

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: ROLLING HILLS ELEMENTARY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Lukeshia Miller

SAC Chair: Tangelia Clayton

Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/28/2012

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)
		Bachelor's			<p>2011-2012: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade D (399 points). The following student achievement results were realized: in READING, 38% of the students tested scores at level 3 or above, in MATHEMATICS, 33% of students tested scored at level 3 or above, in SCIENCE, 28% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher and in WRITING, 73% of the students tested scored 3.0 or higher. In Reading, 85% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Math, 49% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 57% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 36% of the students tested made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (472 points), 77% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 60% of the students</p>

Principal	Lukeshia J. Miller	<p>Degree in Elementary Education</p> <p>Master's Degree in Educational Leadership</p> <p>Elementary Education (1-6) Certification</p> <p>Educational Leadership Certification (all levels)</p> <p>Principal Certification (all levels)</p>	6	6	<p>tested made learning gains. In Math, 59% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 24% of the students tested scored a level 3 or higher. In Writing, 84% of the students tested achieved proficiency.</p> <p>2009-2010: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade A (538 points), 100% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 75% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 83% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 67% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 72% of the students tested made learning gains. In Writing, 76% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Science, 35% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher.</p> <p>2008-2009: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (490 points), 97% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 64% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 64% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 22% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 91% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p> <p>2007-2008: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (465 points), 72% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 65% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 63% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 65% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 30% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 67% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p>
Assis Principal	Robin L. Brown	<p>B.A.: Journalism,</p> <p>M.S.: Educational Leadership,</p> <p>Certifications: Ed. Lead. K-12 ESE: K-12 Journalism: 6-12 Social Science: 5-9</p>	1	13	<p>During the 2011-2012, Robin Brown served as Assistant Principal at Lake Weston Elementary School in Orlando, Florida. For the 2011-2012SY, Lake Weston received a school letter grade of "B" (495 points). In READING, 42% of the students tested scored a level 3 or higher, in MATHEMATICS, 52% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher, in SCIENCE, 32% of students tested scored at level 3 or higher and in WRITING, 82% of students tested scored 3 or higher.</p> <p>2010-2011: Lake Weston Elementary School - Grade A (529 points), 85% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL. In Reading: 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 75% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.</p> <p>2006-2007: Sheridan Park Elementary School/Broward County, Florida - Grade B (522 points), 97% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL. In Reading, 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.</p> <p>2005-2006: Sheridan Park Elementary School/Broward County School/Broward County, Florida - Grade A (426 points), 100% Proficiency. AYP subgroups: White, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL. In READING: 43% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 57% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.</p> <p>2004-2005: Sheridan Park Elementary School/Broward County School/Broward County, Florida - Grade A (427 points), 100% Proficiency. AYP subgroups: White, Hispanic, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL. In READING: 61% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 71% of students tested made learning gains.</p>

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)
Math/Instructional Coach	Geraldine Hall	Bachelor's of Science, Elementary Education Certification in Elementary Education, 1-6 ESOL Endorsed NBCT: EC - Gen	14	2	<p>2011-2012: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade D (399 points). The following student achievement results were realized: in READING, 38% of the students tested scores at level 3 or above, in MATHEMATICS, 33% of students tested scored at level 3 or above, in SCIENCE, 28% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher and in WRITING, 73% of the students tested scored 3.0 or higher. In Reading, 85% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Math, 49% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 57% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 36% of the students tested made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (472 points), 77% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 60% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 59% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 24% of the students tested scored a level 3 or higher. In Writing, 84% of the students tested achieved proficiency.</p> <p>2009-2010: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade A (538 points), 100% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 75% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 83% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 67% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 72% of the students tested made learning gains. In Writing, 76% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Science, 35% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher.</p> <p>2008-2009: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (490 points), 97% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 64% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 64% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 22% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 91% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p> <p>2007-2008: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (465 points), 72% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 65% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 63% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 65% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 30% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 67% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p>
					With more than 24 years of effective instructional experience in the classroom, Ms. Alston's joins RHE as the Reading & Writing Instructional Coach for the 2012-2013SY. Prior to joining the RHE staff, Ms. Alston taught at Windy Ridge K-8 School

Reading & Writing: Instructional Coach	Brenda Alston	<p>B.S.: Elementary Education M.S.: Reading Certification: Elem. Ed. 1-6, Reading K-12, ESOL Endorsement K-12</p>		<p>and Pinewood Elementary School. Her area of expertise and documented student achievement has been in the academic area of READING.</p> <p>2011-2012: Windy Ridge K-8 School - GRADE A, Reading Mastery - 78%, Math mastery - 74%, Science Mastery - 74%. AYP subgroups: Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL students. Writing Mastery - 88%.</p> <p>2010-2011: Windy Ridge K-8 School - Grade A, Reading mastery - 90%; Math mastery - 89%; Writing mastery - 90%, Science mastery - 78%, AYP-85%. Black and Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in either Reading or Math. English Language Learners did not make AYP in Reading and Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2009-2010: Windy Ridge K-8 School - Grade A, Reading mastery - 92%; Math mastery - 90%; Writing mastery - 93%; Science mastery - 81%. AYP - 87%. Black and SWDs did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2008-2009: Windy Ridge K-8 School - Grade A, Reading mastery - 93%; Math mastery - 92%; Writing mastery - 100%; Science mastery - 77%. AYP -100%. All subgroups made AYP.</p> <p>2007-2008: Windy Ridge K-8 School - Grade A, Reading mastery - 88%; Math Mastery - 90%; Writing mastery - 93%, Science mastery - 69%. AYP - 97%. Black students did not make AYP in Math.</p>
Curriculum Resource Teacher	Karrie Hosey	<p>Bachelor's in Criminology/Psychology. Master's degree in Elementary Education.</p> <p>Certification in Florida Exceptional Student Educator, Grades K-12 Florida Elementary Educator, Grades K-6 Connecticut Professional Educator, Grades K-6</p> <p>Endorsement: ESOL, Grades K-12 endorsement</p>		<p>2011-2012: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade D (399 points). The following student achievement results were realized: in READING, 38% of the students tested scores at level 3 or above, in MATHEMATICS, 33% of students tested scored at level 3 or above, in SCIENCE, 28% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher and in WRITING, 73% of the students tested scored 3.0 or higher. In Reading, 85% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Math, 49% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 57% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 36% of the students tested made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (472 points), 77% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 69% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.. In Reading, 60% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 59% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 24% of the students tested scored a level 3 or higher. In Writing, 84% of the students tested achieved proficiency.</p> <p>2009-2010: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade A (538 points), 100% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 75% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 83% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 67% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 72% of the students tested made learning gains. In Writing, 76% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Science, 35% of the students tested scored at level 3 or higher.</p> <p>2008-2009: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (490 points), 97% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 59% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 64% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 64% of the students tested made learning gains.</p>

					<p>In Science, 22% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 91% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p> <p>2007-2008: Rolling Hills Elementary School - Grade C (465 points), 72% Proficiency, AYP subgroups: Black, SWDs, Economically Disadvantaged, ELLs. In Reading: 65% of lowest 25% made learning gains. In MATH, 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains. In Reading, 63% of the students tested made learning gains. In Math, 65% of the students tested made learning gains. In Science, 30% of the students tested scored at proficiency. In Writing, 67% of the students tested scored at proficiency.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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	<p>All teachers at Rolling Hills Elementary are highly qualified and certified. Potential candidates are identified through the district's Employment Services department. Applicants are identified, screened, interviewed, and hired based via the district's ERecruit recruitment, screening, and hiring process.</p> <p>To retain highly qualified teachers, Rolling Hills Elementary is committed to providing extensive staff development opportunities, provide additional curriculum resources and materials as needed, partner novice teachers with experienced teachers, and provide a dedicated support staff to assist teachers as needed.</p>	Principal, AP, Resource/Support Personnel	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
<p>For the 2011-2012 school year, all instructional staff are teaching "in-field". However, during the 2011-2012 school year, three teachers (6%)out of 46 teachers received a less than effective rating.</p>	<p>The Instructional Coach and Teacher will meet on a weekly basis as part of the professional learning community model. The Instructional Coach and Teacher will discuss best practices and evidence-based learning strategies as part of the intense focus on student achievement for all areas of the core curriculum.</p> <p>The Instructional Coach will also be provided with opportunities to observe the Teacher's instructional techniques. The Teacher will have time to observe the Instructional Coach and other highly effective teachers throughout the grade level, with specific learning focus. Time will be provided following observations for questions, feedback, coaching and planning.</p> <p>The CRT and Math Coach, will provide model lessons using reading and math strategies.</p> <p>The Instructional Coach and Teacher will actively participate in professional</p>

development focusing on differentiated instruction in all subject areas, assessment, Response to Intervention, classroom management, and other grade level appropriate training. The Principal and Asst. Principal will conduct informal and formal observations and provide instructional feedback and monitoring. The Instructional Coach and Teacher will meet on a monthly basis with the Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT and Math Coach to discuss school-wide goals. They will also meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss student data and modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students based on data from various assessments.

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	10.9%(5)	21.7%(10)	47.8%(22)	21.7%(10)	34.8%(16)	106.5%(49)	8.7%(4)	10.9%(5)	32.6%(15)

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
Karen Redel	Courtney Guillen	Karen Redel has taught Kindergarten for more than 21 years. She is a National Board Certified Teacher and has served as the Grade Level Chairperson for the Kindergarten department	The mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis as part of the professional learning community model. The mentor and mentee will discuss best practices and evidence-based learning strategies as part of the intense focus on student achievement for all areas of the core curriculum. The mentor will also be provided with opportunities to observe the mentee's instructional techniques. The mentee will have time to observe the mentor and other highly effective teachers throughout the grade level, with specific learning focus. Time will be provided following observations for questions, feedback, coaching and planning. The Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide model lessons using reading and math strategies.

		and has a wealth of knowledge and experience in Early Childhood Education.	<p>The mentor and mentee will actively participate in professional development focusing on differentiated instruction in all subject areas, assessment, Response to Intervention, classroom management, and other grade level appropriate training.</p> <p>The mentor and mentee will meet on a monthly basis with CRT/Instructional Coach to discuss school-wide goals. They will also meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss student data and modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students based on data from various assessments.</p>
Rachael Sevlie	Christina Farris David Smith	<p>Rachael Sevlie successfully taught 4th grade for four years. She is an effective teacher with a proven track record for increasing student achievement in all subject areas, especially in the area of Writing. Currently Ms. Sevlie serves as the Curriculum Resource Teacher, Instructional Coach, and Writing Coach for Rolling Hills Elementary. She has extensive knowledge and expertise with our research based, state adopted curriculum.</p>	<p>The mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis as part of the professional learning community model. The mentor and mentee will discuss best practices and evidence-based learning strategies as part of the intense focus on student achievement for all areas of the core curriculum. The mentor will also be provided with opportunities to observe the mentee's instructional techniques. The mentee will have time to observe the mentor and other highly effective teachers throughout the grade level, with specific learning focus. Time will be provided following observations for questions, feedback, coaching and planning. The Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide model lessons using reading and math strategies.</p> <p>The mentor and mentee will actively participate in professional development focusing on differentiated instruction in all subject areas, assessment, Response to Intervention, classroom management, and other grade level appropriate training.</p> <p>The mentor and mentee will meet on a monthly basis with CRT/Instructional Coach to discuss school-wide goals. They will also meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss student data and modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students based on data from various assessments.</p>
			<p>The mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis as part of the professional learning community model. The mentor and mentee will discuss best practices and evidence-based learning strategies as part of the intense focus on student achievement for all areas of the core curriculum.</p>

Jackie McCarthy

Brittini Stephens

Ms. McCarthy has taught for more than 15 years and currently serves as the First Grade Chairperson. She has extensive knowledge using effective instructional strategies that have been proven to increase student achievement.

The mentor will also be provided with opportunities to observe the mentee's instructional techniques. The mentee will have time to observe the mentor and other highly effective teachers throughout the grade level, with specific learning focus. Time will be provided following observations for questions, feedback, coaching and planning. The Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide model lessons using reading and math strategies.

The mentor and mentee will actively participate in professional development focusing on differentiated instruction in all subject areas, assessment, Response to Intervention, classroom management, and other grade level appropriate training.

The mentor and mentee will meet on a monthly basis with CRT/Instructional Coach to discuss school-wide goals. They will also meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss student data and modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students based on data from various assessments.

Sharon McKinney

Chelsey Potter

Mrs. McKinney has over 15+ years of experience as an Elementary teacher and has taught at both primary and intermediate levels.

She is a teacher leader on campus and serves as one of the model classrooms for professional development on campus.

The mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis as part of the professional learning community model. The mentor and mentee will discuss best practices and evidence-based learning strategies as part of the intense focus on student achievement for all areas of the core curriculum. The mentor will also be provided with opportunities to observe the mentee's instructional techniques. The mentee will have time to observe the mentor and other highly effective teachers throughout the grade level, with specific learning focus. Time will be provided following observations for questions, feedback, coaching and planning. The Reading Coach and Math Coach will provide model lessons using reading and math strategies.

The mentor and mentee will actively participate in professional development focusing on differentiated instruction in all subject areas, assessment, Response to Intervention, classroom management, and other grade level appropriate training.

The mentor and mentee will meet on a monthly basis with CRT/Instructional Coach to discuss school-wide

			goals. They will also meet on a bi-weekly basis to discuss student data and modifying instruction to meet the needs of all students based on data from various assessments.

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

Rolling Hills Elementary is a Title I school. We are provided additional federal funding to assist in the instruction of high-needs students. Title I funds are used to fund a Parent Resource Teacher, Reading Support Teacher, Math & Science Support Teacher and an Intervention Resource Teacher as well as additional curriculum materials and instructional resources. All staff members and resources purchased using Title I funds are used directly for the benefit of the varying needs of our identified at-risk students. Support and instruction is provided to identified students on a daily basis. A portion of our Title I funds is allocated towards the cost of staff development and parental involvement activities.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Currently, Rolling Hills does not have any identified migrant students in our school population.

Title I, Part D

Rolling Hills does not receive Title I, Part D funding.

Title II

Title II funds will be used to provide professional development in the area of Math for the 2012-2013SY. All instructional staff will receive professional development using the ACALETICS program (this new program will supplement math instruction at grades 2-5). In addition to this program, Teachers will also receive professional development to support the useful implementation and use of the upgraded software programs: FASTT MATH & Successmaker. Teachers will also have several opportunities to disaggregate data and participate in extensive planning using the Professional Learning Communities model.

Title III

Rolling Hills does not receive Title III funding.

Title X- Homeless

Rolling Hills does not receive Title X funding.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

During the 2012-2013SY, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds will continue to be used to pay certified teachers for immediate intensive instruction outside the teacher's contracted time and outside the curriculum block schedule. Teachers work with students who are identified as below grade level, bubble students, or as a member of a subgroup in the area of reading.

These funds are also used to pay for 2 hourly tutors that will focus on pushing into the classrooms and working with level 1 and 2 students in the areas of Reading, Math, Science and Writing.

Violence Prevention Programs

Orange County Public Schools works very close with the Orange County Sheriffs Department in the MAGIC program for 5th grade students to help prevent violence and drug use. Rolling Hills Elementary has a SAFE Coordinator who works with the

assigned Resource Deputy to decrease violent behavior and the registrar to increase student attendance. Rolling Hills Elementary is a part of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Grant that provides a Clinical Case Manager and two Prevention Specialists. These individuals are instrumental in providing additional social skills support to students, teach lessons that are geared to reducing violence, and provide mental health services for targeted students. In addition, Rolling Hills Elementary has a Behavioral Specialist and a Behavior Modification Program Specialist to assist students with disabilities and a Dean of Students to assist with behavioral issues in the regular education setting. Rolling Hills Elementary is in its 7th year of implementation of the Behavior Leadership Team Academy, which is responsible for creating task forces to implement school-wide procedures to reduce behavior infractions.

Nutrition Programs

Rolling Hills Elementary offers a breakfast program and a lunch program with food choices that are in compliance with the USDA Breakfast and Lunch Programs. As part of our nutrition and health program, students are instructed in health during Physical Education classes. Rolling Hills currently provides free breakfast and lunch to all students, due to the Provision II designation, as determined by the federal government.

Housing Programs

Rolling Hills Elementary does not offer a housing program.

Head Start

Rolling Hills Elementary currently does not have a head start program, but does have one VPK unit on site.

Adult Education

Rolling Hills Elementary currently does not offer an Adult Education program.

Career and Technical Education

Rolling Hills Elementary currently does not offer Career and Technical Education courses, but exposes students to various careers during TEACH-IN and integrates careers where appropriate throughout the curriculum.

Job Training

Rolling Hills Elementary currently does not offer a job training program.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Lukeshia Miller, Principal
Robin Brown, Assistant Principal
Oscarneda Floyd, Staffing Specialist/RtI Coach
Karrie Hosey, Curriculum Resource Teacher/RtI Coach
Brenda Alston, Reading Coach
Geraldine Hall, Math/Science Coach
Fredrick Ray, Dean
Terry Bird, Behavior Specialist
Sharisse Broadbent, Social Worker
Dana Rehm, Social Worker
Candy Stephenson, School Psychologist

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?

Rolling Hills RtI team meets monthly placing a focus on core curriculum areas and tiered support that includes methods of instruction, school based-curriculum, and the classroom setting to continually increase student progress and achievement. The team focuses on disaggregation of the data, grade level instructional focus calendars, instructional pacing, differentiated instruction, and prior and current interventions. In addition to the school based RtI meetings, members of the RtI school based team meet with grade levels on a weekly basis to continually assess the progress of identified students receiving interventions. During the meeting process, student data is disaggregated recognizing trends in relationship to interventions. The team also evaluates the effectiveness of the interventions determining continual implementation or modification. The school-based leadership team members continually monitor lesson plans that were developed during grade level Professional Learning Communities and provide additional support in the classroom with identified students. The purpose of the group is to provide a delivery of service model which addresses academic and behavior concerns.

The Reading, Writing, and Math/Science coaches provide best practices in instructional strategies in order to increase student achievement. The Reading, Writing, and Math/Science coaches also assist with monitoring data specific to their curriculum focus as well as modeling effective instructional strategies and providing professional development in their content area.

The Staffing Specialist assists in gathering data and working with the exceptional education teachers in tracking exceptional education student data as well as providing strategies, resources and materials for students making minimal learning gains in the regular education setting. The Staffing Specialist also monitors the progress and implementation of interventions and strategies school-wide and provides ongoing professional development for staff members as it relates to RtI.

The Curriculum Compliance Teacher monitors the progress and implementation of interventions and strategies for identified ELL students ensuring intervention plans remain ESOL compliant.

The school psychologist provides historical data on students, assessment support when determined, assessment tools to gauge student progress as a result of interventions, intervention techniques and practices, and various intervention plans. The psychologist assists with providing ongoing professional development for all instructional staff members as it relates to the Response to Intervention process.

The Social Workers provide support (financial, medical, etc.) to identified students' families with various resources from a plethora of community agencies. The Social Workers and Dean also provide parents with essential training to decrease the areas of deficiencies regarding their current parenting skills.

The Dean and Behavioral Specialist work together to provide support to identified students exhibiting behavioral concerns. They monitor student progress, behavioral interventions, and provide teachers with strategies, resources and professional development to increase student engagement and on-task behaviors.

During the 2012-2013 SY and as an additional layer of support, the RtI process will be facilitated, guided and directed by the school Staffing Specialist (grades K-2) and the Curriculum Resource Teacher (grades 3-5).

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

The RtI leadership team meets with members of the School Advisory Council and staff members to discuss, draft, and implement the focus of the School Improvement Plan. During the meetings, the team addresses and monitors the School Improvement Plans goals and objectives being met or not being met and makes improvements or modifications needed to address student needs identified in our Response to Intervention plan. Based on discussions, instructional focus may be modified to provide opportunities for teachers to participate in professional staff development activities that will enhance instruction.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Data sources for Reading will include the following:

DIBELS

FAIR

Grade Level Standards Based Summative Assessments

EduSoft Benchmark Assessments

Imagine It Benchmark Assessments

Imagine It Weekly Lesson Assessments

Accelerated Reader

Successmaker

STAR tests

FCAT results

Intervention assessments (Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery, Elements of Reading)

Data sources for Math will include the following:

Edusoft Benchmark Assessments

Envision Assessments

FOCUS from FCAT EXPLORER

Successmaker

FASTT Math

FCAT results

Data sources for Science will include the following:

EduSoft Benchmark Assessments

Snapshots

Assessments based on OCPS Essential Labs

IMS

EDW

Benchmarks (Edusoft)

Data sources for Writing will include the following:

Write Score

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Response to Intervention was introduced at grade level meetings at the end of the 2008-2009 school year. During the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year, initial professional development was provided during the week of pre-planning. During the same year the school based leadership team was fully trained in all modules by district personnel. Also, during 2009-2010 school year the school based RtI team was fine-tuned. A status check was completed for the 2009-2010 school year and initial planning took place for the 2010-2011 school year.

During the 2010-2011 school year, RtI personnel from the North Learning Community completed formalized detailed training and answered questions for all instructional members during pre-planning. RtI resource teachers continued to participate in district trainings to remain updated on current information. The School Psychologist provided extensive training for all instructional personnel, during weekly data meetings on chutes and ladders (data collection) and progress monitoring.

For the 2011-2012 school year, the school identified our Staffing Specialist as our RtI Coach. Additional training was provided during pre-planning to all staff members and will continue throughout the school year at bi-weekly data meetings and during Professional Learning Community meetings. District RtI personnel assisted the school-based RtI team and teachers with data analysis support as well as additional resources and strategies to support current intervention model.

To further deepen the understanding and effectiveness of the RtI process during the 2012-2013SY, the Rolling Hills Elementary School Leadership team attended "Interventions Team Training" sponsored by the Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System in July 2012. The Leadership Team will facilitate a professional development training(s) during the first nine weeks of school for all instructional staff, based on the new knowledge gained from the intensive training.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Supporting the current school RtI process at Rolling Hills Elementary this school year, a designated school representative from the school leadership team will meet on a weekly basis via PLC meetings to review, discuss and plan appropriate actions based student academic and behavioral data. This process will be guided and directed by the school Staffing Specialist (grades K-2) and the Curriculum Resource Teacher (grades 3-5).

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Lukeshia Miller, Principal
Robin Brown, AP
Karrie Hosey, CRT/RtI Coach (3-5)
Brenda Alston, Reading Coach
Linda Lou Johnson, Reading Resource Teacher
Karen Redel, Teacher - Kindergarten
Oscarneda Floyd, Staffing Specialist/RtI Coach (K-2)
Carmen Adkins, Media Clerk
Geraldine Hall, Math & Science Instructional Coach

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets twice a month to discuss findings from classroom walkthroughs, assessments, computer-based reading programs (AR and Successmaker), and the school wide reading program, Imagine It! to determine actions needed for increasing the amount of time students are reading and developing comprehension skills. We also use this data to determine what professional development is needed for instructional and support staff. We work as a collaborative team and also receives input from classroom teachers and support staff members that work with students in various intervention groups.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT are: deconstruction of the NGSSS, implementation of the CCSS at grades K-2, development and implementation of a schoolwide instructional focus calendar, development and implementation of formative and summative assessments that are aligned to standards, continued implementation of the Imagine It! reading program and development and implementation of a schoolwide progress monitoring system. Other key initiatives include: continued differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of all learners - specifically the lowest 30% across all grade levels.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/28/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

The key to success is an early start in school through a developmentally appropriate Pre-Kindergarten program. A child who has attended Pre-K has already made many of the emotional adjustments required for Kindergarten, and has had the opportunity to make significant academic growth, which facilitates the transition to Kindergarten.

Children in our Pre-K class have often mastered part of the Kindergarten curriculum. At Rolling Hills Elementary the children enrolled in Pre-K learn all the basics of life in the "big" elementary school. Basics such as separating from their parents, walking in line, listening, following directions, respecting their peers and teachers, and proper etiquette in the lunch room and media center are all taught. They are given the opportunity to learn basic skills such as letter identification, letter sounds, number identification and value, and even learn beginning sight words which is all part of the first semester curriculum in Kindergarten. Thus, our Pre-K students enter Kindergarten well-prepared for success.

The students gross motor skills are developed through manipulation of small objects, cutting, and outdoor play activities such as running and climbing. The brain's neuron transmitters, which support reading and language development, grow as a result of these Pre-K activities. Children encounter similar activities in Kindergarten and are equipped to approach them with a higher level of intellectual development and self confidence. The most important preparation for school which Pre-K provides is a love of learning. Establishing this love within a child creates a positive and highly beneficial outlook on school. At Rolling Hills the children leave Pre-K excited about their future learning opportunities in Kindergarten and they are confident in their ability to succeed.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 FCAT reading point goal for student mastery is 9 points. We will increase from 38% (103 students) to 47% of students in grades 3-5 achieving proficiency in reading.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 38% (103 students) of students achieved proficiency (Level 3) on the reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 3-5, 47% (128 students) of students tested will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT reading test. This will be an increase of 9 points.

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	Continued mastery of Imagine It! Reading program with emphasis given to the alignment with NGSSS and CCSS.	Implement Imagine It! as the new core reading program. Closely monitor to ensure fidelity.	Administrators, School Leadership Team	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans	Classroom walk-through data, PLC notes, Imagine It! weekly assessments, benchmark exams
2	Implementation of new lesson plan template that will be developed in alignment with the NGSSS (2-5) and CCSS (K-2).	Teachers in grades K-5 will develop and integrate the NGSSS and CCSS into grade level lesson plans that are constructed and aligned to the appropriate standards.	Administrators, School Leadership Team	Instructional focus calendars, classroom walk-throughs, weekly lesson plan checks	FAIR, Edusoft, data matrix
3	Need for RtI Tier 3 Instruction	45 minute intervention block outside of the 90 minute reading block	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Coaches	Progress monitoring, classroom walk-throughs	FAIR, Edusoft, data matrix, FCAT, common assessments
4	Need for RtI Tier 2 instruction	Teachers will actively utilize differentiated instruction through whole group instruction and small group instruction	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Coaches	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly PLC meetings, lesson plans	FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, data matrix, common assessments
5	Lack of parental involvement	Host a monthly literacy night for parents and students. Provide incentives to increase parental involvement.	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Faculty, and Staff	Parent participation, sign-in sheets	Parent sign-in sheets
6	Access to Literature	Provide classroom teachers with a large selection of high interest literature for their classroom libraries. Ensure students have access to AR books. Maximize opportunities for independent reading outside of the classroom.	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Faculty, Media Clerk	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly PLC meetings	Accelerated Reader Reports
	Mastery and implementation of the FCAT 2.0 Test	Professional development training sessions on the use and implementation	Administrators, Reading Instructional	Instructional Lesson plans, PLC meetings and Grade level planning	Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes, Formative

7	Specifications	of the test item specifications to guide and plan instructional program provided for all instructional staff.	Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher.	meetings.	and summative benchmark assessments.
8	Mastery of CCSS/ K-2	Professional development training sessions will be provided for teachers at the K-2 level to guide implementation of the new standards.	Administrators, Reading Coach, CRT, Math Coach, Grade Level Chair (K-2).	Instructional lesson plans, PLC meetings notes and grade level meetings.	Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes, Formative and summative benchmark assessments, FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA.
9	Mastery and Development of Instructional Focus Calendar	Professional development training sessions on the implementation of the IFC to guide and plan instructional program. All instructional staff will participate.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
10	Mastery of On-going Progress monitoring with the implementation of instructional adjustments as needed.	Professional development and training sessions on Progress Monitoring initiatives that are currently in place. Emphasis will be placed on implementing adjustments as needed, based on student achievement data.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance
11	Mastery of I-Observation Teacher Evaluation system with emphasis on domains 2,3 and 4 and design questions 2,5,7 and 8.	Professional development training sessions on the implementation of instructional strategies that are reflective of domains 2-4 and design questions 2, 5, 7 and 8. All instructional staff will participate.	Administrators and Instructional Coaches.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work	Training evaluations, exit slips, informal observations, formal observations.
12	Mastery and implementation of differentiated instruction and small group instruction at all grade levels.	Professional development and training sessions on the implementation of effective differentiated instruction and small group instruction (K-5).	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
13	Mastery and implementation of Marzano's instructional strategies.	Professional development and training sessions on Marzano's instructional strategies with guided implementation at all grade levels.	Administrators and Reading Coach.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
	Effective and targeted use of technology to support reading instruction.	Professional development and training sessions on the use of IMS, E-Suite (Imagine It!), AR/STAR, SuccessMaker	Administrators, Reading Coach, Math & Science Coach, Technology Supportperson.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments,	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and

14	5.0	student work	summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance, software usage report.
----	-----	--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan and to ensure that our students receive quality instruction, the 2013 point goal for students is 9.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 18%(49) of students tested on the FCAT 2.0 READING assessment scored at levels 4, 5 or 6.	In grades 3-5, 27% (73) of students tested will score at levels 4, 5 or 6 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 READING assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mastery and implementation of the FCAT 2.0 Test Specifications	Professional development training sessions on the use and implementation of the test item specifications to guide and plan instructional program, will be provided for all instructional staff	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher.	Instructional Lesson plans, PLC meetings and Grade level planning meetings	Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes, Formative and summative benchmark assessments.
2	Mastery and Development of Instructional Focus Calendar	Professional development training sessions on the implementation of the IFC to guide and plan instructional program. All instructional staff will participate.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
3	Mastery of Progress monitoring to inform and modify instruction accordingly	Professional development and training sessions on systematic Progress Monitoring with emphasis placed on implementing instructional adjustments as needed that is based on student achievement data	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
4	Mastery and implementation of Differentiated Instruction and Small group instruction at all grade levels.	Professional development training will be provided for teachers that will guide the effective implementation of differentiated instruction and small group instruction. Specific training will address instructional delivery at the level of cognitive complexity with	Administrators, Reading Coach, Math & Science Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level Chairpersons.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.

		scaffolding, as needed to support student proficiency at grade level.			
5	Effective and targeted use of technology that will support Reading instruction.	Professional development training for the use of the following software programs: E-Suite (Imagine It!), Successmaker 5.0, IMS, AR/STAR, Science Fusion (literacy-based)	Administrators, Reading Coach, Math & Science Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level Chairpersons.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.

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:	Once students have achieved mastery on the reading FCAT, it is imperative that they continue to demonstrate growth and deepen their level of reading comprehension.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 15% (41 students) achieved above proficiency on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	In grades 3-5, 24% (65 students) of students will achieve above proficiency on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient amount of enrichment opportunities for proficient students	Teachers will accelerate students achieving above proficiency through differentiated instruction	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Coaches	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly PLC meetings	FAIR, Edusoft, data matrix, FCAT
2	Lack of extended learning opportunities for proficient students	After school clubs will offer enrichment opportunities for proficient students	Administrators, Leadership Team, Faculty	Student participation	Student attendance sheets, after school projects
3	Mastery of On-going Progress monitoring with the implementation of instructional adjustments as needed	Professional development and training sessions on Progress Monitoring initiatives that are current in place. Emphasis will be placed on implementing adjustments as needed, based on student achievement data.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
4	Mastery and implementation of differentiated instruction and small group instruction at all grade levels.	Professional development and training sessions on the implementation of effective differentiated instruction and small group instruction (K-5).	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
	Effective and targeted use of technology to	Professional development and training sessions on	Administrators, Reading Coach,	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade	Classroom walk-throughs, informal

5	support reading instruction.	the use of IMS, E-Suite (Imagine It!), AR/STAR, SuccessMaker 5.0 .	Math & Science Coach, Technology Supportperson.	level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance, software usage report.
---	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 point goal for students making learning gains on the reading portion of the FCAT is 13. We will increase from 56% (156 students) to 69% of students in grades 3-5 who make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (156 students) made learning gains at Rolling Hills on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.	69% (188) of the students at Rolling Hills will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading 2.0.

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	Need for direct, explicit instruction	Students reading below grade level will receive 45 minutes of direct reading instruction daily.	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Coaches	Classroom walk-throughs, daily fluency checks, weekly data meetings	Ongoing progress monitoring, FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, data matrix
	Differentiated instruction during the reading and intervention blocks	Classroom teachers will differentiate within the 90 minute reading block	Administrators, School Leadership Team, Coaches	Classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans, weekly data meetings	FAIR, Edusoft, FCAT, data matrix, common

2		as well as during the 45 minute intervention block to ensure students' academic needs are being met daily.			assessments
3	Need for learning opportunities beyond regular school hours.	Students reading below grade level will have the option to attend our After School Tutoring program two times per week, as well as Saturday school. These programs will address the specific needs of the students enrolled in a small group setting.	Administrators, Reading Coach	Walkthroughs, lesson plans	FAIR, Edusoft, data matrix
4	Mastery and Development of Instructional Focus Calendar	Professional development training sessions on the implementation of the IFC to guide and plan instructional program. All instructional staff will participate.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
5	Mastery of On-going Progress monitoring with the implementation of instructional adjustments as needed.	Professional development and training sessions on Progress Monitoring initiatives that are currently in place. Emphasis will be placed on implementing adjustments as needed, based on student achievement data.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
6	Mastery and implementation of Marzano's instructional strategies.	Professional development and training sessions on Marzano's instructional strategies with guided implementation at all grade levels.	Administrators and Reading Coach.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
7	Effective and targeted use of technology to support reading instruction.	Professional development and training sessions on the use of IMS, E-Suite (Imagine It!), AR/STAR, SuccessMaker 5.0.	Administrators, Reading Coach, Math & Science Coach, Technology Supportperson.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance, software usage report.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	N/A
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Reading Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 point goal for the lowest 25% of students making learning gains on the reading portion of the FCAT 2.0 is 5. We will increase from 85% (57 students) to 90% of students in the lowest 25% who make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 85% (57 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading 2.0.	In grades 3-5, 90% (60 students) of the students in the lowest 25% at Rolling Hills will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ensuring each student in the lowest 25% receives daily reading interventions	All students in the lowest 25% will receive 45 minutes of reading interventions daily, targeting their specific deficiencies.	Administrators, Reading Coach	Classroom walk-throughs, teacher feedback, weekly PLC and data meetings	Daily fluency checks for students in a decoding program, ongoing progress monitoring, FAIR, Edusoft, mini-benchmark assessments, FCAT
2	Mastery of new intervention programs	Intervention teachers will be trained in Reading Mastery, Early Interventions in Reading, and Corrective Reading	Administrators, Reading Coach	Classroom walk-throughs, coaching conversations	Fluency checks, FAIR, ongoing progress monitoring
3	Need for learning opportunities beyond regular school hours.	Students in the lowest 25% will have the option to attend our After School Tutoring program. The specific needs of these students will be met in a small group setting two days per week.	Administrators, Reading Coach	Walkthroughs, lesson plans	FAIR, Edusoft, data matrix
4	Mastery of On-going Progress monitoring with the implementation of instructional adjustments as needed.	Professional development and training sessions on Progress Monitoring initiatives that are currently in place. Emphasis will be placed	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work

		on implementing adjustments as needed, based on student achievement data.	Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher and all Grade Level chairs.		product and student demonstration performance
5	Mastery and implementation of Marzano's instructional strategies.	Professional development and training sessions on Marzano's instructional strategies with guided implementation at all grade levels.	Administrators and Reading Coach.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance.
6	Effective and targeted use of technology to support reading instruction.	Professional development and training sessions on the use of IMS, E-Suite (Imagine It!), AR/STAR, SuccessMaker 5.0 .	Administrators, Reading Coach, Math & Science Coach, Technology Supportperson.	Classroom walk-throughs, weekly grade level PLC meetings, lesson plans, formal and summative assessments, student work.	Classroom walk-throughs, informal and formal observations, Formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessments, student work product and student demonstration performance, software usage report.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # In 2010-2011, 60% of RHE students were not proficient in Reading. Our AMO goal is to reduce this percentage, utilizing the goals & action steps embedded in our Reading strategies. 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:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the goal for all subgroups on the 2013 Reading FCAT 2.0 assessment is to increase the level of performance by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In READING, the following subgroups performed as listed: BLACK: 29% (78 students out of 270), scored at level 3 or higher. HISPANIC: 8% (21 students out of 270), scored at level 3 or higher. MULTI-RACIAL: 1% (4 students out of 270), scored at level 3 or higher. WHITE: 4% (12 out of 270), scored at level 3 or higher.	In READING on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment, the expected level of performance demonstrated by each subgroup in listed below: BLACK: 34% (92 students) will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment. HISPANIC: 13% (35 students), will score at level 3 or higher of pn the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment. MULTI-RACIAL: 6% (16 students), will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment. WHITE: 9% (24 students), will score at level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Classroom and intervention teachers will need to be trained on how to analyze data and base instruction on specific skill deficits.	Intervention and classroom teachers will receive training on how to analyze data, group students, and target their specific needs through small group instruction. They will also receive progress monitoring training.	RtI Coach, Reading Coach, Administrators	Weekly data meetings, progress monitoring data, classroom walkthroughs.	Imagine It! Weekly Assessments, Benchmark Exams, FAIR, data matrix
2	Mastery and implementation of the FCAT 2.0 Test Specifications.	Professional development training sessions on the use and implementation of the test item specifications to guide and plan instructional program provided for all instructional staff.	Administrators, Reading Instructional Coach, Math & Science Instructional Coach and Curriculum Resource Teacher.	Instructional Lesson plans, PLC meetings and Grade level planning meetings. Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes, Formative and summative benchmark assessments.	Formative and summative benchmark assessments.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 FCAT reading percentage goal for the ELL subgroup is 1 point. We will increase from 97% (60 students) to 98%(61)of ELL students in grades 3-5 becoming proficient in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
97% (60 students) of the ELL subgroup were proficient on the reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 3-5, 98% (61) of students in the ELL subgroup will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Reading test. This will be an increase of 4 percent.

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	Availability of material to meet the proficiency needs of ELL students.	Teachers will utilize Imagine It! ELL resources from grade levels that meet individual proficiency needs.	CCT, Reading Coach, Administrators	Weekly data meetings, ESOL meetings, classroom walkthroughs	Data matrices, FAIR, fluency progress monitoring
2	Technology targeting ELL needs	ELL students will use "Discover English" daily, and will also have access to Starfall and Breakthrough to Literacy. ESOL classes will be suited with Listening centers and LeapFrogs.	CCT, Reading Coach, Administrators	Weekly data meetings, classroom walkthroughs	Weekly SuccessMaker reports, fluency progress monitoring

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 FCAT reading percentage goal for the Students With Disabilities subgroup is 11% percent. We will increase from 74% (23 students) to 90%(28) of SWD subgroup students in grades 3-5 becoming proficient in reading.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (23 students) of the SWD subgroup were proficient on the reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 3-5, 90% (28) of Students With Disabilities tested will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Reading test. This will be an increase of 5 percent.

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	Need for more ESE teachers to work with ESE students on specific learning goals	In addition to SLD teachers, ESE certified special areas teachers, the reading coach, and the RtI coach will service ESE students to ensure their specific learning goals are being met.	Administrators, RtI Coach, Reading Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, data meetings, IEP meetings	Progress monitoring data, benchmark exams, weekly Imagine It! assessments, data matrix

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In order to meet the Superintendent's 11 essential outcomes, the OCPS K-12 Reading Plan, and to ensure that our students receive quality reading instruction, the 2013 FCAT reading gain goal for the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is 9%. We will increase from 55% (141 students) to 57%(146) of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 becoming proficient in reading.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (141 students) of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup were proficient on the reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	In grades 3-5, 57% (146) of Economically Disadvantaged students tested will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Reading test. This will be an increase of 5 percent.

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	Mastery of new curriculum	Implement Imagine It! as the new core reading program. Closely monitor to ensure fidelity.	Reading Coach, Administrators	Weekly data meetings, classroom walkthroughs	Benchmark exams, data matrices
2	Access to literature	Provide classroom teachers with a large selection of high interest literature for their classroom libraries. Ensure students have daily access to AR books. Maximize opportunities for reading outside of the classroom (ex: morning holding area)	Reading Coach, Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Media Clerk	Classroom walkthroughs, weekly data meetings, morning holding area walkthroughs	Accelerated Reader reports

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
Data Overview: Analysis of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 and FAIR data	PreK - 5	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston	All instructional staff - school-wide.	August 6, 2012	Data review and analysis will be conducted through grade level planning meetings, PLC meetings, Professional Development trainings (entire staff)	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Formative & Summative Assessments aligned to POWER STRANDS/ BENCHMARKS	K - 5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide and PLCs.	Sept. 2012 (3rd - 5th) October 2012 (K-2)	On-going: The implementation of the revised IFC will serve as the guide and schedule that specify the dates the power standards will be taught and re-taught. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings and the PLC process.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Engaging & Challenging the High Flyer (levels 4 and beyond) w/ project-based learning, targeted questioning strategies for critical thinking across the curriculum	K - 5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide	October 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Instructing at the cognitive level of complexity - teaching core reading skills with the use of scaffolding/ differentiation (lowest 30%).	K-5	B. Alston, Reading Coach	All instructional staff - school-wide	August 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
FCIM - Florida's Continous Improvement Model: Instructional Focus Calendars	PreK - 5	Dr. Marcie Mathews, Sr. Admin./NLC	All instructional staff - school-wide	August 7, 2012	The FCIM process and IFCs will be implemented to guide/structure the instructional program at RHE for the 2012-2013 school year. The process will be implemented through the weekly PLC meeting as a means to plan and adjust instructional goals and monitor student performance.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
READING Power strands - Focusing on what matters the most!	PreK-5	B. Alston, Reading & Writing Coach	All instructional staff - school-wide.	August 7, 2012	The implementation of the revised IFC will serve as the guide and schedule that specify the dates the power standards will be taught and re-taught. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings and the PLC process.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
The Perfect Match - The Alignment of Imagine It! Stories with the READING POWER STANDARDS	K - 5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide.	August 7, 2012	The implementation of the revised IFC will serve as the guide and schedule that specify the dates the stories & power standards will be taught and re-taught. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings and the PLC process.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Deconstructing the Standards in READING	PreK - 5	B. Alston, Reading Coach	All instructional staff - school-wide	August 14, 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings and the PLC process.	B. Alston, Reading Coach
Instructional Focus Calendar	PreK - 5	B. Alston, Reading Coach	All instructional staff - school-wide	August 7, 2012	On-going: The implementation of the revised IFC will serve as the guide and schedule that specify the dates the power standards will be taught and re-taught. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade	B. Alston, Reading Coach

					level planning meetings and the PLC process.	
DATA WALL - Benchmark & FAIR results !	K-5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide.	Sept. 2012 Oct. 2012	On-going: The visual data wall will be disaggregated and adjusted immediately after the administration of the benchmark assessment to reflect the student's current level of proficiency.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Targeted Instructional strategies for ELL support	Grades 3-5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide.	October 2012 and on-going	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
ELEMENTS of Lesson Plan Presentation, Delivery and Differentiated Instructional Coaching for Teachers	K-5	B. Alston, Reading Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff - school-wide.	Aug. 13, 2012 & on-going	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey

Reading 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
Computer based program aligned with FCAT 2.0. Supplemental to the Reading Core program. Students have daily exposure to higher complexity text in Reading.	Successmaker 5	Title I	\$28,600.00
			Subtotal: \$28,600.00
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: \$28,600.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal # 1:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 10% (7 students) of identified ELL students (67 students) at RHE, demonstrated proficiency and exited the ELL program. For the 2012-2013 school year, 15% (11 students) will demonstrate proficiency on the CELLA and exit the ELL program.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 10% (7 students) of identified ELL students (67 students) at RHE, demonstrated proficiency and exited the ELL program. For the 2012-2013 school year, 15% (11 students) will demonstrate proficiency on the CELLA and exit the ELL program.

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	Teachers lack knowledge and expertise of instructional strategies to provide effective instruction for ELL students.	Implementation of professional development training with emphasis on targeted instructional strategies to support ELL students. Additional academic resources that teachers will utilize are: Starfall, Successmaker (Discover English), LEAP frogs interactive materials.	K. Hosey, CRT & Compliance Specialist Brenda Alston, Reading Coach	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	Classroom observations, grade level planning, PLC meetings, district benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments, student work samples and student performance demonstration.
2	Language barrier (student)	ESOL Paraprofessional will provide language support to students.	K. Hosey, CCT	Progress monitoring. On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations.	Classroom observations, grade level planning, PLC meetings, district benchmark assessments, formative and summative assessments, student work samples and student performance demonstration.

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

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:	23%(62) of the students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (level 3) in math in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (49) of students received a level 3 on 2012 FCAT.	23% (62) of all students Grades 3-5 will reach a level of 3 on the FCAT in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students scored below proficiency in all strands of math content knowledge.	Increase student understanding of math big ideas through use of hands on math instruction.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments	Classroom Walkthrough Data, Formative Assessments, Edusoft Mini Assessment Data, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5.
2	Students may not have concrete understanding of math concepts.	Reinforce math concepts in the classroom with use of hands on math activities to reinforce the lessons.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5.
3	Students are not showing mastery of concepts over time.	Implement Envision Topic Assessments Implement SuccessMaker Math Provide small group intervention for targeted students	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5.
4	Lack of teacher knowledge for MATH skills assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment.	All instructional staff will receive professional development training on the NGSSS Math standards, deconstruction of the MATH standards and training of the use of the POWER STRANDS for Math and use of the Item test specs developed by FLDOE.	Math Coach, Principal, Asst. Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5.
5	Mastery and implementation of the ACALETICS program that will support Math instruction.	All staff will receive professional development training on the use of the program by the Educational Developmental Associates School Support Representative.	Kim Kieffer, EDA School Support Manager G. Hall, Math Coach Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, program assessments	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5, program assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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:	16%(43) of all students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (31) of all students achieved a level 4 or 5 in math on FCAT in 2012.	16% (43) of all students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in math on FCAT in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty with algebraic thinking and problem solving.	Increased time spent teaching algebraic thinking skills. Implement SuccessMaker Math.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan monitoring, Weekly team planning, use of InstructionalFocus Calendar, mini assessments.	Classroom Walkthrough Data, Formative Assessments, Edusoft mini assessment data, Envision Topic Assessments.
2	Students need more practice with problem solving skills	Increased instruction time and center activities that model strategies and practice for problem solving skills in math.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan monitoring, Weekly team planning, use of InstructionalFocus Calendar, mini assessments.	Classroom Walkthrough Data, Formative Assessments, Edusoft mini assessment data, Envision Topic Assessments.
3	Students need more practice with Geometry and Fractions.	Increase the rigor in the presentation of Geometry and Fraction content.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan monitoring, Weekly team planning, use of InstructionalFocus Calendar, mini assessments.	Classroom Walkthrough Data, Formative Assessments, Edusoft mini assessment data, Envision Topic Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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:	60%(163) of students will make learning gains in math on the FCAT in 2013. This is a 14 point increase from last year.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

55% (150) of all students made learning gains in math on FCAT in 2012.	60% (163) of all students will make learning gains in math on FCAT in 2013.
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of enough time in the school day to reinforce and ensure concrete understanding of math concepts.	After school tutoring for those students that have scored a level 2 on FCAT.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Formative assessments, graphing of student data	Formative assessment data, student observation.

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:	N/A
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

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

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

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

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:	54%(36) of all students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in math on FCAT in 2013. This is a 5 point increase from FCAT in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(33) of the students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in math on FCAT in 2012.	54% (36) of all students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in math on FCAT in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the Lowest 25% struggle with math due to vocabulary deficiencies.	Increased instruction in math vocabulary with a focus on real world applications.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan monitoring, weekly team planning, use of word wall.	Classroom walkthrough data, student interaction with Math word wall, formative assessments, mini assessment data, Envision Topic Assessments.
2	Students need more time in a small group setting with direct instruction and a research based program.	Implement Number Worlds Math Intervention Program within the additional 90 minutes of math instruction per week.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team planning, assessments	Classroom walkthrough data, student interaction with Math word wall, formative assessments, mini assessment data, Envision Topic assessments.
3	Students struggle with retention of concepts and knowledge	Implement use of Successmaker Math for the lowest 25% in grades 3-5.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team planning, assessments	Classroom walkthrough data, student interaction with Math word wall, formative assessments, mini assessment data, Envision Topic assessments.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # In 2010-2011, 41% of RHE students in grades 3-5, were not proficient in Math. Our AMO goal is to reduce this percentage, utilizing the goals & action steps embedded in the Mathematics strategies described in the plan.					
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:	During the 2012-2013 school year, students in all subgroups will increase their level of performance by 5%, as determined by the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In Mathematics on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 assessment, the following subgroups performed as listed below: BLACK: 24% (66 students out of 271), scored at level 3 or higher. HISPANIC: 3% (8 students out of 271), scored at level 3 or higher. MULTI-RACIAL: less than 1% (1 students out of 271), scored at level 3 or higher. WHITE: 2% (5 students out of 271), scored at level 3 or higher.	In Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment, the expected level of performance demonstrated by each subgroup is listed below: BLACK: 29% (79 students) will score at level 3 or higher. HISPANIC: 13% (35 students) will score at level 3 or higher. MULTI-RACIAL: 6% (16 students) will score at level 3 or higher. WHITE: 7% (19 students) will score at level 3 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not getting enough small group instruction in math.	Implement consistent small group instruction three days per week.	Principal, AP, Math coach	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team planning meetings, mini assessments	Classroom Walkthrough Data, teacher created formative assessments, Envision Topic assessments.
2	Students need more small group direct instruction time.	Implement additional small group instruction using Number Worlds Math Intervention Program.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team planning meetings, mini assessments	Classroom Walkthrough Data, teacher created formative assessments, Envision Topic assessments.
3	Lack of knowledge of the NGSSS-Mathematics and the test specification obje	All instructional staff will receive professional development training on the NGSSS Math standards, deconstruction of the MATH standards and training of the use of the POWER STRANDS for Math and use of the Item test specs developed by FLDOE.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Instructional lesson plans, PLC meeting notes, grade level planning notes, classroom walkthroughs, formative and summative assessments.	Formative and summative assessments.
4	Mastery and implementation of the ACALETICS program that will support Math instruction.	All staff will receive professional development training on the use of the program by the Educational Developmental Associates School Support Representative.	Kim Kieffer, EDA School Support Manager G. Hall, Math Coach Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments, program assessments	SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5, program assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making	
------------------------------------------------	--

satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	3%(2) of the ELL student subgroup were not proficient in math on FCAT in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
97% (60) of all ELL students were proficient in math on FCAT in 2012.	98% (61) of all ELL students will become proficient in math on FCAT in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not getting enough small group instruction.	Increase small group instruction. Implement daily use of the Acaletics Math program.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team meetings to assess progress, mini assessments	Classroom walkthrough data, teacher created formative assessments, Acaletics Assessments
2	Students have difficulty with understanding concepts due to language barriers.	Reinforce concepts visual and pictoral representation of the problems. Use of visual learning bridge as part of the Envision math program.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, lesson plan monitoring, weekly team meeting to assess progress, mini assessments	Classroom walkthrough data, teacher created formative assessments, Envision Topic assessments.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-2012, as determined by the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, 92%(25 out of 27 students) of the Students with Disabilities subgroup were not proficient in math. On the 2012-2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, 12% (4 students) are expected to increase their level of performance by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7%(2 out of 27 students) of the Students with Disabilities were proficient in math on FCAT in 2012.	On the 2012-2013 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, 12% (4 students) are expected to increase their level of performance by 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need more hands on activities.	Teachers pull small math group and use more hands on activities. Use of the Envision part 2.	Teachers, Math Principal, Assistant Principal coach,	Progress Monitoring, students obseravtion, mini asesments	Envision Topic Assessments, Benchmark Assesments, FCAT Focus.
2	Instructional delivery needs to be simplified.	Teachers use the Envision Intervention strategies for struggling students.	Teachers, Math Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal	Progress Monitoring, students obseravtion, mini asesments	Envision Topic Assessments, Benchmark Assesments, FCAT Focus.
3	Students need to know their basic math facts.	Students use the Fastmath program. Teacher use more Math fact activities and games.	Teachers, Math Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal	Progress Monitoring, students obseravtion, mini asesments, Fasttmath data	Envision Topic Assessments, Benchmark Assesments, FCAT Focus.Math Facts assessments
	Mastery and	All staff will receive	Kim Kieffer,	Classroom Walk	SuccessMaker

4	implementation of the ACALETICS program that will support Math instruction.	professional development training on the use of the program by the Educational Developmental Associates School Support Representative.	EDA School Support Manager G. Hall, Math Coach Principal, Assistant Principal	Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assesments, program assessments.	Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5, program assessments
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	45% of the Economically Disadvantaged Students were not proficient in math on the FCAT in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (148) of all economically disadvantaged students were proficient in math on FCAT in 2012.	65% (175) of our economically disadvantaged students will become proficient in math on FCAT in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students struggle with understanding math concepts due to lack of real world application.	Students will have more connections made between the math students are learning and their every day lives.	Principal, AP, Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, conversations with students, lesson plan monitoring, assessments	Classroom Walkthrough Data, teacher created assessments, Envision Topic assessments.

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
Data Overview: Analysis of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 , Benchmark Assessments and EnVision Benchmark assessments.	PreK - 5	G. Hall. Math & Science Coach	All instructional staff.	August 6, 2012	Data review and analysis will be conducted through grade level planning meetings, PLC meetings, Professional Development trainings (entire staff)	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementing MATH DATA WALLS	K-5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	All instructional staff.	Sept. 2012	Data review and analysis will be conducted through grade level planning meetings, PLC meetings, Professional Development trainings (entire staff)	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey

Instructional Coaching & Modeling Math lessons	K - 5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	All instructional staff.	October 2012	Informal and formal observations, grade level planning, PLC meetings, Professional Development trainings (entire staff).	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Deconstructing Word Problems	K - 5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	All instructional staff.	Sept. 2012	Data review and analysis will be conducted through grade level planning meetings, PLC meetings, Professional Development trainings (entire staff)	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of Successmaker 5 - software program to support math instruction w/ on-going data analysis & additional support for students needing intervention assistance in math.	Grades 3-5	G. Hall, Science & Math Coach	Teachers - grades 3-5 , Specials Teachers, ESE Teachers	October 2012	Classroom informal and formal observations, professional development trainings, PLC meetings, program assessments, benchmark assessments.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of MATH WORD WALLS to support math vocabulary skills.	K - 5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers in grades K-5.	October 2012 and on-going	Classroom informal and formal observations, professional development trainings, PLC meetings, program assessments, benchmark assessments	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of ACALECTICS (supplemental math program)	K - 5	Kim Kieffer, ACALECTICS/EDA, Inc., School Support G. Hall, Science & Math Coach	All instructional staff,	October 2012 and on-going	Classroom informal and formal observations, professional development trainings, PLC meetings, program assessments	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of FASTT MATH Next Generation - software program to support math instruction w/on-going data analysis.	Grades 3-5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers - grades 3-5 , Specials Teachers, ESE Teachers	October 2012 and on-going	Classroom informal and formal observations, professional development trainings, PLC meetings, program assessments, benchmark assessments.	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of Professional Development with emphasis on the following skill areas: FRACTIONS, GEOMETRY AND PROBLEM-SOLVING USING NUMBER SENSE.	Grades 3-5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers - grades 3-5 , Specials Teachers, ESE Teachers	October 2012 and on-going	Classroom informal and formal observations, professional development trainings, PLC meetings, program assessments, benchmark assessments	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental materials to provide hands on math experiences for students K-5.	AIMS Solve It!	Title I	\$134.70
Subtotal:			\$134.70

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Interactive computer based program used daily by students K-5 to practice and enhance mastery of fundamental math skills.	FASTT Math Next Generation	Supplemental Academic Instruction (176)	\$3,200.00
			Subtotal: \$3,200.00
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
Supplemental instructional intervention materials for grades 3-5. Ongoing feedback provided for teachers which will be used to drive instruction. Professional Development is included.	Acaletics	General - Instructional Materials	\$27,500.00
			Subtotal: \$27,500.00
			Grand Total: \$30,834.70

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:	28%(25) of students will achieve proficiency in science in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 23%(21) of students achieved a Level 3 on FCAT Science.	The expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is for 28% (25) of students to achieve a Level 3 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	Students scored below proficiency in all four strands of science content knowledge.	Increase student understanding of Big Ideas in science by focusing instruction on deeper understanding through the use of inquiry based activities. Work with teachers to increase understanding of Science Big Ideas and how to supplement instruction using Science Fusion.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math/Science Coach, Science Lab teacher	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring lesson plans and weekly team planning meeting notes, monitoring student grades on science assessments, and student notebook entries.	Classroom Walk Through data, FCAT science, teacher created summative assessments, Science Fusion Assessments
	Students may not be familiar with the format	Utilize test preparation materials in all grade	Principal, Assistant	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring	Classroom Walk Through data,

2	of the test since 5th grade is the first year they are exposed to it.	levels to familiarize students with the format of the test as well as offer hints and tips for choosing the best answer on a multiple choice assessment.	Principal, CRT, Math/Science Coach, Science Lab Teacher	lesson plans and weekly team planning meeting notes, monitoring student grades on science assessments, and use of Instructional Focus Calendar	FCAT science, and teacher created summative assessments.
3	Students traditionally show very little growth on the Edusoft benchmark assessment throughout a given school year.	Utilize scores to form small groups that need assistance with particular benchmarks.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math/Science Coach, Science Lab Teacher	Monitoring Edusoft benchmark scores, monitoring lesson plans for small groups, and use of Instructional Focus Calendar.	Edusoft data.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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:	8%(7) of students will score above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012, 2% (2) students scored a level 4 or 5 in Science.	The expected level of performance in 2012-2013 is for 8% (7) of students to score above 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 scored below proficiency in scientific thinking benchmarks.	Increase time spent teaching scientific processes to increase student understanding of scientific thinking benchmarks. Work with teachers to increase the use of higher level thinking questions during science	Principal, Assistant Principal, Math/Science Coach, Science Lab Teacher	Classroom Walk Throughs, monitoring lesson plans and weekly team planning meeting notes, monitoring student grades on science assessments, and the use of Instructional Focus Calendar.	Classroom Walk Through data, FCAT science data, teacher created summative assessments and science fair rubric.

		instruction. Participate in a school and county wide science fair.			
2	Students have little practice making connections across strands of science content.	Increase time demonstrating and explaining to teachers and students the connections between pieces of science content.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Math/Science Coach, Science Lab Teacher	PLC meetings with teachers to discuss strategies used in each classroom, Classroom Walk Throughs, student notebook entries linked to connecting content, and use of Instructional Focus Calendar.	Classroom Walk Through data, FCAT science scores, teacher created summative and formative assessments, and OCPS Essential Lab rubric for notebook assessment (grades 2-5).
3	Lack of opportunity to enrich science understanding and explore student science questions.	After school science enrichment clubs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Lab Teacher	Monitoring of content covered in groups, use of Instructional Focus Calendar, and student notebook entries.	OCPS Essential Lab rubric for notebook assessment.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Professional development with						

emphasis on the implementation of "HANDS ON" Lab experiments in the classroom.	Fifth	G.Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers: Grades 3-5	October 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of EDA's Science QUICK Picks: program will support math instruction and NGSSS,	Grades 3-5	G.Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers: Grades 3-5	October 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored student performance assesements, via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of Science Vocabulary Notebook	Grades 3-5	G.Hall, Math & Science Coach	Teachers: Grades 3-5	Sept. 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored student performance assesements, via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey

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
Science based videos and lessons	Brainpop and BrainpopJr.		\$1,300.00
Interactive white boards will be used to enhance lessons taught in Science, Reading, Writing, and Math. Teachers will incorporate technology with hands on activities.	Smartboards	Title I	\$39,536.00
			Subtotal: \$40,836.00
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
Supplemental instructional intervention materials for 5th grade. Ongoing feedback provided for teachers which will be used to drive instruction. Professional Development is included.	Acaletics - Science Quik Piks	Instructional Materials (115)	\$1,644.50
			Subtotal: \$1,644.50
			Grand Total: \$42,480.50

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas

in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The expected level of performance for all students taking the 2013 FCAT Florida Writes assessment will increase by 5%. By June 2013, 78% (61 students) students taking the FCAT 2.0 Writing test at Rolling Hills Elementary will score a level 4.0 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The total percent proficient in 2011-2012 is 73% (57 students) scoring a 3.0 or higher on the Florida Writes.	By June 2013, 78% (61 students) students taking the FCAT 2.0 Writing test at Rolling Hills Elementary will score a level 4.0 or above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Amount of scheduled instructional time is limited to approximately 50 minutes each day.	Using the Professional Learning Communities, teachers will share and devise strategies to transition quickly to writing subject area and all subject areas to use time effectively.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	Grade level based FCAT like prompts given bi-weekly to focus on student gains.	FCAT scoring rubric.
2	Disconnected, school-wide approach to writing.	This year, we continue our writing task force, composed of 1 member from every grade level. The team looked at our Core writing program, Being a Writer and determined the pacing and supplemental materials necessary to teach writing effectively. Each team created an Instructional Focus Calendar to guide their grade level's writing instruction.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Grade Level Chairpersons	Classroom Walkthroughs, with the focus of determining whether effective writing strategies are being implemented	CWT
3	Lack of Writing data to guide instructional practice	Purchased Write Score, a prompt scoring test that measures the 6 traits of writing and provides targeted feedback for teachers	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Grade level teachers	Comparing students progression over the school year, we should see an increase in scoring with the targeted writing feedback	Teacher Feedback, Write Score prompts and CWT
4	Lack of teachers sharing great writing instructional practices	We implemented Professional Learning Communities that share what worked and didn't work in regards to instruction	Principal, Assistant Principal and Writing Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, with the focus of determining whether effective writing strategies are being implemented	CWT and conversations during PLCs
5	Lack of parental knowledge of FCAT writing expectations	We are planning to incorporate an FCAT writing expectations training at our Reading and Writing night in the Fall	CRT	Parental Feedback	Conversations with parents
6	Lack of resources for instructional practices	We are sending teachers to writing trainings and forming writing PLCs to keep teachers informed of writing instruction.	CRT	Classroom Walkthroughs, with the focus of determining whether effective writing strategies are being implemented	CWT and conversations during PLCs
	Mastery of the " Write from the Beginning and Beyond" program	Professional development training will be provided for	Administrators, Reading & Writing Instructional	Guided practice and training for Teachers, informal observation,	Graded student prompts, student writing

7	teachers at grades K-5, using the schoolwide program. Guided coaching will also be provided for teachers, by the Reading & Writing Instructional Coach.	Coach, CRT.	student writing prompts, PLC and grade level planning.	performance demonstration, Schoolwide writing assessments.
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				

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
FCAT 2.0 Writing requirements for 2012-2013.	Grades 3-5	Brenda Alston, Reading & Writing Coach	Teachers in grades 3-5, with targeted training for grade 4.	October 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work and classroom observations	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey
Implementation of Write from the Beginning and Beyond program	Grades 2-5	Brenda Alston, Reading & Writing Coach	Teachers in grades 2-5, with targeted training for grade 4.	October 2012	On-going. This effort will be monitored via program assessments, monthly writing prompts, weekly grade level planning meetings, the PLC process, student work samples and classroom observations	L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, G. Hall, C. Hosey

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
Provide 3rd and 4th grade teachers with data to drive instruction in Writing.	Write Score, a writing sample scoring test that measures the 6 traits of writing and gives focused feedback.	Title I	\$2,424.27
			Subtotal: \$2,424.27
			Grand Total: \$2,424.27

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		In order to receive quality instruction and achieve academically, students must attend school daily. Attendance statistics are directly correlated to student achievement data.			
Attendance Goal #1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
During the 2011-2012 school year, the average daily attendance rate was 95% (568).		The expected daily attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school year will rise to 98% (586), a 3% increase.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
In the 2011-2012 school year the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) was 29% (171).		The expected number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) for the 2012-2013 school year is 26% (155), a 3% decrease.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
In the 2011-2012 school year, the number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more) was 26% (157).		The expected number of students with excessive tardies (10 or more) for the 2012-2013 school year is 23% (138), a 3% decrease.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of motivation to get to school/class on time and to be at school daily	Provide students with an reward for perfect attendance. Students will be recognized at quarterly awards' ceremonies.	School Clerk; Registrar; School Administration	Review of student daily attendance	Attendance rate statistics

2	Basic needs override the importance of school	Schedule ACST and ETI meetings every two weeks	School Clerk; Registrar; School Administration	Review of student daily attendance	Attendance rate statistics; Review of students with excessive tardies and absences
3	Family issues override the urgency to attend school and arrive on time.	Outreach to parents of students with excessive absences and tardies with phone calls and home visits.	Social worker; Registrar; School Administration	Review of student daily attendance	Attendance rate statistics;

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
N/A						

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:

A student's presence at school is essential to receiving a

1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	high quality education. Academic achievement is obtained when student behavior is appropriate. Once the student is removed from the learning environment (i.e OSS and ISS) their education becomes counterproductive. Our goal is to decrease the amount of Out-of School suspensions by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The total number of In-School suspensions for the 2011-2012 year was 27.	The expected number of In-School suspensions for the 2012-2013 is 25, a decrease of 5%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The total number of students suspended in school was 26.	The expected number of students suspended in school to 24, a decrease of 5%.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The total number of Out-of School Suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year was 169.	The expected number of Out-of School Suspensions for the 2012-2013 is 160, a decrease of 5%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The total number of students suspended out of school was 102.	The expected number of students suspended out of school to 95, a decrease of 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack problem solving abilities	Provide Social Skills training in a small group setting for students who have a history of repeated offenses.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist Dean	Review of Suspension rates; Number of Referrals; Teacher Feedback	Referral data; Suspension rates
2	Lack of strategies to build classroom community	Teachers incorporate class meetings a minimum of two days a week	Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Staffing Specialist	Review of Suspension rates; Number of Referrals; Teacher Feedback	Referral data; Suspension rates
3	Building strong relationships with parents, students, teachers and administrators	Teachers will call parents at least one time per quarter to inform the parent of positive academic or behavioral accomplishments; Administrators will call parents to report positive efforts Dean will check on repeat offenders to address any concerns.	Principal and Assistant Principal, Dean	Positive phone call log; Teacher Feedback Student Contact log	Referral data; Suspension rates
4	Unable to contact parents	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Dean along with the teacher will make home visits.	Principal and Assistant Principal, Dean	Contact Log; Review of Suspension rates; Number of referrals	Referral data; Suspension rates
5	Inconsistent strategies for dealing with inappropriate behaviors	School wide discipline plan, consistent grade level plans and classroom plans as needed. Professional	Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Behavior, Specialist Staffing Specialist	Grade Level PLC's; Teacher Feedback; and behavior data	Referral data; Suspension rates

		Development - classroom management and data collection			
6	Student lack of knowledge of school rules and procedures	School-wide procedure videos, posters and Review of Code of Conduct completed quarterly	Principal, Assistant Principal, Dean, Behavior Specialist Staffing Specialist	Review of Suspension rates; Number of Referrals; Teacher Feedback	Referral data; Suspension rates
7	Consistent implementation of Tier 1, 2, and 3 Behavioral Interventions	Provide assistance to teachers in implementing Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions	Principal, Assistant Principal, Staffing Specialist, CRT, Math Coach, Reading Coach, Behavioral Specialist, ESE teachers Dean	Behavioral Intervention Team PLC's, Teacher Feedback, Behavior Data	Referral data; Suspension rates
8	Daily communication with parents	Student planners	Principal and Assistant Principal Dean	Teacher Feedback; Parent Feedback	Referral data; Suspension rates

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
N/A						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Parent participation in school activities contribute to students achievement in school. Our goal is to increase parental involvement at PTO, SAC and PLC meetings. In 2012-2013, our expected level of parental involvement will demonstrate an increase from 2% (10 parents) to 3% (18 parents) attending the PTO, SAC, and PLC meetings on a monthly basis.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In 2011-2012, parental involvement at PTO, SAC, and PLC meetings remained consistent as evidenced by a review of sign in sheets. On average, 2% (10) parents attended.	In 2012-2013, our expected level of parental involvement will demonstrate an increase from 2% (10 parents) to 3% (18 parents) attending the PTO, SAC, and PLC meetings on a monthly basis.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parent's work schedule conflicts with class times.	Provide parenting classes.	Administration and Instructional Support	Attendance	Sign in Sheets
2	Lack of interest and motivation.	Continue to solicit parents and volunteers from the community to help beautify the school campus.	Administration, Instructional Support and Teachers	Comparison to previous years	Sign in Sheets and Community Volunteer's survey
3	Parent's literacy level Language barrier	Increase parent/teacher communication through the use of Student Agendas for all students in grade PK-5.	Administration, Instructional Support and Teachers	Random Planner Checks	Planners
4	Parent's work schedule Communication	Continue Meet your teacher, Open House, and Report Card Conferences	Administration, Instructional Support and Teachers	Comparison to previous years	Sign in sheets
5	Parent's lack of time and interest	Organize Family Literacy Night where students and parents create reading and writing materials to use at home.	Administration, Instructional Support and Literacy Team Teachers	Attendance	Sign in Sheets
6	Communication	Provide a Math and Science Night in conjunction with the Orlando Science Center	Family Involvement Committee	Attendance	Sign in Sheets
7	Parent's lack of interest, motivation and time. Parent's literacy level Language barriers	Provide an FCAT Writing Night with help of the 4th grade teacher	Administration and Family Night Coordinator	Attendance	Sign in Sheets
8	Parent's lack of time and motivation	Provide four Accelerated Reader (AR) nights where students can check out books, teachers will read to students and provide activities.	CRT Teachers Administration	Attendance	Sign in Sheets
9	Parent feeling disconnected to school. Cultural differences.	Continue inviting parents to monthly Student of the Month ceremonies. Provide two family night	Music teacher Classroom teachers	Attendance	Sign in Sheets

		events. Winter Concert Multicultural Night			
--	--	--------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

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
N/A						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM					
STEM Goal #1:		To increase student participation in STEM lessons and 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	Teachers need more exposure to STEM methods and instruction.	Monthly PLC STEM activity PD	Science Coach	Teacher Formative Assessment. Mini Assessments. Student experiments.	Science and Math FCAT FOCUS. Use of Science Fusion Assessments
2	Students need more exposure to STEM activities and content.	Level 4 and 5 students will attend STEM Academy after school, twice per week.	Science Coach	Evaluate student's activities and presentations.	Group project assessments.

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
STEM strategies that are aligned to grade level expectations/standards	3rd through 5th	Science Coach	3rd -5th grade teachers	10/11/12 - 6/7/13	PLC's. Coaching Cycle/Monitoring. Walkthroughs	Principal, Assistant Principal, Science Coach

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
Targeted students will receive enrichment support for Science and Math two days a week after school.	STEM Academy	Supplemental Academic Instruction (176)	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
			Grand Total: \$1,500.00

Additional Goal(s)

1. Rolling Hills will implement the AVID (Achievement Via Individual Determination) program/philosophy to support academic rigor and promote college readiness. 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. 1. Rolling Hills will implement the AVID (Achievement Via Individual Determination) program/philosophy to support academic rigor and promote college readiness. Goal	Rolling Hills Elementary will embed AVID program and philosophy into curricular subject areas to promote academic rigor and college readiness.
1. Rolling Hills will implement the AVID (Achievement Via Individual Determination) program/philosophy to support academic rigor and promote college readiness. Goal # 1:	
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
1. By June 2012, 33% (3) teachers were introduced to the AVID program, received training and implemented AVID strategies in the classroom setting.	By June 2013, all 4th and 5th grade teachers (8) will be trained in the AVID program and implementation in all 4th and 5th grade classes will begin and monitoring of implementation will continue.

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	Not all teachers have been trained in the AVID program.	The teachers that have been trained are sharing WICQOR strategies with their grade level teachers during PLCs.	CRT (AVID Coach), Principal, Asst. Principal	Informal observations, instructional lesson plans, PLC meetings notes, grade level planning minutes, training evaluation results, student performance data.	Formative and summative benchmark assessments, FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA and student work product.
2	Mastery and implementation of CCSS/ K-2. This goal and barrier is also addressed in the READING section of the 2012-2013 SIP.	Professional development training sessions will be provided for teachers at the K-2 level to guide implementation of the new standards.	Administrators, Reading Coach, CRT, Math Coach, Grade Level Chair (K-2).	Instructional lesson plans, PLC meetings notes and grade level meetings. Classroom walk-throughs, PLC notes.	Formative and summative benchmark assessments, FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA.
3	Lack of teacher knowledge for MATH skills assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment. THIS BARRIER & GOAL WAS ALSO ADDRESSED IN THE MATH SECTION OF THE SIP.	All instructional staff will receive professional development training on the NGSSS Math standards, deconstruction of the MATH standards and training of the use of the POWER STRANDS for Math and use of the Item test specs developed by FLDOE.	Math Coach, Principal, Asst. Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs, Monitoring Lesson Plans, weekly team planning, use of instructional focus calendar, mini assessments	CCSS assessments, ACALETICS Program assessments, mini assessments, SuccessMaker Math, FASTT Math Data Grades 3-5.
	Increase the number of students participating in the RHE Art Club.	The ART Teacher will recruit students that have an interest in being a member of the	Principal, Asst. Principal, Reading Coach, Math Coach	Monitoring of Art Club curriculum (aligned with district curriculum) and informal observations	Student work product, Teacher made assessments

4		RHE Art Club. The ART Teacher will introduce targeted Reading and Math skills that align with the art projects that students will produce.			
5	Continued guided implementation of the Rti process at all grade levels to promote effective implementation . This goal was addressed in the Reading section of the SIP.	Instructional Support Teachers have been assigned to grades K-2 and 3-5, to provide specific Rti attention and guidance for teachers and identified students.	Staffing Specialist (K-2), CRT (3-5), Reading Coach, Principal, Asst. Principal	Monitoring of weekly Rti meetings, grade level rti representation, student performance data	Rti graphing, Rti action plans that address student deficits, formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessment results, progress monitoring data
6	Lack of vertical alignment and instructional planning between Kindergarten and PreK Teachers.	Implement scheduled planning sessions to include PreK and Kindergarten Instructional staff. Lesson focus and planning will target the CCSS taught at the Kindergarten and First grade levels.	Reading Coach, CRT, Principal, Assistant Principal	Instructional plans, IFCS, planning session notes.	Formative and summative benchmark assessments, FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA, student work product.
7	Lack of identification of severely struggling students via the Rti process during the first month of school (Sept.2012).	Implement screening initiatives and assessments during the second week of school to identify student areas of skill weakness in reading and math. Plan and implement and course of action to provide additional instruction for the identified student.	Staffing Specialist (K-2), School Psychologist, CRT (3-5), Reading Coach, Principal, Asst. Principal	Monitoring of weekly Rti meetings, grade level rti representation, student performance data	Rti graphing, Rti action plans that address student deficits, formative and summative assessments, benchmark assessment results, progress monitoring data, adjust student instructional plan as necessary and based on acquired data.

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
Introduction to district wide AVID program.	Grades 3-5	G. Hall, Math & Science Coach K. Hosey, CRT	All instructional staff.	October 2012	Classroom observation, weekly grade level planning,	G. Hall, L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, K. Hosey
Mastery and implementation of CCSS/ K-2.	Grades K & 1	B. Alson, Reading Coach	Teachers/Kindergarten and First grade.	October 2012	Classroom observation, weekly grade level planning.	G. Hall, L. Miller, R. Brown, B. Alston, K. Hosey

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
Organization is a key principal of the AVID program. Organizational materials were purchased for all 3rd-5th grade students.	Binders, pencils, dividers, supply pouches.	Title I	\$371.30
			Subtotal: \$371.30
			Grand Total: \$371.30

End of 1. Rolling Hills will implement the AVID (Achievement Via Individual Determination) program/philosophy to support academic rigor and promote college readiness. Goal(s)

2. The percent of VPK students who will enter Elementary School READY based on FLKRS Data will score 70% or higher.

THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of 2. The percent of VPK students who will enter Elementary School READY based on FLKRS Data will score 70% or higher. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal(s)

3. Students who read on grade level by age 9, will increase at K-2, as determined by the FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP.

Goal:

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
See Reading section of the SIP.	K-2	Principal, Reading Coach	All K-2 Instructional staff	Bi-weekly during data meetings	Continuous monitoring through data meetings and PLC meetings.	Principal, School Leadership

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 3. Students who read on grade level by age 9, will increase at K-2, as determined by the FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP.

Goal(s)

4. Students who become fluent in Math Operations (K-3) will increase. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE MATHEMATICS SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal:

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Deconstruction of NGSSS Math standards	Grades K-5	G. Hall, Math Coach	All instructional staff	Trainings will occur on a monthly basis.	Monitored through weekly lesson planning checks and plc planning.	Principal, Asst. Principal and CRT

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

End of 4. Students who become fluent in Math Operations (K-3) will increase.
THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE MATHEMATICS SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal(s)

5. RHE will maintain a high Fine Arts enrollment percentage.
STUDENT PARTICIPATION WILL CONTINUE AT 100%, AS ALL STUDENTS ARE ENROLLED
IN ART.

Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of 5. RHE will maintain a high Fine Arts enrollment percentage.
STUDENT PARTICIPATION WILL CONTINUE AT 100%, AS ALL STUDENTS ARE ENROLLED IN ART.
Goal(s)

6. Rolling Hills Elementary School will decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education.

THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of 6. Rolling Hills Elementary School will decrease disproportionate classification in Special Education. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE READING SECTION OF THE SIP. Goal(s)

7. To decrease the percent of students that are retained for the 2012-2013 school year from 5% (30 students in 2011-2012) to 2% (10 students in 2012-2013) across all grade levels. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE SUSPENSION SECTION OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. Goal:

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Budget:

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

End of 7. To decrease the percent of students that are retained for the 2012-2013 school year from 5% (30 students in 2011-2012) to 2% (10 students in 2012-2013) across all grade levels. THIS GOAL IS ADDRESSED IN THE SUSPENSION SECTION OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Supplemental materials to provide hands on math experiences for students K-5.	AIMS Solve It!	Title I	\$134.70
				Subtotal: \$134.70
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Computer based program aligned with FCAT 2.0. Supplemental to the Reading Core program. Students have daily exposure to higher complexity text in Reading.	Successmaker 5	Title I	\$28,600.00
Mathematics	Interactive computer based program used daily by students K-5 to practice and enhance mastery of fundamental math skills.	FASTT Math Next Generation	Supplemental Academic Instruction (176)	\$3,200.00
Science	Science based videos and lessons	Brainpop and BrainpopJr.		\$1,300.00
Science	Interactive white boards will be used to enhance lessons taught in Science, Reading, Writing, and Math. Teachers will incorporate technology with hands on activities.	Smartboards	Title I	\$39,536.00
				Subtotal: \$72,636.00
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
Mathematics	Supplemental instructional intervention materials for grades 3-5. Ongoing feedback provided for teachers which will be used to drive instruction. Professional Development is included.	Acaletics	General - Instructional Materials	\$27,500.00
Science	Supplemental instructional intervention materials for 5th grade. Ongoing feedback provided for teachers which will be used to drive instruction. Professional Development is included.	Acaletics - Science Quik Piks	Instructional Materials (115)	\$1,644.50
Writing	Provide 3rd and 4th grade teachers with data to drive instruction in Writing.	Write Score, a writing sample scoring test that measures the 6 traits of writing and gives focused	Title I	\$2,424.27

		feedback.		
STEM	Targeted students will receive enrichment support for Science and Math two days a week after school.	STEM Academy	Supplemental Academic Instruction (176)	\$1,500.00
1. Rolling Hills will implement the AVID (Achievement Via Individual Determination) program/philosophy to support academic rigor and promote college readiness.	Organization is a key principal of the AVID program. Organizational materials were purchased for all 3rd-5th grade students.	Binders, pencils, dividers, supply pouches.	Title I	\$371.30
				Subtotal: \$33,440.07
				Grand Total: \$106,210.77

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 8/30/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
-Leveled books - Media Nights -Campus Beautification -	\$2,728.00

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

For the 2012-2013 school year the School Advisory Council will be responsible for the following activities:

- Reviewing, revising, and updating the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan.
- Assisting with Curriculum Nights (Reading, Math, Writing, Science) and Fine Arts Nights
- Assisting with increasing parent involvement (volunteering, Adult Education classes - basic computer skills and learning the English language)
- Campus Beautification
- Increasing Literacy on campus by having Media Nights once a month (Families reading together)
- Increasing partnerships with local businesses and community leaders

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Orange School District ROLLING HILLS ELEMENTARY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	59%	84%	24%	227	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	60%	59%			119	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	69% (YES)			126	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					472	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Orange School District ROLLING HILLS ELEMENTARY 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	62%	76%	35%	241	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	67%	72%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	75% (YES)	83% (YES)			158	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					538	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested