilize both fiction and non-fiction texts to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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
Pathways to the Common Core book study	All grades/ language arts	Leadership team	All instructional staff	Monthly	Classroom implementation of common core strategy; teacher feedback	Administration
Reading Comprehension Toolkit	Grade 2-5, non-fiction text in reading	Leadership team	Instructional staff in grades 2-5	Pre-service week, Sept. 17, and 2012 early release day.	Informal assessment data, lesson plans, response writing from informational text, monitoring conducted through CTEM	Classroom teachers, administration, instructional support staff

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Comprehension Toolkit - Focus on Common Core non-fictional text strategies in grades 2-5.	Locational Budget	$3,800.00
Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Pathways to the Common Core instructional book study.	Locational Budget	$1,221.08
			Subtotal: $5,021.08

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: $5,021.08

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Last year, 37% (25) students demonstrated proficiency in listening/speaking on the CELLA. This year, it is expected that 41% of students taking the CELLA will demonstrate proficiency in listening/speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

In 2012, 37% (25 students)demonstrated proficiency in listening/speaking on the CELLA.
In 2013, it is expected that 41% will demonstrate 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
	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations;

		demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. The teacher will utilize a variety of English Language Learner strategies to enhance understanding of content.		instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and improve reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. The teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year, 13% (9) students demonstrated proficiency in reading on the CELLA. This year, it is expected that 14% of students that take the CELLA will demonstrate proficiency in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

In 2012, 13% (9 students)demonstrated proficiency in reading on the CELLA.
In 2013, it is expected that 14% will demonstrate proficiency in reading on the CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ell students experience delays reading skills due to limited vocabulary, limited experience to build background knowledge, limited English usage in the home and in many cases, illiteracy in the home.	The teacher will utilize strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations for reading on grade level expectations. Provide scaffolded support for ELL by inclusion in small group support for level 1 and 2 students as appropriate. Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks.	ELL teacher, classroom teachers, administration, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

| | | Employ checks for understanding that include 1:1 questioning with the student or written responses to text dependent questions to determine student's level of understanding of what was read. | | feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning. | |

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Last year, 28% (18) students demonstrated proficiency in writing on the CELLA. This year, it is expected that 31% of students taking the CELLA will demonstrate proficiency in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2012, 28% (18 students)demonstrated proficiency in writing on the CELLA.
In 2013, it is expected that 31% will demonstrate 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	Students do not have opportunities for authentic conversations and evaluation of their own or others writing. Limited application of the writing process.	Implement the Writer's Workshop process to include multiple peer and teacher edits with opportunities for whole group sharing of drafts. Students will conference with small and whole group after each draft. Students support and evaluate each other's prompt and text-dependent written responses based on the writing rubric. Following the evaluation, partners will discuss the evaluations and reach agreements as to how the writing could be improved/strengthened.	Classroom teachers, administration, writing committee, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams, classroom teachers, administration,	Writing committee, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams to analyze student work samples and quarterly benchmark responses in order to guide instruction/intervention.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; student writing samples; administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student writing portfolios

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Last year 32% (77) students achieved level 3 on FCAT Mathematics. This year 35% (92) students will achieve level 3 on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 32% (77 students) scoring level 3 on FCAT Math.	2013 expected level of performance is 35% (92 students) scoring level 3 on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rigor - Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

2		of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.			
3	Math instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension in math word problems.	Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Teachers will utilize the Launch, Explore, and Summary inquiry model of instruction as an approach to solving word problems.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Last year 20% (48) students scored levels 4 or above on FCAT Mathematics. This year 22% (58) students will achieve levels 4 or above on FCAT Mathematics.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	2012 current level of performance is 20% (48 students) scoring at or above level 4 on FCAT Math.		2013 expected level of performance is 22% (58 students) scoring at or above level 4 on FCAT Math.		
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be	Classroom teachers, administrators and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

			Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.			
3	Use of Informational Text across all content to teach reading and writing skills and strategies - Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support in the use of the close reading model.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Administrators Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
4	Math instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension in math word problems.	Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Teachers will utilize the Launch, Explore, and Summary inquiry model of instruction as an approach to solving word problems.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Last year 66% (107) students achieved learning gains on FCAT Mathematics. This year 69% (119) students will achieve learning gains on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 66% (107 students).	2013 expected level of performance is 69% (119 students).

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessment that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.	Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks. During classroom observations, administrators will determine that learning goal is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the learning goal and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standards/benchmarks.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Student interviews to determine understanding of the learning goal and scale.	CTEM observations, student interviews, student work samples.
2	Data-driven planning, instruction, and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions, and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.	School-level data chats (monthly); administrator to teacher or team (weekly); teacher to student a minimum of one time quarterly.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed.	Formative and summative assessments, student data notebooks.
3	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	CTEM observations, student interviews, student work samples.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in	

mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3b:

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Last year 61% (27) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Mathematics. This year 65% (28) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 61% (27 students)in lowest 25% making learning gains in FCAT Math.	2013 expected level of performance is 65% (28 students)in lowest 25% making learning gains in FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.	Content area teachers will routinely utilize both fiction and non-fiction texts to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

					and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	
3	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the Explore, Launch, and Summary model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

---

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 # 5A : Current 52% Expected 56% During the 2012 – 2013 school year, we will increase the number of students achieving proficiency from 52% to 56%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	Last year 63% (83) of white students made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 67% (84) of white students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. Last year 45% (22) of Hispanic students made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 51% (45) of Hispanic will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. Last year 45% (15) of American Indian students made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 51% (10) of American Indian students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. Last year 73% (8) of black students made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 76% (10) of black students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance for white students is 63% (83 students). 2012 current level of performance for Hispanic students is 45% (22 students). 2012 current level of performance for American Indian students is 45% (15 students). 2012 current level of performance for black students is 73% (8 students).	2013 expected level of performance for white students is 67% (84 students). 2013 expected level of performance for Hispanic students is 51% (45 students). 2013 expected level of performance for American Indian students is 51% (10 students). 2013 expected level of performance for black students is 76% (10 students).
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to higher order questions.	Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews, teacher checklists
3	Math instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the problem solving in word problems and real situations.	Teachers will utilize consistent scaffolds and the Launch, Explore, and Summary techniques in their classrooms so students have strategies and skills to approach and solve word problems and real world math situations. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for solving word problems. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher scaffolding techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 46% (22) of English Language Learners made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 51% (24) of English Language Learners will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 46% (22 students)of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress.	2013 expected level of performance is 51% (24 students)of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress.
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	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to higher order questions.	Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated, research-based strategies, predetermined and identified within the lesson plan, to remove the barrier.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the Launch, Explore, and Summary model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
3	Math instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the problem solving in word problems and real situations.	Teachers will utilize consistent scaffolds and the Launch, Explore, and Summary techniques in their classrooms so students have strategies and skills to approach and solve word problems and real world math situations. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for solving word problems.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher scaffolding techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 33% (13) of students with disabilities made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 40% (18) students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 33% (13 students)of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress.	2013 expected level of performance is 40% (18 students)of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations working in small group or individually with students to support improved skills. Provide lesson plans in a central database to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
3	Lessons/ activities are not appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will utilize the Launch, Explore, and Summary model of instruction to meet the needs of students at differing learning levels. Use of this model will be included in lesson plans and monitored through CTEM. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, the teacher will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5.	Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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:	Last year 51% (75) of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics. This year 56% (104) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on FCAT Mathematics.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	2012 current level of performance is 51% (75 students)of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math.	2013 expected level of performance is 56% (104 students)of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students are not held accountable for giving critical, creative, and independent responses to higher order questions.</td>
<td>Teacher will maintain data by subgroup in order to identify issues specific to the risk factors associated with the subgroup. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.</td>
<td>Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff</td>
<td>Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning</td>
<td>Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.</td>
<td>Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups.</td>
<td>Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff</td>
<td>Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning</td>
<td>Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews, teacher checklists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Math instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the problem solving in word problems and real situations.</td>
<td>Teachers will utilize consistent scaffolds and the Launch, Explore, and Summary techniques in their classrooms so students have strategies and skills to approach and solve word problems and real world math situations. Teachers will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for solving word problems. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5.</td>
<td>Teachers, administrators, instructional support staff</td>
<td>Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher scaffolding techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.</td>
<td>Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews</td>
</tr>
</table>

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
Pioneer math teachers provide training during monthly school improvement committee meetings.	All	Pioneer math teachers	All instructional staff	Monthly	Quarterly benchmark test, classroom observations, lesson plans, progress monitoring plan, data analysis	Classroom teachers, pioneer math teachers, administration, instructional support staff

Mathematics Budget:

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Last year 36% (27) students achieved level 3 on FCAT Science. This year 40% (33) students will achieve level 3 on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 36% (27 students) scoring level 3 on FCAT Science.	2013 expected level of performance is 40% (33 students)scoring level 3 on FCAT Science.
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	Rigor - Students are not held accountable for giving critical, independent and creative responses to higher order questions.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls	Teachers, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, and School Administrators	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
	2	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these and the 5Es approach in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of	Teachers, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, and School Administrators	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

		cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.			
3		Use of Informational Text across all content to teach reading and writing skills and strategies - Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a combination of non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model and the 5Es of science instruction, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies through reading and science labs. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support in the use of the close reading model. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction/intervention is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Last year 12% (9) students achieved levels and above on FCAT Science. This year 13% (11) students will achieve levels 4 and above on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 12% (9 students) scored 4 and above on FCAT Science.	2013 expected level of performance is 13% (11 students)scoring 4 and above on FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding of strategies and activities that support students in giving higher order responses to questions. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings. During observations, administrators will note the work students are doing, determining level of Webb's DOK into which the work falls.	Teachers, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, and School Administrators	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews
2	Interactive Learning Strategies and differentiated instruction - Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.	Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be	Teachers, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, and School Administrators	Meet with grade level teams to determine effectiveness of of cooperative structures/strategies through analysis of student work samples and assessment. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; Administrators' observations; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

		accountable for implementing professional learnings. Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.			
3	Use of Informational Text across all content to teach reading and writing skills and strategies - Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Teachers will utilize a combination of non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model and the 5Es of science instruction, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies through reading and science labs. Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support in the use of the close reading model. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learnings.	Classroom teachers, administrators, and support staff	Meet with grade level teams to analyze data for common assessments, determine if instruction is working, and adjust instruction if needed. Maintain minutes of meetings to reflect discussion of teacher questioning techniques and student responses. Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers.	Common formative, summative, and embedded assessments; CTEM; lesson plans; and student interviews

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science point of contact teachers provide training on the 5E lesson model during monthly school improvement committee meetings.	All instructional staff	Science point of contact teachers	All instructional staff	Monthly	Monthly Quarterly benchmark tests, classroom observations, lesson plans, progress monitoring plan, data analysis, science notebooks	Classroom teachers, science point of contact teachers, administration, instructional support staff

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Last year 74% (64) students achieved level 3 or higher on FCATn 2.0 Writing. This year 81% (73) students will achieve level 4 or higher on FCAT 2.0 Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 current level of performance is 74% (64 students) scored level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0 Writing.	2013 expected level of performance is 81% (73 students) scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT 2.0 Writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited application of adequate word choice.	Facilitate students' application of adequate word choice through the use of write traits kits, modeled writing and academic notebooks	Classroom teachers, Administration, Writing goal group, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams.	Writing committee, grade level PLC meetings and administration to analyze ongoing progress monitoring data.	Monthly writing prompts, student writing portfolios, classroom observations
2	Limited application of the writing process.	Implement the Writer's Workshop process to include multiple peer and teacher edits with opportunities for whole group sharing of drafts. Students will conference with small and whole group after each draft. Students support and evaluate each other's prompt and text-dependent written responses based on the writing rubric. Following the evaluation, partners will discuss the evaluations and reach agreements as to how the writing could be improved/strengthened.	Classroom teachers, administration, writing committee, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams	Classroom teachers, Administration, Writing committee, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams to analyze student work samples and quarterly benchmark responses in order to guide instruction/intervention.	Student written response to text samples, monthly writing prompts, student writing portfolios, classroom observations
3	Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction.	Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all content areas. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. Reading Coach will provide inservice on short and extended responses and writing rubrics during grade-level PLCs. In all content areas, when assessing student responses, check for capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is written in complete sentences. Teachers will maintain student writing portfolios to demonstrate writing in the content. These will be available to observers upon request.	Classroom teachers, Administration, Writing goal group, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams	Classroom teachers, Administration, Writing committee, Reading Coach and grade level PLC teams to analyze student work samples and quarterly benchmark responses in order to guide instruction/intervention	Student written response to text samples, monthly writing prompts, student writing portfolios, classroom observations

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:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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
Writers' Workshop	All grade levels	Leadership team	All instructional staff	Monthly	Student portfolios, CTEM observations, lesson plans, writing across all content areas, checks for conventions in writing, students demonstrate a working knowledge of the Writers' Workshop process.	Instructional staff, administration, instructional support staff

Writing Budget:

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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:	32%(96)of white students accrued 10 or more days absent. It is expected that the number of white students accruing 10 or more days absent will reduce to 25%. 39% (69) of Hispanic students accrued 10 or more days absent. It is expected that the number of Hispanic students accruing 10 or more days absent will reduce to 30%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96% attendance rate for the 2012 school year	90% of students will accrue less than 10 or more days absent/tardy.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
25% (167) of current students accrued excessive absences of 10 or more days.	20% of students expected to accrue excessive absences of 10 or more days.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
9%(50)of students accrued 10 or more excessive tardies.	5% of students expected to accrue 10 or more excessive tardies.

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 illness.	Health lessons to provide health tips to prevent illness to students and parents.	Classroom teachers, leadership team	Leadership team and school nurse will monitor TERMS reports, parent call logs, and clinic logs for absence reasons.	TERMS and Data Warehouse attendance summary, parent/teacher communication log.
2	Limited parent awareness of the district attendance policy.	Communicate and implement the district attendance policy. Monthly meetings with the parents of students with 10 or more absences.	Classroom teachers, data entry, administration, and school attendance assistant	Teachers monitor weekly attendance and communicate to the parent the attendance concern when child has missed five days of school. Administration will send home attendance notification letter when student accumulates five absences.	TERMS and Data Warehouse attendance summary, parent/teacher communication log.

3	Limited parent awareness of the school attendance/tardy policy.	Communicate and implement the school tardies policy through the school handbook. Students to attend lunch detention once 10 tardies are accrued. Attendance rewards for students with perfect attendance.	Classroom teachers, administration	Data entry monitor weekly tardies. Administration will communicate to the students and parent when 10 tardies have accrued. Student will be assigned lunch detention by administration.	TERMS and Data Warehouse attendance summary
4					

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:	Last year 0 students were issued in-school suspension. This year 0 students will be issued in-school suspension. Last year 0 students was issued out-of-school suspension. This year 0 students will be issued out-of-school suspension.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 total number of In School Suspensions was 0	2013 expected number of in-school suspensions is 0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 total number of In School Suspensions was 0.	2013 expected number of students suspended in school is 0.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 number of Out-of-School suspensions was 0	2013 expected number of out-of-school suspensions is 0.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
2012 total number of students suspended out of school was 0	2013 expected number of students suspended out of school is 0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited parent knowledge and proficiency of rules and expectations.	Expectations reviewed, modeled, and practiced for all school settings. Student/class rewarded with Hawk tickets for exhibiting positive behavior. Targeted students trained in conflict mediation.	Classroom teachers, PBS committee, school counselor	Monitoring of minor and major infraction reports. Review of Class Hawk records.	Minor and major infractions, student pass system.
2	Consistent review and re-teach of the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) expectations in all school settings.	Facilitate weekly and monthly review of PBS expectations, rewards and data.	PBS committee, faculty, administration	PBS team, grade level teams and administration will review and analyze discipline data and areas of concern monthly and as needed.	TERMS and Student Pass

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Parent involvement will increase from 70% to 90% involvement in school activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
70% (380) of students' parents participated in one or more school activities.	90% (486) of students' parents will participate in one or more school activities.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Presentation format – parent participation is lower at formal presentations	Provide a variety of formats including informal "Coffee Hour" chats with administration and student performances during formal PTO/SAC meetings.	Classroom Teachers, SAC and PTO and Administration.	Parent surveys	Sign in sheets and survey results.
2	Parent-student activities to be engaging and meaningful to both parents and students.	Student-led conferencing yearly	Classroom teachers, leadership team.	Teacher/administration observations.	Teacher/administration observations. Parent survey results and sign in sheets.
3	Parents lack strategies to support student academic learning in the home environment.	Provide evening programs to support parents in assisting their children with school work at home to include Family Math Night, Love and Logic	Leadership team, PTO, SAC, school counselor	Parent surveys	Parent sign in and surveys.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Given instruction in science labs, students will incorporate the Vernier probes, mathematics, and writing in the creation of student selected project each quarter.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited opportunities for students to solve problems, think creatively, experiment, and work with data throughout the school year.	Teachers will teach students the scientific method. Provide opportunities for all grade levels to participate in scientific labs throughout the year using the Vernier labs. Students will engage in research projects on a given topic per grade level that will coincide with their pre-Laureate project. Students will have opportunities to collect, interpret, and graph data.	Classroom teachers, Instructional Resource Teacher, administration, instructional support staff	Science PLC to analyze quarterly benchmark data to drive continued planning and instruction.	CTEM, student work samples, quarterly benchmark tests, student project product

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)

Increase parent involvement in the school. 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. Increase parent involvement in the school. Goal Increase parent involvement in the school. Goal #1:	Last year two sessions of student-led conferencing was conducted school-wide. This year, parents will participate in one session of student-led conferences, Family Math Night, and musical performances by different grade levels throughout the year.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
Last year (2010-2011) one session of student-led conferencing was conducted school-wide. In the 2010 - 2011 school the number of volunteer hours was 7,148.	This year,(2011-2012), two sessions of student-led conferences will be conducted school wide. In the 2011 - 2012 we will increase volunteer hours 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
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						

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 Increase parent involvement in the school. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.	Comprehension Toolkit - Focus on Common Core non-fictional text strategies in grades 2-5.	Locational Budget	$3,800.00
Reading	Teachers will maintain high expectations for students' responses to higher order questions, determining in advance of the lesson the level of teacher questioning and student response that demonstrates mastery of the standard/benchmark cognitive complexity rating.	Pathways to the Common Core instructional book study.	Locational Budget	$1,221.08
				Subtotal: $5,021.08

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $5,021.08

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/21/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business

and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds are available to support classroom instruction in the areas of Math, Writing, and Science.	$1,240.16

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

Data review on performance of all standardized testing, quarterly benchmark tests, monthly MTSS data chats. Additionally, work with SAC members on understanding the school improvement plan and how it relates to classroom instruction.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Collier School District
SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	63%	60%	51%	248	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	57%	47%			104	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?	44% (NO)	58% (YES)			102	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					454	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Collier School District
SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	75%	83%	44%	279	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	61%	57%			118	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?	51% (YES)	59% (YES)			110	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					507	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested