FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: WATERLEAF ELEMENTARY

District Name: Duval

Principal: Marianne Simon

SAC Chair: Geree Lockett

Superintendent: Ed Pratt Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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)
					2011-2012 Principal- Waterleaf Elementary Grade A, Reading Mastery 62%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 49%, Writing mastery 83%, Reading gains 71%, Bottom 25% reading gains 83%, Math gains 77%, Bottom 25% math gains 72%, Total points 566-A 2010-2011 Principal- Woodland Acres Grade A, Reading Mastery 59%, Math Mastery 77%, Science Mastery 34%, Writing mastery 69%, Reading gains 60%, Bottom 25% reading gains 64%, Math gains 81%, Bottom 25% math gains 91%, Total points 535, gain of 89 points overall AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading and Black students did not make AYP in Math. 2009-2010- Principal- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade C, Reading Mastery 53%, Math Mastery 64%, Science Mastery 23%,

| Principal | Marianne Simon | Bachelor's degree in Special Education (K-12) and a Masters in Educational Leadership | 2 | 8 | Writing mastery 74%, Reading gains 51%, Bottom 25% reading gains 40%, Math gains 40%, Bottom 25% math gains 77%, Total points 446, loss of 34 points overall AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading and Black students did not make AYP in Math.

2008-2009- Principal- Woodland Acres Elementary
Grade C, Reading Mastery 62%, Math Mastery 64%, Science Mastery 35%,Writing mastery 80%, Reading gains 62%, Bottom 25% reading gains 68%, Math gains 55%, Bottom 25% math gains 55%, total points 481,gained 34 points overall AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Math.

2007-2008- Principal- Woodland Acres Elementary
Grade C, Reading Mastery 63%, Math Mastery 60%, Science Mastery 26%, Writing mastery 72%, Reading gains 55%, Bottom 25% reading gains 43%, Math gains 55%, Bottom 25% math gains 73%, total points 447, loss of 66 points overall AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Math. |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Norma Frye	K-6	2	13	2011-2012 - Waterleaf Elementary Grade A, Reading Mastery 62%, Math Mastery 69%, Science Mastery 49%, Writing mastery 83%, Reading gains 71%, Bottom 25% reading gains 83%, Math gains 77%, Bottom 25% math gains 72%, Total points 566-A 10-2011 - Woodland Acres Grade A, Reading Mastery 59%, Math Mastery 77%, Science Mastery 34%, Writing mastery 69%, Reading gains 60%, Bottom 25% reading gains 64%, Math gains 81%, Bottom 25% math gains 91%, Total points 535, gain of 89 points overall AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading and Black students did not make AYP in Math. 2009-2010- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade C, Math Mastery 64%, Learning Gains 64%, Bottom 25% gains 77% AYP: Black students did not make AYP in Math. 2008-2009- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade C, Math Mastery 64%, Learning Gains 55%, Bottom 25% gains 55% AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. 2007-2008- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade C, Math Mastery 60%, Learning Gains 55%, Bottom 25% gains 73% AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. 2006-2007- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade B, Math Mastery 71%, Learning Gains 62%, Bottom 25% gains 77% AYP: Black and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. 2005-2006- Woodland Acres Elementary

					Grade D, Math Mastery 56%, Learning Gains 70%, Bottom 25% gains N/A AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. 2004-2005- Woodland Acres Elementary Grade C, Math Mastery 55%, Learning Gains 62%, Bottom 25% gains N/A AYP: Black and Students with Disabilities

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. Meet with mentors weekly to discuss various concerns and issues. 2.Coach provides support and model demo lessons in Classrooms. 3. Principal will meet with each grade level every week to provide support 4. Encourage participation in professional development that will enhance professional growth.	Marianne Simon Norma Frye Marianne Simon Marianne Simon/Norma Frye	On-going On-going On-going 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
7% (3) staff members are teaching out of field or are not highly qualified.	TDE time to gain knowledge necessary to pass exams Mentor meetings weekly

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	16.3%(8)	30.6%(15)	36.7%(18)	16.3%(8)	30.6%(15)	79.6%(39)	2.0%(1)	2.0%(1)	49.0%(24)

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
Jessica Koci (PK)	Ashley Roden (PK)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling

		grade-level.	
Sabrena Bua (Kdg)	Amanda Tasker (Kdg)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same grade-level.	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling
Sabrena Bua (Kdg)	Allison Fethe (Kdg)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same grade-level.	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling
Ashley Burgos (1st)	Mariel Manalo (1st)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same area.	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling
Mary Ellen Cook (Speech and Language)	Nell Rosenberg (Speech/Language)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same area.	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling
Shannon Wine (ESE Lead)	Candace Adams (ESE VE)	Highly qualified mentor teaching on the same area.	Weekly meetings, classroom observations and modeling

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
Laura Kratz (Guidance), Shannon Wine (ESE Lead Teacher), Kaitlin Castillo (Speech/Language Pathologists), Julie Witucki (ESE Teacher), Kim Bergfeld and Stephani Brantley (Gen Ed Teachers)

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?

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?
MTSS/RTI meets twice a month. The team attends all districts workshops concerning RtI and brings back any/all relevant info to the faculty and presents at meetings and/or trainings to ensure information is received. An agenda is established based upon teacher concerns in the classroom related to academics and/or behavior. The team discusses the concern(s) and assists the teacher in developing a plan for intervention(s) (tier 2 & 3). The team members meet regularly with the staff to assist in supporting the implemented plans. Assistance may include, but is not limited to, conducting classroom observations, assisting with collecting appropriate data, developing graphs/charts that are used to monitor plan progress. Each member of the RTI team are also members of a school-wide team. For example, reading/writing, math/science, accountability, foundations.

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?

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
The RtI Leadership Team is directly involved with developing and implementing the School Improvement Plan. All members are also part of our Extended Leadership Team, who meet after school weekly to discuss implementation of the SIP. Members will use the problem-solving strategy to look at data, identify needs of the school and individual teachers and students, and will develop strategies and interventions to help meet the goals of the SIP.

MTSS Implementation

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

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.
We will use data from FCAT, District Benchmark assessments, CCSS K-2 Math Benchmark, FAIR, and teacher-made assessments. Data on absenteeism, referrals, and suspensions will be pulled from Genesis for behavior. Data will be managed through Insight Inform.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.
The RtI Leadership Team will use all information provided from the district level RtI trainings to train the school faculty. The information will be delivered at monthly early release day trainings, monthly faculty meetings, and weekly grade-level meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
The team members meet regularly with the staff to assist in supporting the implemented plans. Assistance may include, but is not limited to, conducting classroom observations, assisting with collecting appropriate data, developing graphs/charts that are used to monitor plan progress.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Norma Frye- Reading Teacher
Kelly Cholmondeley- Kindergarten Lead Literacy Teacher
Stephani Brantley- Primary Lead Literacy Teacher
Ashley Burgos- 1st Grade Reading
Kim Kirton- Intermediate Lead Literacy Teacher
Sara Fretz- 4th Grade Reading Teacher

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
In support of the district's reading goals and our school based reading goals, we have established a monthly literacy team data review meeting to assist us in aligning with DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan. Team members, review current and longitudinal data to ensure the successful implementation of the core reading series and research based strategies for supporting students in the core curriculum.
We further meet to assess faculty professional development needs and to formulate plans on effective implementation of targeted reading goals within our surrounding community. Our main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the manner in which it is being delivered across content and grade levels to provide next steps for

improving the reading achievement of our students.
The school-based LLT meets once a month during Early Release days and then plans trainings for other Early Release days and weekly grade-level meetings.
Their role is to provide model classrooms for other teachers to come and observe. They also provide trainings on reading best

practices, for example: mini-lesson modeling, literacy centers, guided reading, running records, etc. This team monitors the 25

book implementation and provides school-wide fun activities based on reading.

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
The two major initiatives are to train and provide modeling for the "I do, We do, You do" method. Teachers seem to skip over the "I do" part. The team will also participate in the RtI work at the school this year. They will provide valuable input into interventions and strategies needed to move our students.

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:	In 2013, 29% (86) of all 3rd, 4th and 5th graders will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (64)	29%(86)

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	1A.1. Students at varying ability levels	1A.1 Daily differentiated instruction, guided reading, cooperative learning groups, Study Island, Destination Success and Online leveled readers to allow students to achieve mastery. .	1A.1. Principal Instructional Coach Teachers	1A.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and during weekly grade level/departmentalized meetings.	1A.1. Classroom observations
2	1A.2. Teachers not understanding best practice and pedagogy to reach the needs of all students	1A.2. Implement strategies learned from Book Study… Next Steps in Guided Reading Comprehension Shouldn't Be Silent	1A.2. Principal Instructional Coach Teachers	1A.2. Lesson plans will be written in the workshop model format and will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs.	1A.2. Classroom observations
3	1A.3. Timely access to assessment data.	1A.3. Use FAIR data, data from Pearson Inform/Insight, Focus for Instruction sheets and Informal data on a daily basis to drive instruction.	1A.3. Principal Instructional Coach Teachers	1A.3. Data notebook reviews and classroom walkthroughs	1A.3. Classroom observations
4	1A.4. Prior knowledge with both the parents and students.	1A.4. Include higher-order questions using Webb's depth of knowledge in lesson plans	1A.4. Principal Instructional Coach Teachers	1A.4. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be reviewed during weekly grade level meetings	1A.4. Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to Determine frequency of higher order questions.

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:	In 2013, 35% (100) of all 3rd, 4th and 5th graders will score at or above a level 4 in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(79)	35% (100)

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	2A.1. Teachers not having the skills and training to know how to reach "above average" students.	2A.1. All teachers will attend bi-monthly curriculum PLCs to enhance skills in differentiating instruction for high achievers. Daily differentiated instruction, guided reading, cooperative learning groups, Study Island, Destination Success and Online leveled readers will help achieve student's highest potential	2A.1. Principal Instructional Coach	2A.1. Administrators will attend PLCs and complete focus walks	2A.1. PLC Agendas
2	2A.2. Creating effective lesson plans that include differentiation and rigor	2A.2. All teachers will indicate in lesson plans in the differentiation section, how they will alter the daily instruction to meet the needs of their high achievers.	2A.2. Principal	2A.2. Review lesson plans	2A.2. Lesson Plans

3	2A.3. Low critical thinking Skills and knowledge of benchmark specification.	2A.3. Include higher-order questions using Webb's depth of knowledge in lesson plans. Use authentic literature to show progression of specific benchmark throughout the grade levels.	2A.3. Principal Classroom Teacher	2A.3. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be reviewed during weekly grade level meetings	2A.3. Classroom walkthrough log and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of higher order questions and benchmark specifications.

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:	In 2013, 75% (140) of all 3rd, 4th and 5th graders will make Learning Gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(82)	75%(140)

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	3A.1. Time to assess	3A.1. The school will implement the FAIR assessments, Benchmark assessments and Informal assessments to monitor student progress.	3A.1. Principal Instructional Coach ClassroomTeacher	3A.1. Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule	3A.1. Printout of FAIR assessments
	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.

2	Time to differentiate work on a daily basis	Daily differentiated instruction, guided reading and cooperative learning groups to allow students to assist each other in mastery of knowledge.	Principal Instructional Coach Teachers	Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be reviewed during weekly grade level meetings	Classroom observations
3	3A.3. Novice teachers with limited knowledge	3A.3. Bi-Monthly PLC-Teachers observing multiple teaching styles and best practices	3A.3. Principal Instructional Coach	3A.3. Teacher feedback and monthly meetings. Classroom observations and walk-throughs.	3A.3. Power-points and Teacher feedback.

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:	In 2013, 85% (37) of all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade in the lowest 25% will make Learning Gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(28)	85% (37)

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	4A.1. Number of students reading 1 or more years below grade level	4A.1. Use Guided Reading to increase student reading level	4A.1. All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team	4A.1. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation	4A.1. DRAs District Benchmark Assessment

			RtI Team		
2	4A.2. Students at this level are not motivated	4A.2. Pair each student in the bottom 25% with a mentor teacher	4A.2. Teachers Principal	4A.2. On-going progress monitoring of students	4A.2. Mentoring log Benchmark scores RtI documentation
3	4A.3. Time to give students extra instruction in reading	4A.3. Each classroom will provide 45 minutes of RtI or FCIM time in their schedules	4A.3. Teachers Principal RtI Team	4A.3. Review of lesson plans Teacher observation On-going progress monitoring of students	4A.3. RtI documentation FCIM documentation Benchmark scores

---

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 # Waterleaf Elementary opened in 2011-2012 therefore there is no data for 2010-2011. 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:	Our goal is to increase the number of black students who will score a level 3 or above on FCAT by 20%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%(34) Of black students scored a level 3 or above on FCAT.	68% (50) of black students will score a level 3 or above on FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5B.1. Black subgroup: Method for Tracking Each Subgroup in Reading	5B.1. Develop a tracking sheet that monitors the progress of each subgroup to see if any are falling behind the expected level of achievement.	5B.1. School Instructional Coach Classroom Teacher Principal	5B.1. Conduct Data Chats with teachers to determine if the progress for each subgroup is sufficient.	5B.1. Ongoing Progress Monitoring Assessments
5B.2. Black subgroup: Student engagement	5B.2. Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental	5B.2. Principal Coach Teacher RtI Team	5B.2. On-going analysis of student work through focus walks, observation, and product of student	5B.2. Teacher and Student data/conference log.

2		instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.		work.	
3	5B.3. Black subgroup: Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in appropriate level activities	5B.3. Bi-monthly teacher meetings to analyze student data, student work, and professional development needs	5B.3. Principal Teachers Coach	5B.3. Teacher conversations, lessons, and data analysis	5B.3. Benchmark will be used to analyze growth of 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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Our goal is to increase the number of students with disabilities who will score a level 3 or above on FCAT by 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%(19) of students with disabilities scored a level 3 or above on FCAT last year.	68% (23) of students with disabilities will score a level 3 or above on FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	5D.1. Lack of understanding of SWD population	5D.1. ESE Lead will conduct bi-monthly meetings with classroom teachers	5D.1. ESE Lead	5D.1. Focus Walks Teacher conferences Early Release training	5D.1. Focus Walk Logs Conference documentation Early Release Agendas

2	5D.2. Lack of time management for ESE teachers	5D.2. All ESE teachers will use the same forms for planning guided reading and guided math lessons Time with students will be monitored to ensure students are met with daily	5D.2. ESE Lead Principal ESE Teachers	5D.2 Monitoring of lesson plans and anecdotal notes Monthly ESE meetings to discuss lessons.	5D.2. Benchmark data RtI and FCIM data
3	5D.3. Some students are 1 year or more behind in reading	5D.3. Use intervention strategies during RtI and FCIM time, while exposing students to grade level content during the workshop time	5D.3. ESE Teachers Gen. Ed Teachers ESE Lead Principal	5D.3. Monitoring of lesson plans and anecdotal notes Monthly ESE meetings to discuss lessons.	5D.3. Benchmark data RtI and FCIM 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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Our goal is to increase the number of students who are economically disadvantaged who will score a level 3 or above on FCAT by 34%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (29) of students who are economically disadvantaged scored a level 3 or higher on FCAT last year.	68% (63) of students who are economically disadvantaged will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack of prior knowledge	5E.1. Use authentic literature, personal anecdotes to broaden understanding and build schema for a stronger foundation The use of graphic organizers (concept maps, KWL, etc) will activate any prior knowledge	5E.1. Principal Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom walkthroughs and will be reviewed during weekly grade level meetings	5E.1. Classroom observations
2	5D.3. Some students are 1 year or more behind in reading	5D.3. Use intervention strategies during RtI and FCIM time, while exposing students to grade level content during the workshop time	5D.3. Gen. Ed Teachers ESE Lead Principal	5D.3. Monitoring of lesson plans and anecdotal notes Monthly ESE meetings to discuss lessons.	5D.3. Benchmark data RtI and FCIM 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
Guided Reading	K-5	Simon Frye	School Wide	PLC- bi-monthly	Peer observations	Simon Frye
RtI	K-5	Simon Frye Wine Kratz	School Wide	PLC- bi-monthly	Monthly meetings w/documentation Classroom visits w/documentation	Simon
FCIM	3-5	`Simon Frye	3-5 grade	Early Release-November	Observations	Simon
Text Complexity	K-5	Simon	School Wide	Early Release-October	Classroom observations PLC discussion	Simon Frye

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students proficient in Listening/Speaking by 6%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
39% of the students are 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
1	1.1. Limited English Proficiency is a barrier to acquisition of academic English.1.1.	1.1. Develop academic English through teacher modeling of content vocabulary. Promote development of academic English through student collaborative work in content areas.	1.1. Administration ESOL teachers	1.1. Teachers will create formal and informal assessments with collaboration correlated to specific goals. Item analysis of these specific assessments will be maintained in Data Notebooks and used as a collaboration tool during Monthly Administrative Data Chats, Vertical PLC meetings and grade level/departmental meetings.	1.1. Teacher Created Assessments Teacher observation
2	1.2. Cultural differences	1.2. Pair with student leader	1.2. Classroom teacher	1.2. Formal and informal assessments	1.2. CELLA, FCAT 2.0, and FAIR
3	1.3. shy (personality/academics)	1.3 non-contingent interactions	1.3. Classroom teacher	1.3. Formal and informal assessments	1.3 CELLA, FCAT 2.0, and FAIR

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students proficient in Reading by 6%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
6% of the students are 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
1	2.1. Need to bridge literacy gaps in home language	2.1. Highly qualified interpreters will be matched to students of same home language during instructional core blocks, during	2.1. Administration	2.1. ESOL Teachers and Paraprofessionals will provide monthly input into progress. Genesis Membership data will be reviewed monthly.	2.1. Genesis ELL Membership Data ESOL Teacher Feedback Interpreter Feedback

			Modifications to interpreter schedules will be made as needed.	
2	2.2. Need for additional instructional opportunities beyond the school day	2.2. Target ELL students will be provided opportunities for free tutoring before and after school. Tutoring will be aligned to NGSS/Common Core Standards.	2.2. Administration	2.2. Participates' attendance and achievement will be tracked across strands and compared to overall student achievement.	2.2. SAI/SES Attendance Records SAI Data Profiles Benchmark and FCAT Reading Test (3rd-5th)
3	2.3. Need for awareness of Subgroup: English Language Learners (ELLs) and strategies for monitoring.	2.3. Teachers will identify students according to Subgroup, (including ELLs). EllS will be identified according to numbers of years in program and status, (active, post monitoring and exited).	2.3. Administration and ESOL Teachers	2.3. Monthly Data Meetings will provide opportunities for progress monitoring of individual teacher's ELL data and provide opportunities for problem solving and next steps.	2.3. Monthly Data Meetings Agendas and minutes Student Achievement data from DRA2, Inform, FAIR and quarterly formative/summative data Scholarship Warnings and retention data

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students proficient in Writing by 9%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:
11% of the students are 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
1	2.1. Limited English Proficiency is a barrier to writing in English.	2.1. Implementing Thinking Maps as a form of pre-writing using non-linguistic forms as a scaffold to writing in English.	2.1. ESOL Teacher Administration Instructional Coach	2.1. Formal and Informal teacher created assessments.	2.1. Teacher created assessments Thinking Maps Writing Journals
2	2.2. Cultural differences	2.2. Opportunities for functional writing	2.2. Classroom teacher	2.2. Formal and informal assessments	2.2. CELLA, FCAT 2.0, and FAIR
3	2.3. Shy (Personality/academics)	2.3. Keep journal to show growth over time	2.3. Classroom teacher	2.3. Formal and informal assessments	2.3. CELLA, FCAT 2.0, and FAIR

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students who score a level 3 by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (63	31%(92)

	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	1A.1. Low critical thinking and problem solving skills.	1A.1. Include higher order questioning in Webb's depth of knowledge in lesson plans.	1A.1. Principal and Instructional Coach	1A.1. Lesson plans reviewed during walk-through and formal/informal observations.	1A.1. Classroom walk-through log and focused walk through to determine frequency of higher-ordered questions and lists of questions in anecdotal notes.
2	1A.2. Lack of understanding in CCSS.	1A.2. Teachers will collaborate on understanding the CCSS Benchmarks and design lessons based on the depth of knowledge of each individual benchmark.	1A.2. Principal and Instructional Coach	1A.2. Lesson will be observed through Informal and Formal Observations.	1A.2. Cast Evaluation Tool Student Benchmark and PMA Scores by Benchmark.
3	1A.3. Lack of data driven instruction	1A.3. Teachers will collaborate with their grade levels to determine the effectiveness of lessons to determine next steps.	1A.3. Principal and Instructional Coach	1A.3. Review of grade level minutes and Team Meetings.	1A.3. Student formal and informal assessment 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 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:	Based on the 2011 FCAT Math Assessment results, 55% (71) of students scored at Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5 55% (71) of the students achieved a level 4 or 5 in math on the 2011 FCAT math test.	In grades 3-5 58% (135) of the students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in math on the 2012 FCAT math test.

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	2A.1. Time allocated to work with higher performing students.	2A.1. Provide enrichment opportunities and differentiated lessons to meet the needs of all students.	2A.1. Classroom Teacher	2A.1. Lesson plans reviewed	2A.1. Math Portfolios, Benchmark Assessments
2	2A.2. Lack of problem solving skills.	2A.2. Students are given increasingly challenging problems.	2A.2. Classroom Teacher	2A.2. Review of student work.	2A.2. Math Portfolios
3	2A.3. Lack of conceptual understanding	2A.3. Students will be given manipulative to work out and think out problems	2A.3. Classroom Teacher	2A.3. r Review of student work	2A.3. Math Portfolio

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students who make learning gains in math by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (89)	80% (149

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. Lack of prior knowledge or skills.	3A.1. Teachers will use pretests, exit tickets and small group instruction to determine understanding and inform instruction.	3A.1. Classroom Teacher	3A.1. Exit ticket forms	3A.1. Teacher-made assessments
2	3A.2. Time constraints	3A.2. Utilize math journals to monitor student progress and plan for instruction.	3A.2. Classroom Teachers	3A.2. Journals incorporated with Math Workshop	3A.2. Lesson plans and math journals
3	3A.3. Students not understanding math vocabulary	3A.3. Bring literature into the math lessons that incorporate math vocabulary.	3A.3. Classroom teachers	3A.3. Classroom assessment scores	3A.3. Classroom tests DCPS math assessments K-5

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students in the bottom 25% who make learning gains in math by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (15)	75% (35)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>4A.1.

Lack necessary pre-skills</td><td>4A.1.

Teachers will use an "exit ticket" to determine acquisition of content and to form differentiated groups for the next day</td><td>4A.1.

Classroom Teachers</td><td>4A.1.

Exit ticket forms</td><td>4A.1.

Teacher made assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>4A.2.

Time constraints</td><td>4A.2.

Utilize math journals to monitor student progress and plan for instruction.</td><td>4A.2.

Classroom Teachers</td><td>4A.2.

Journals incorporated with Math Workshop</td><td>4A.2.

Lesson plans and math journals</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>4A.3.

Students not understanding math vocabulary</td><td>4A.3.

Bring literature into the math lessons that incorporate math vocabulary.</td><td>4A.3.

Classroom teachers</td><td>4A.3.

Classroom assessment scores</td><td>4A.3.

Classroom tests DCPS math assessments K-5</td></tr>
</table>

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 # Waterleaf Elementary opened in 2011-2012 therefore there is no data for 2010-2011. 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Our goal is to increase the number of black students who will score a level 3 or above on FCAT by 15%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (42)of black students scored a level 3 or higher on FCAT.	74% (55) of black students will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. ome teachers are not incorporating effective problem-solving strategies during the daily mathematics instruction.	5B.1 The school-based coach will provide professional development during PLC's on the effective use of problem-solving tools/strategies.	5B.1. Principal District and School-Based Coaches	5B.1 . Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations	5B.1. District Math Benchmark Assessment
2	5B.2. Teachers have not received support in the effective use of problem-solving strategies	5B.2. The instructional coach will support mathematics teachers through the coaching model to incorporate the problem-solving tools/strategies as part of instruction	5B.2 Principal District and School-Based Coaches.	5B.2. Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations	5B.2. Focus Walk Observation Notes
3	5B.3. Teachers are not consistently implementing problem-solving strategies during daily mathematics instruction.	5B.3. Mathematics teachers will incorporate problem-solving tools/strategies as a part of the daily mathematics instruction.	5B.3. Principal District and School-Based Coaches	5B.3. Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations	5B.3. CAST (Administrators only) District Math Benchmark 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 subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students with disabilities who score a level 3 or higher by 12%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (27) of students with disabilities scored a level 3 or higher on FCAT.	74% (25) of students with disabilities will score a level 3 or higher on FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack of understanding for SWD strategies	5D.1. All students with disabilities will be strategically placed based on student need	5D.1. Principal ESE Lead Teacher	5D.1. Administration and ESE Lead will meet monthly ESE and general education teachers	5D.1. Focus Walks
2	5D.2. Creating effective lesson plans that include differentiation.	5D.2. All teachers will indicate in the differentiation section of the lesson plans, how they will alter the daily instruction to meet the needs of their struggling students.	5D.2. Principal	5D.2. Review Lesson Plans	5D.2. Lesson Plans
3	5D.3. Students not understanding math vocabulary	5D.3. Bring literature into the math lessons that incorporate math vocabulary.	5D.3. Classroom teachers	5D.3. Classroom assessment scores	5D.3. Classroom tests DCPS math assessments K-5

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:	School opened August 2011, so no previous AYP data is available.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	In grades 3-5, students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will meet AYP on the FCAT Math 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	5D.1. Creating effective lesson plans that include differentiation.	5D.1. All teachers will indicate in the differentiation section of the lesson plans, how they will alter	5D.1. Principal	5D.1. Review lesson plans	5D.1. Lesson Plans

		the daily instruction to meet the needs of their struggling students.		
2	5E.2. Time constraints	5E.2. Utilize math journals to monitor student progress and plan for instruction.	5E.2. Classroom Teachers	5E.2. Journals incorporated with Math Workshop	5E.2. Lesson plans and math journals
3	5E.3. Students not understanding math vocabulary	5E.3. Bring literature into the math lessons that incorporate math vocabulary.	5E.3. Classroom teachers	5E.3. Classroom assessment scores	5E.3. Classroom tests DCPS math assessments K-5

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
Analysis of instructional practices in relation to student performance	K-5	Simon	K-5	Once a month on Thursdays	Classroom Observations	Simon
Differentiated Instruction	PK-5	Simon	K-5	Once a month on Thursdays	Classroom Observations	Simon
Effective Implementation of the Workshop Model in Math	K-5	Simon	K-5	Early Release Wednesdays	Classroom Observations	Simon

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

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students who score a level 3 on FCAT by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (17)	33%(27)

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	1A.1. Implementing Science across all grade levels	1A.1. Explicit instruction and vocabulary work in the classrooms Implementing science journals throughout grade levels	1A.1. Teacher Principal Science Lead	1A.1. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	1A.1. Journal Student Work Lesson Plans
2	1A.2. Understanding and Implementing FCAT 2.0	1A.2. Using a "bridge" to understand the grade level alignment of science across grade levels	1A.2. Teacher Principal Science Lead	1A.2. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	1A.2 Journal Student Work Lesson Plans
3	1A.3. Knowledge of new curriculum.	1A.3. Science lead trainings and cross grade level collaboration.	1A.3. Teacher Principal Science Lead	1A.3. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	1A.3. Journal Student Work Lesson Plans

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students who score a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT by 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (8)	19%(15)

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	2A.1. Lack of scientific materials resulting in accessibility to materials and needed items for labs/inquiry based exploration	2A.1. Students will participate in hands-on inquiry based exploration of scientific concepts	2A.1. Teacher Principal Science Lead	2A.1. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	2A.1. Journal Student Work Lesson Plans FCAT Science Rubric for labs/inquiry based learning
2	2A.2. Teachers understanding of higher order questioning	2A.2. Include higher-order questions using Webb's depth of knowledge in lesson plans	2A.2. Teacher Principals Science Lead	2A.2. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	2A.2. Journal Student Work Lesson Plans FCAT Science Rubric for labs/inquiry based learning
3	2A.3. Instruction time available for science	2A.3. Ensure available time is spent on higher order, hands on, inquiry based instruction.	2A.3. Teacher Principal Science Lead	2A.3. Focus Walks Knowledge Walls Student achievement	2A.3. Journal Student Work Lesson Plans FCAT Science Rubric for labs/inquiry based learning

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
Inquiry based lessons	K-5	Simon	School-wide	Tribal Thursdays	Teachers will observe one another	Simon
Science Notebooks	K-5	Simon Teachers	School-wide	Tribal Thursdays	Observations in class Samples of science notebooks	Simon

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

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:	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of students who are proficient in writing by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (34)	53% (55)

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	1A.1. Students' background knowledge for writing across a variety of genres	1A.1. Showcase student work on a Literacy Board which will highlight writing and responses to literature across the grade levels.	1A.1. Reading and Writing Team K-2 3-5	1A.1. Student Writing Portfolios Student Journals Student work as displayed	1A.1. Rubrics Baseline prompt data Ongoing district prompts for grade 3-5 and Analysis of student data/growth based on writing rubrics
2	1A.2. Teachers' comfort levels in regards to the role of a science journal or how to keep and effective journal.	1A.2. Increase the use of writing in other content areas, journaling in science based on our book study Science Journaling	1A.2. Mrs. Simon Mrs. Frye	1A.2. Student journal samples Discussions around student work	1A.2. Rubrics Baseline prompt data Ongoing district prompts for grade 3-5 and Analysis of student data/growth based on writing rubrics
3	1A.3. Teacher's knowledge of teaching writing and the new writing for FCAT 2.0	1A.3. 2 Classroom Observation of writing lessons during the Tribal Thursdays with opportunities for feedback and discussion of best practices in writing	1A.3. Mrs. Simon Mrs. Frye	1A.3. Student work samples Lesson plans integrating new learning about writing	1A.3. Rubrics Baseline prompt data Ongoing district prompts for grade 3-5 and Analysis of student data/growth based on writing rubrics

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	

Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT 2.0	K-5	Simon Frye	School-wide	Early Release	Classroom observations Student Work evaluation	Simon Frye
Step-Up to Writing	ESE Teachers	District Level	ESE teachers	TDE at school	Classroom observations Student Work evaluation	Simon Frye Wine

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

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:	The number of students with excessive absences will decrease by 5% . The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by 5%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93%	94%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
33% (185)	28% (182)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
12%(68)	7%(46)

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	1.1. Education of parents on the importance of attendance and their student's academic success.	1.1. Monthly Attendance Intervention Team meetings will be held for all students identified by the district to have excessive absences/tardies. An Attendance Contract will be created in the meeting and monitored	1.1. CRT Guidance Councelor District Truancy Officer Teacher Parents	1.1. The District Truancy Officer will monitor families that the team has met with for attendance compliance	1.1. District monitors
2	1.2. Motivation to come to school	1.2. Incentives for students to include awards for perfect attendance of each the four nine weeks. Teachers may also recognize students who are present in school every day or simply increase their attendance rate	1.2. Administration Classroom Teachers	1.2. Awards sheets Number of Incentives	1.2. Attendance sheets
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3	1.3.

| 3 | Children miss the bus and then their parents do not bring them to school | Parents will be notified via School Messenger phone call each day that their child is absent from school.

The Attendance Intervention Team will meet weekly to analyze attendance data and sign attendance contracts with parents. | Guidance Counselor Principal | Analyzing student absentee data to observe for decrease in AIT referrals

Attendance Referrals that are submitted to the State Attorney for follow up | Data from School Messenger reports School absentee data

Weekly data on the number of referrals submitted to the State Attorney. |

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
Provide incentives to promote attendance.	Incentive-based: coupons, gift certificates, trinkets, positive notes home, recognition during morning announcements	Business Partners and school-based internal funds account	$300.00
Recognize students for the Perfect Attendance Award, each grading period.	Various Awards	PTA funds School-based internal Awards fund	$200.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Suspension

Suspension Goal #1:</td><td>Our goal for 2012-2013 is to maintain our number of discipline issues. We currently have very low numbers of suspensions and plan to keep it that way.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions</td><td>2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions</td></tr>
<tr><td>.01%(6</td><td>Maintain the same as last year</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</td></tr>
<tr><td>.004%(2 students)</td><td>Maintain the same as last year</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</td></tr>
<tr><td>.02% (12)</td><td>Maintain the same as last year</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</td></tr>
<tr><td>.01% (6)</td><td>Maintain the same as last year</td></tr>
</table>

	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	1.1. Ineffective implementation of Safe & Civil Schools, Foundations, CHAMPS and classroom management procedures	1.1. Monthly meetings of the Foundations Team to review policies and procedures and concerns related to behavior	1.1. Principal Foundations Chair	1.1. Reduction in total number of incidences, referrals, in-school and out –of- school suspension.	1.1. Genesis Discipline Reports
2	1.2. Inability to train new teachers regarding various strategies for improving student behavior and classroom management	1.2. Conduct bi-weekly new teacher meetings with Administration, Coaches and Mentors – surveying teachers regarding student behavior issues and effective teacher strategies	1.2. Principal PDF	1.2. Effective classroom management and limited incidents of referrals to administration	1.2. Weekly Classroom Focus Walks, Genesis Discipline 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
CHAMPS	K-5	Various Teachers	All grades	Early Release and PLC meetings	Classroom observations	Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of parents who volunteer at the school and/or attend our monthly activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
64%(400)	70%(500)
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	1.1. Time	1.1. All PTA functions, including monthly PTA meetings, will be published in the monthly newsletter, webpage, ParentLink and on the school marquee.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Review of volunteer hours	1.1. Volunteer sign-in sheets
2	1.2. Not enough interest in SAC membership	1.2. SAC will expand its membership base. The Principal will invite active parents to join. Each current SAC member will bring an additional member to the meetings.	1.2. Principal SAC Members	1.2. Review of the monthly attendance	1.2. Sign In Sheets
3	1.3. Funding Time	1.3. Academic Family Nights will be held throughout the school year to encourage parents to participate in their student's education.	1.3. Principal Curriculum teams PTA	1.3. Attendance will be reviewed	1.3. Attendance sheets School Climate Survey

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
Volunteer Training	Pk-5	Simon Callison	School-wide	Early Release-October	Parent conversations	Callison
Volunteer Coordinator Training	Office staff	Community Involvement Office	Volunteer Coordinator	September 2011	Volunteer log	Callison

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:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance	Provide incentives to promote attendance.	Incentive-based: coupons, gift certificates, trinkets, positive notes home, recognition during morning announcements	Business Partners and school-based internal funds account	$300.00
Attendance	Recognize students for the Perfect Attendance Award, each grading period.	Various Awards	PTA funds School-based internal Awards fund	$200.00
				Subtotal: $500.00

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: $500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent	☐ NA

Are you a reward school: ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

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

The SAC has not set forth what they will spend SAC funds on yet. It is proposed that some funds go towards purchasing Books of the Month for teachers to have so that we may study the same books as a school.	$1,200.00

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

The SAC is committed to increasing its membership this school year and to make monthly goals to keep all members focused on the issues at hand. The first priporities are the school improvement plan, business partnerships, and SAC recruitment.

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
No Data Found
No Data Found