FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JAMES M. ANDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dixie

Principal: Mike Thomas

SAC Chair: Tammy Bryan

Superintendent: Mark Rains

Date of School Board Approval: 11/13/12

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mike Thomas	Educational Leadership; K-12 Special Education	8	8	09-10: Very Effective, School Grade "C", School did not make AYP 10-11: Outstanding, School Grade "A", School did make AYP. 11-12: School Grade "B"
Assis Principal	Kristen McCaskill	Elementary Ed., Educational Leadership	10	2	09-10: Very Effective, School Grade "C", School did not make AYP 10-11: Outstanding, School Grade "A", School did make AYP. 11-12: School Grade "B"

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Karen Cooper	Elementary Education, Reading Endorsement	35	10	10-11: School Grade "A", School did make AYP. 11-12: School Grade "B"

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	Mentoring Partnerships	M. Thomas	end of school year	
2	Participation in regional job fair for teachers	M. Thomas	summer	

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
0	

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
35	2.9%(1)	14.3%(5)	34.3%(12)	48.6%(17)	37.1%(13)	97.1%(34)	14.3%(5)	0.0%(0)	37.1%(13)

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
Jill Thomas	Danielle Hunter	Danielle is a beginning speech teacher. Jill is certified in Speech-Language Impaired (K-12)	Classroom observation and co-planning

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Dixie County Title I
School Year 2011-12
Title I contact: Frances Bray

Title I will be providing:
Anderson Elementary School with two teachers for students that need direct instruction and 25% of the Reading Coach's salary.
Title I will continue to furnish teacher in-service on Read Naturally, Writers in Control, SUMS, My Reading Coach, Failure Free and other programs, classroom materials/supplies and after-school tutoring.
SES tutoring for students for students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on FCAT will be offered in the fall. This program is for students in grade 3-5. A provider fair will be held at both elementary schools in conjunction with Open House at the beginning of school. Title I is working hard to provide programs that help all students succeed to the best of their ability.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Working in conjunction with surrounding counties to identify and provide services to migrants children.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Trainings for teachers: PD to help teachers communicate effectively with parents; further teachers'understanding of Text Complexity/CCSS; RTI training and implementation; Discovery Education training for student progress monitoring

Title III

n/a

Title X- Homeless

Teachers inform our guidance department of possible homeless children. Our guidance department attempts to contact parents and provide further information to our district administrator(s).

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Teachers inform our guidance department of possible homeless children. Our guidance department attempts to contact parents and provide further information to our district administrator(s).

Violence Prevention Programs

We work in conjuction with the Dixie County Sheriff's Department to offer the DARE program to our students. Our students undergo a DARE curriculum with a trained DARE officer. This program is offered to all K-5th grade students. The goal for our students is to complete the DARE program and participate in a "graduation" at the end of their 5th grade year.

Nutrition Programs

In addition to our daily breakfast and lunch meals, our Food Service program offers free after school snacks to after school students, as well as free lunches during the summer. We have an active Wellness Policy to encourage healthy decisions at meal/snack time.

Housing Programs

Available in our community.

Head Start

Head Start is available in our community. Head Start students are invited to our school during the school year to participate in various activities, including screening for entering Kindergarten.

Adult Education

n/a

Career and Technical Education

n/a

Job Training

n/a

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, District ESE, Guidance Counselor, 4 General Education, Special Education Teacher

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 leadership team meets on a quarterly basis to discuss the goals of the RtI process. We evaluate universal assessments which guide our decisions about budget and professional development needs. The RtI team is responsible for bringing other stakeholders to the meetings such as district ESE staff. This team also ensures that RtI is being done with fidelity and documentation of goals and strategies are correct. The leadership team is also responsible for scheduling quarterly and monthly meetings with grade levels. Because RtI addresses the needs of all students, the RtI problem solving process is the driving force for all decisions of our school and the different leadership teams.

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

The role of the leadership team is to closely monitor the School Improvement Plan and to continue to look at effective ways to achieve and successfully make our AMO goals through student growth, achievement, etc, and to implement instructional focus.

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.

We will be using data from FCAT, FAIR assessment, Discovery Education, Skyward, KidBiz, Kids College, Failure Free, STAR, Read Naturally, FCAT Test Maker and student work samples.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Summer training, ongoing professional development throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Quarterly grade level meetings to discuss needs and to redirect/clarify as needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Literaacy Team consists of:
Mike Thomas
Kristen McCaskill
Karen Cooper
Heather Dixon
Carol Anne Forehand
Aimee St.Laurent
Chasity Lord
Denee Hurst

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

Literacy Team meets at least monthly to discuss school wide literacy successes and concerns. Reading Coach, Principal or AP act as facilitators.

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

To provide guidance and direction to faculty in administering quality literacy instruction to meet the needs of all students. This team will provide guidance with RtI, FAIR, Failure Free and Team Read Initiatives. Weekly grade level data meetings will be held to monitor student progress.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/3/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Pre-K to Kindergarten Transition Team is in place consisting of: Elementary Reading Coach, Pre-K teachers and K Teachers. The team works in conjunction with community programs (Head Start) and parents to provide information and assistance to adults who will insure a smooth and seamless transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. Pre-K facilities are invited to our school in the Spring of each year. Incoming Kindergarten students are screened in the Spring in order to begin planning for Fall instruction. Pre-K students experience an orientation into one of the Kindergarten classrooms.

*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:	Increase percentage of Level 3 studentsto 50%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (51)	50% (103)

	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 time	Schedule RtI instruction for all Tier 2 and 3 students, utilize additional staff for RtI, professional developement, scheduling.	School admin, instructional personnel, reading coach.	Periodic assessments, RtI meetings.	FCAT, FAIR, Discovery Education
2	Lack of time	Schedule RtI instuction for all Tier 2 and 3 students, utilize additional staff for RtI, professional development, scheduling.	School admin, instructional personnel, reading coach	Periodic assessments, RtI meetings,	FCAT, FAIR

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:	Anderson will increase the number of students scoring FCAT Level 4 and 5 to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (44)	40% (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	Poor test taking strategies	Instruction focused on test taking skills and strategies including modeling and practice	Classroom teachers, school admin.	Progress monitoring including Discovery Education, A.R., FAIR, and Kidbiz.	FCAT students scoring Level 4 and 5.
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:	Improve percentage of students making learning gains to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

63% (106)		65% (110)		

	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	Transfer skills and strategies to assessments.	Incorporate FRI strategies in instruction.	Instructional staff	Periodic monitoring, and assessments, grade level meetings, data analysis	FCAT, and FAIR
2	Time for intervention and RtI groups	Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will recieve 20-50 minutes of RtI daily reading instruction, scheduling.	Instructional staff, RtI teachers	RtI data meetings, grade level meetings	Failure Free, A.R., FAIR, Discovery Ed, Kidbiz, FCAT Success Maker, RtI 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:	
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:	Percent of Bottom Quartile students achieving learning gains in reading will increase to 60%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (7)	60% (22)

	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
	Limited vocabulary	Intensive vocabulary instruction utilizing	Instructional staff, Reading coaches	Periodic assessments,data	FAIR, Discovery Ed and FCAT

		Failure Free, Elements of Reading, Kidbiz, Vocabulary A-Z, Harcourt and Scott Foresman Reading Series and other materials or programs.		analysis	
1					
2	Higher order questioning delivered by teachers	Teachers will be trained through TEAM Read monthly PD, then sharing strategies with instructional staff	School admin, Reading coaches	Monitoring, periodic assessments, data analysis	FCAT and FAIR

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 #
	Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), students performing at proficiency level in reading will increase annually. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	59%	62%	66%	70%	74%	

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:	Minority groups will increase in proficiency
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (11)	50% (18)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited vocabulary	Intensive vocabulary instruction utilizing Failure Free, Elements of Reading, Kidbiz, Harcourt and Scott Foresman Reading Series, Vocabulary A-Z, and other materials and programs.	Instructional staff, reading coach	Periodic assessments, data analysis	FCAT, FAIR
2					

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Students with disabilities at AES will increase their progress to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (16)	40% (20)

	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	Vocabulary limitations	Intensive vocabulary instruction utilizing Failure Free, Elements of Reading, Kidbiz, Harcourt and Scott Foresman Reading Series, Vocabulary A-Z, and other materials and programs.	Instructional staff, reading coach	Periodic assessments, data analysis	FCAT, FAIR
2	Wide range of reading comprehension, fluency and vocabulary deficiences amoung SWD students	RtI small group instruction focused on individual needs and skills utilizing FRI strategies, Failure Free, Kidbiz, Elements of Reading, Harcourt and Scsott Foresman reading series and other programs.	Instructional staff, school admin, reading coach	RtI team, grade level teams, periodic assessments FAIR, Kidbiz, and Thinkgate	FCAT, FAIR, AYP 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:	70% of ED students will achieve FCAT levels of 3 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (69)	70% (116)

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

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	Vocabulary limitations	Intensive vocabulary instruction utilizing Failure Free, Elements of Reading, Kidbiz, Harcourt and Scott Foresman Reading Series, Vocabulary A-Z, and other materials and programs.	Instructional staff, reading coach	Periodic assessments, data analysis	FCAT, FAIR
2	Limited vocabulary development	Intensive vocabulary instruction utilizing materials and strategies from FRI, Failure Free, Elements of Reading, Kidbiz, Harcourt and Scott Foresman reading series and other materials and programs.	Instructional staff, school admin., reading coaches.	Periodic assessments, RtI meetings, grade level meetings	FCAT, FAIR

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
Discovery Education	K-5	DE representative	All Science, Math and Reading teachers in grades K-5	Pre-planning, Aug. 15, 2012 and Oct. 4, 2012	Use of progress monitoring tool	Reading Coach, Administration
Kidbiz	3-5	Achieve 3000 representative	All Science, Math and Reading teachers in grades K-5	Aug 28, 2012	Monitoring student usage and reports	Reading Coach, Administration
CCSS	K-5	Reading Coach and Asst. Principal	K-5 teachers	Aug. 1-2 (Grades 3-5); Aug. 17, 2012 (Grades K-2)	Data meetings	Reading Coach, Administration
Text Complexity/Close Reading/Read Alouds	K-5	Reading Coach and Asst. Principal	K-5 teachers	Aug. 1-2, 17, 2012 Oct. 10, 2012	Lesson plans with TC/CR/RA highlighted	Reading Coach, Administration

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:

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:	AES will achieve the goal of 50% achieving proficiency in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (45)	50% (23)

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	Becoming better acquainted with the NGSSS	Summer Training to investigate NGSSS	Principal	On-going monitoring of Power Standards Maps	Discovery Education assessment
2	Using Instructional Material that was new last year.	Become better acquanted with materials.	District Staff	Use of materials with fidelity throughout the school year	Discovery Education assessment
3	Pacing	Creation of Power Standard Map to guide instruction	Principal and Teachers	Monthly monitoring of Power Standard Maps with teachers	Discovery Education assessment
4	Getting used to the new testing and reporting categories with FCAT 2.0	Professional Development using the New Test Design Summard and Specifications for each grade	Principal	Lesson Plans	FCAT 2011

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:	AES will increase to 45% of students achieving proficiency (level 4 and 5) in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (27)	45% (93)

	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	Poor test taking strategies	Instruction focused on test taking skills and strategies including modeling and practice	Classroom teachers, school admin.	Progress monitoring including Discovery Education, A.R., FAIR, and Kidbiz.	FCAT students scoring Level 4 and 5.
2	Transition from SSS to NGSSS	Test-taking stategies such as manipulating word problems.	teachers	student work; teacher observation	FCAT 2012

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 Spring 2013, at least 60% of the total student population will achieve a learning gain in Math as evidenced on the school grade report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6% (8)	60% (124)

	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	Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	Weekly grade level meetings to monitor student performance and appropriate lesson planning to meet expectations.	Principal and teachers	Chapter and Big Idea Assessments	Discovery Ed and FCAT scores

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:	Percent of Bottom Quartile students achieving learning gains in Math will increase to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	40% (20)

	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	Knowledge of basic mathematics facts	Weekly timed assessments to help create automaticity in fact knowledge and computer based practice	Classroom teachers	Timed Tests	Timed tests

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 #
	Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), students performing at proficiency level in Math will increase annually.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	62%	65%	68%	72%	76%	

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:	Minority groups will increase in proficiency
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (24)	An increase in minority group proficiency

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Knowledge of basic mathematics facts	Weekly timed assessments to help create automaticity in fact knowledge and computer-based practice	Classroom teachers	Timed Tests	Timed Tests

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:	
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Students with disabilities at AES will increase in proficiency to 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (21)	49% (26)

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	Being able to visualize the math problem	Small group instruction with manipulatives	Classroom teacher	Teacher observation	Text 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:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	AES will increase satisfactory progress with ED students to 39% in Math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (48)	39% (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	Student needs to visualize the math problems	Small group instruction with manipulatives	Classroom teacher	Teacher observation	Text assessment

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
Acaletics inservice	3-5	Acaletics provider	Math teachers in grades 3-5	Classroom modeling in September	Teacher observation	Classroom teacher

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:	AES will inrease number of students obtaining proficiency in science to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (11)	65% (41)

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 Textbook Series	Using Science textbooks to assess student knowledge through Chapter tests as well as use of workbooks.	School Admin	Walkthroughs during Science instruction.	Chapter Assessments and FCAT
2	Kids College	Online computer program that places emphasis on Science.	Teachers Grade 3-5	printed data reports.	Assessment data and FCAT
3	FCAT Test Maker	Online computer program that places emphasis on Science using NGSSS.	Teachers Grade 3-5	Printed data reports.	Assessment data and 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 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:	AES will achieve 20% proficiency in level 4 and 5 students on FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0)	20% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited science vocabulary	Incorporate science vocabulary across the curriculum.	school admin	Discovery Education	FCAT
2	New Science textbooks.	Use textbooks that follow NGSSS.	School admin	Chapter tests	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:

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 Learning Wheels PD	K-5	Learning Wheels representative	School-wide	Saturdays in September	classroom observations	Admin/coach

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:			AEs will achieve 90% of students scoring 3.5 or above.	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (41)	90% (57)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Integrating professional development strategies: Writer's In Control	Classroom teachers will attend professional development trainings on both strategies and plan writing instruction together.	Teachers, school admin	School wide writing prompts beginning in January 2012	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 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
M Forney inservice	4th grade	M Forney	grade level	August, pre-planning	classroom observation	Admin

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:	AES will decrease the number of students missing 10 or more days of school.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
N/A	N/A
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
5% (12)	Less than 6%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
-1% (1)	Less than 6%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Notification of Absences	Parent notification letters mailed home	Principal	Daily response of parents	Skyward Attendance Data

| 2 | Parental Apathy | School Truancy Officer | Mike Thomas | Periodic review of absences | Skyward Attendance 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
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	AES will decrease the number of in-school suspensions
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

0	25
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	15
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1	3

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Classroom Management of new teachers (refresher for current teachers)	New teachers will observe their mentors classroom management techniques. School administration will monitor discipline through walk throughs and office referrals	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	Skyward data reports on discipline regarding in-school and out-of-school suspensions
2	New behavior software program	This software program is used to hold children accountable and come up with problem solving strategies when dealing with inappropriate actions.	Assistant Principal	evaluate who has used this program.	Computer program and evulate increase or decrease in suspensions.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase Parent Involvement
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Currently about 10% of parents attend Family Learning Nghts with their students.	Increase Parent involvement by at least 5%.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents do not receive notification of school events.	Relay school information through a variety of sources including flyers, student planners, media/newspaper, school website and Skyward parent access portal.	AES Instructional staff and Admin	Survey	Survey feedback

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

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
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

⃝ 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 10/3/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dixie School District JAMES M. ANDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	81%	80%	50%	287	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	64%	61%			125	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?	63% (YES)	54% (YES)			117	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					529	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dixie School District JAMES M. ANDERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	80%	65%	56%	275	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	51%	47%			98	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?	42% (NO)	47% (NO)			89	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					462	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested