

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CRANBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Linda McCloud

SAC Chair: Tammy Murphy

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/10/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Linda A. Daniels	BA- Elementary Education, Florida A & M University; Master of Science-Educational Leadership, Nova University; Principal Certification-State of Florida	10	13	Principal of Cranberry in 2011-12 Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 69%, Math mastery: 67%, Science Mastery: 69%. Writing Mastery: 90%. Learning Gains-Reading: 60% Math: 58% Lowest 25%: R-52% M-41%
Assis Principal	John Carey	BS Education University of Connecticut MS Education Leadership Nova University Principal Certificate State of Florida	7	10	Assistant Principal of Cranberry in 2011-12 Grade: A, Reading Mastery: Writing Mastery: 90%. 69%, Math mastery: 67%, Science Mastery: 69%. Writing Mastery: 90%. Learning Gains - Reading: 60% Math: 58% AMO-Math: 80% Reading: 79% Lowest 25%: R-52% M-41%

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.

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)
No data submitted				

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	1. Regular meetings with new teachers 2. Meet with teacher 30, 60 and 90 days after hire date	Principal	On-going End of School year	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
57	5.3%(3)	8.8%(5)	78.9%(45)	7.0%(4)	87.7%(50)	0.0%(0)	7.0%(4)	17.5%(10)	66.7%(38)

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
			-Meet and Greet-before school opens to help set

<p>Tami Taylor Karen Cramer Linda Vodopija</p>	<p>Dawn Szay Benly Sabino Beth McCurdy</p>	<p>New Teacher New Teacher New Teacher</p>	<p>up rooms -Classroom Management Tips Book Study -Analyze PRIDE Rubrics -Help with creating lesson plans -Discuss Focus Calendar -Developing the IPDP</p>
--	--	--	--

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Title I is a federally funded program designed to address the academic needs of low performing students through additional academic support (tutoring , pull-out etc.), parent trainings staff development. Title I schools have a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Our goal is to assist students in meeting the state's high standards, particularly in the areas of reading, writing, science and mathematics. The district coordinates with Title II in ensuring professional development needs are provided to teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The district supports a Migrant Identifier/Recruiter who provides referral services and support to migrant students and their families. The ID&R person coordinates with the Title I and other programs to ensure student and family needs are met.

Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to provide students in alternative schools with services needed to make a successful transition from at-risk programs to further their schooling or employment opportunities.

Title II

Title II funds are used for teacher and principal quality training. Professional development activities are provided to improve the knowledge of teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, as appropriate. Instruction is provided to teach children with different learning styles and/or children with disabilities and special learning needs. Professional development activities are provided to improve behavior in the classroom. Training is provided to make all teachers highly qualified.

Title III

Supplemental services and materials are provided to schools to improve the academic achievement and language acquisition of immigrant and English Language Learner students throughout the district.

Title X- Homeless

Homeless education case managers provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program provides on-going outreach, training and tutoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers, support reading teachers at schools and offer credit retrieval and dropout prevention programs for high school students.

Violence Prevention Programs

The district provides violence and drug prevention programs that incorporate bullying prevention, suicide prevention, internet safety and personal safety. Both intentional and unintentional injury prevention programs are provided.

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Perkins funding is used to provide additional resources and professional development to CTE teachers in applicable schools.

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Tami Taylor, Reading Resource Teacher
Jennifer Deans, ESE Liaison
Scott Singleton, Guidance Counselor
Rafaela Galan-Aguirre, ESOL Liaison
Anthony Davis, School Psychologist
Patty Adams, Social Worker
Linda Vodopija, Speech Therapist

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

The team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: The team will review summative and formative data to identify school, grade and individual student academic needs. Based on the data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed. Student progress will be monitored and individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

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 school-based RTI Leadership Team will employ continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the grade level teams, the SAC and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional need. The team will meet with teacher during a SWST meeting and discuss ways to support students with behavioral and academic needs.

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.

The school uses a variety of reports produced by the district Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, mathematics, science and writing is utilized. Further, the school will participate in the FAIR Reading assessment and utilize the district Math assessment and Science assessments and review data from SuccessMaker (ILS) to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

RTI training was held as follows:

The teachers will be trained during faculty meeting on three PS/RTI Modules. There will be on-going trainings with teachers and SWST team members to on current trends and innovative stratgies to help students be successful in the classroom. The SWST team met with district leaders, over the summer, to learn about a variety of instructional strategies to help teacher with interventions to be used with Tier 1, 2 and 3 students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Inform staff of updates as it pertains to MTSS. Participate in MSST meeting and keep parents aware of the MSST process throughout the school year. During weekly PLCs discuss the imprtance of MSST and encourage teachers to share interventions and stratgies during these meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Tami Taylor, Reading Resource
Johnna Poitras, K
Kristie Landers, 1st
Linda Young, 2nd
Elaine Schweitzer, 3rd
Karen Grannell, 4th
Gayle Neher, 5th

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

The Curriculum Committee looks works with school staff to provide oppourtunies for professional development. They meet once a month to look at math and reading srtategies along with other best practices. This committee also looks at ways to use Title I funding.

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

The Curriculum Committee will increase communication between grade level teams; share materials and resources for book studies and workshop; develop a handbook of interventions; make school-wide trainings available to staff.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
---	--

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

Level 3 - 29%(102) Level 3,4,5 - 69% (245)	Level 3 - 33% Level 3,4,5 - 73%
---	------------------------------------

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	SM4 ILS 5x per week Supplement Instruction-Tier 2 & 3 Interventions	Teacher Reading Res. Teacher SWIST team/ Class-room teacher	Review of FAIR/SM4 Data Common Asses. Colaborative Data meetings Data Book review	State FAIR Test FOCUS
2	2012-2013 Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	SM4 ILS 5x per week Supplement Instruction-Tier 2 & 3 Interventions	ESOL Liaison SWIST team Classroom teacher	Review of FAIR/SM4 Data Common Asses. Colaborative Data meetings Data Review Mtgs.	FAIR Test FOCUS FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
--	--

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 40%(143) Level 3,4,5 - 69%(245)	Level 4,5 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

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 background knowledge	Successmaker reading daily	Classroom Teacher	FAIR Results	FAIR
	Lack of Vocabulary	Storytown Robust Vocabulary	Classroom Teacher	Storytown Common Assessments	
2	Lack of background knowledge	Successmaker reading daily	Classroom Teacher	FAIR Results	FAIR
	Lack of Vocabulary	Storytown Robust Vocabulary	Classroom Teacher	Storytown Common Assessments	
			FCAT Explorer		
3	Lack of background knowledge	Successmaker reading daily	Classroom Teacher	FAIR Results	FAIR
	Lack of Vocabulary	Storytown Robust Vocabulary		Storytown Common Assessments	
	Fluency	FCAT Explorer Classroom Teacher			
		Open Book ILS			

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60%(128)	64%

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Storytown Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students Collaborative data sessions	Principal and teachers Read. Res. Teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Review Data Books	FAIR Assessment
2	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Storytown Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students Collaborative data sessions	Principal and teachers Read. Res. Teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Review Data Books Classroom Walk- thru	FAIR Assessment
3	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Collaborative data sessions Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Open Book Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Principal and teachers ESOL Liaison/ Teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Review Data Books Classroom Walk- thru	FAIR Assessment FCAT SM4 Reports Open Book Reports

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52%(29)	56%

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Storytown intervention station Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Intervention teacher Principal Classroom teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data	FAIR Assessment
2	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Storytown intervention station Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Reading Resourceteacher Class-room teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Book review Classroom Walk-Thru	FAIR Assessment
3	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Open Book Storytown intervention station Intervention time in schedule: tier two and	ESOL Liaison/teacher Classroom teacher	Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data review Classroom Walk-Thru Open Book reports	FAIR Assessment FCAT

three students

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 42%(15) Hispanic 67%(26) White 72%(184)	Black 60% Hispanic 92% White 82%

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 Background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Reading Resource Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	class-room teachers Read. Resource Teacher	Effectiveness of Strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Book Review	FAIR Assessment
2	2011-2012 Lack of Background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Reading Resource Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	class-room teachers Read. Resource Teacher	Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Book Review	FAIR Assessment
3	2012-2013 Lack of Background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Open Book Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	classroom teachers	Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Review Mtg	FAIR Assessment FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or
--	---

Reading Goal #5C:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%	66%

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Intervention strategies Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Principal Classroom teacher	Effectiveness of strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data	FAIR Assessment
2	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Language	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes ESOL Support Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Admin. Classroom teacher	Effectiveness of strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Book Review	FAIR Assessment CELLA Assess
3	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Language	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Open Book ESOL Academic Support Rosetta Stone Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Admin. Classroom teacher ESOL Liaison/Teacher	Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Data Review Open Book data	FAIR Assessment CELLA Assess

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(11)	SWD: 48%

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary Fluency	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Intervention strategies Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Principal Classroom teachers	Effectiveness of strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data	FAIR Assessment

2	Lack of background knowledge	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes	Principal Classroom teachers	Effectiveness of strategy Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data	FAIR Assessment
	Lack of vocabulary	Intervention strategies			
	Fluency Comprehension	Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students			
3	Lack of background knowledge	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes	Principal Classroom teachers ESE Teacher	Review FAIR Data and Successmaker Data Open Book reports	FAIR and FCAT Assessments
	Lack of vocabulary	Open Book			
	Fluency Comprehension	120 min. Reading Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students			

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%	78%

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 background knowledge Lack of vocabulary	Successmaker 5 times a week for 30 minutes Intervention strategies Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Principal Classroom teachers	Effectiveness of strategy	Review Data and Successmaker Data FAIR Assessment
2	Lack of background knowledge Lack of vocabulary	Successmaker 5x a week for 30 minutes Read. Resource Intervention time in schedule: tier two and three students	Classroom teachers Admin.	Effectiveness of strategy Data Book review FAIR Assess. Class. Walk-Thru	Review Data and Successmaker Data FAIR Assessment
3	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
Common Core District	K-1	Suzanne Niamen	PLC	Sept. 2012	Walk-through	Administration
Complex Text	K-5	District	After School	During 2012-13 school year	Participation in meetings	
Open Book Training	K-5	Susan Gordan	During the day	October 17, 2012	Attendance-Sign in	

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
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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal # 1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.
CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.
CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 31%(111) Level 3,4,5 - 67%(238)	Level 3 - 35% Level 3,4,5 - 71%

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	Low performance of students on the fourth grade math FCAT 2012. Lack of math resource staff. Students don't know their basic math facts.	PLC discussions on student math achievement. Small group instruction during math block Additional staff for Math support SES tutoring Successmaker/Intervention time.	Teachers and administrators	CWT data Review of SuccessMaker Reports Review common assessments including Pearson, district math assessment	District Mini Assessments and benchmark Assessments Successmaker 4 (ILS) CWT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 36%(127) Level 3,4,5 - 67%(238)	Level 4,5 - 38% Level 3,4,5 - 69%

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	Large population of low performing 4th grade math students on the 2012 FCAT Students don't know their basic math facts.	PLC discussions on student math achievement Small Group instruction during math block Instructional support for grades 3-5 Successmaker/Intervention time.	Administrators Classroom Teachers	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review Successmaker Reports/Data	District Mini Assessments and benchmark Assessments Successmaker 3 (ILS) CWT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (123)	62%

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	Prior low performance on 2012 FCAT Math and lack of additional Math support Students don't know their basic math facts	PLC discussions on student math achievement Small group instruction during math block SES tutoring Successmaker/intervention time.	Administrators Classroom teachers	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review Successmaker Reports/Data	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review Successmaker Reports/Data FCATExplorer

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

41%(24)					45%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	FCAT 4th grade low 2012 FCAT performance. Students don't know their basic math facts.	Inservice for teacher on Instructional Focus Calendar PLC discussions on student achievement in math curriculum Small group instruction during math block SES tutoring Instructional Math Support	Administrators Classroom teachers	Adoption CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data	Adoption CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data CWT

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 # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	80	82	84	85	87	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 55%(18) Hispanic 63%(25) White 69%(171)	Black 66% Hispanic 83% White 83%

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	Low performance of students on the fourth grade math FCAT 2012. Lack of math resource staff. Students don't know their basic math facts.	Inservice for teacher on new textbook and math standards PLC discussions on student math achievement SES tutoring	Administrators Classroom teachers	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data	District Mini Assessments and benchmakr Assessments Successmaker 4 (ILS) CWT

	Successmaker/Intervention time.		
	Small group instruction during math block		

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010-11 67% of the ELL students scored 3 or above	in grades 3-5 69% will score 3 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	Low performance of students on the fourth grade math FCAT 2012. Lack of math resource staff. Students don't know their basic math facts.	Inservice for teacher on new textbook and math standards PLC Focus on new math curriculum SES tutoring Small group ESOL instruction Successmaker/Intervention time. Small group instructional during math block	Administrators Classroom teachers	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data	District Mini Assessments and benchmakr Assessments Successmaker 3 (ILS) CWT

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In Grades 3-5 31% of SWD students made AYP in mathematics	In grades 3-5 49% of SWD students will make AYP in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Low performance of	Inservice for teacher on	Administrators	CWT Data	District Mini

1	students on the fourth grade math FCAT 2012. Lack of math resource staff. Students don't know their basic math facts.	new textbook and math standards PLC discussions on student math achievement Additional ESE resource staff person. SES tutoring Small group instructional during math block	Classroom teachers	Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data	Assessments and benchmakr Assessments Successmaker 3 (ILS) CWT
---	---	--	--------------------	---	---

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%	75%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low performance of students on the fourth grade math FCAT 2012. Lack of math resource staff. Students don't know their basic math facts.	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data SES tutoring Successmaker/Intervention time. Additional math resource help PLC discussions on student math achievement Small group instruction during math block	Administrators Classroom teachers	CWT Data Review Benchmark Assessments Data Review successmaker reports/Data	District Mini Assessments and benchmakr Assessments Successmaker 3 (ILS) CWT

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

Common Core	K/1	District	PLC	August 2012	CWT	Administration
District PD courses/ District Math coordinator	K/5	Amanda Tannehill	PLC	August 2012	Lesson Plans	

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 3 - 44% (44) Level 3,4,5 - 69% (69)		Level 3 - 48% Level 3,4,5 - 73%			
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	New Science Standards	Utilize common assessment to monitor students in the CORE curriculum needing intervention	Classroom teacher	CWT	Florida Achieves assessment site
	New science textbook adoption	Science Lab teacher will assist CORE teacher with curriculum needs	Administrators	Review Florida Achieves assessment data	
		Increase use of FCAT Explorer			

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal #2a:

By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Level 4,5 - 25% (25)
Level 3,4,5 - 69% (69)

Level 4,5 - 29%
Level 3,4,5 - 73%

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
	New Science Standards New science textbook	Utilize common assessment to identify students to receive challenging curriculum	Classroom Teacher Administrators	CWT Review Florida Achieves Assessment	Florida Achieves Assessment site

1	adoption	Science Lab teacher will assist CORE teacher with curriculum needs		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:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science	k-5	Brad Poinchak	Grades k-5	Ongoing	Science Pre & Post	Administratoin Science Lab Teacher, Cheri Dame

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88%(107)	90%

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 moving up from grade 3-4 not familiar with writing strategies	Mary Lewis Training in grades 2, 3 and 4 District Quarterly Assessments	Teachers Administrators	Review District quarterly assessment results	Classroom walk through District Writing Assessment data
2	Students struggling with vocabulary, grammar and not enough practice in grade K-3	Mary Lewis Training in grades K-4 District Quarterly Assessments Monthly writing assessments	Teachers Administrators	Review District quarterly assessment results Review monthly writing assessments Meet with writing consultant	Classroom walk through District Writing Assessment data
3					

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

	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when
--	--

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47%(57)	51%

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 knowledge in Grammar Vocabulary	Mary Lewis Writing District Writng assessment Mmonthly writing assessments	Teachers Administration	Classroom Walk-throughs Assessment results Discussions with Consultant	Writing assesment 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
Mary Lewis	Writing	L. Capitano	Grades 1-4	Throughout the school year	Walk-through Meeting with consultant	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p>				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
95.1%(735/773)	97.1%				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
247	232				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
95	80				
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
	Continuing economic downturn and it's effect	School-wide PBS Program	Administrative PBS team	Attendance Report/Data	District AS400 student data

1	on the family unit.	School based PS/RTI team intervention model	PS/RTI Team Leaders		base system
		School Based Guidance services	Guidance Counselor		
2					
3					
4					
5					

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
44	44
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
34	34
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
62	62
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
33	33

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 social skills An absence of pre-requisite social skills appropriate for a school/classroom setting	Positive Behavior Support Program (PBS) PBS celebrations PBS Weekly prizes Weekly "Teach To's" on behavior skills Positive referrals Staff inservice school PBS plan	Teachers, PBS Team and Administrators	Teacher surveys, Number of referrals Student discipline data	Positive referrals, Behavior Tracking Form results

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Based on parent sign-in sheets, 85% of families will attend two or more school events or parent nights.</p> <p>By May 2013 70% of students in grades 3,4, and 5 will make a years growth in reading as demonstrated on the Successmaker program.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Based on parent sign-in sheets, 80% of families attended two or more school events or parent nights.	Based on parent sign in sheets, 85% of families will attend two or more school events on parent nights
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	Transportation Language Sports in the evenings	Connect Ed message in native language Offer events at different times of the day or week	Teachers Administrators SAC Members	Parent Survey Sign in sheets	Sign in sheets
2	Transportation Language Sports in the evenings Parents working Apathy	Connect Ed message in native language Offer events at different times of the day or week Monthly calendar Incentives/Prizes	Teachers Administrators SAC Members	Parent Survey Sign in sheets	Sign in sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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 Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

School Improvement Plan- Do a needs assessment then discuss ways to increase student achievement in all areas. The SAC will discuss Title I concerns- Parent involvement: ways to increase parent participation, the parent involvement plan and the teacher Student contract.



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

Sarasota School District CRANBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	95%	94%	75%	357	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	70%	75%			145	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?	67% (YES)	81% (YES)			148	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					650	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District CRANBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	89%	96%	73%	350	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	71%	64%			135	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?	67% (YES)	71% (YES)			138	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					623	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested