

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LAKE WHITNEY ELEMENTARY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Elizabeth Prince

SAC Chair: Karyn Hewett

Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Last Modified on: 1/29/2013

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					<p>2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading, 91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards</p>

Principal	Elizabeth Prince	Specialist Degree/Educational Leadership Masters Degree/Elementary Education 1-6 / ESOL Endorsement Bachelors Degree/ Marketing	14	14	<p>in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2007-2008: A grade; 90% met high standards in reading,86% met high standards in math 79% met high standards in writing; 65% met high standards in science; 66% made learning gains in reading; 62% made learning gains in math; 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-no</p> <p>2006-2007: A grade; 92% met high standards in reading,92% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 86% made learning gains in reading; 77% made learning gains in math; 94% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>1999-2006 refer to FLDOE School Accountability Report</p>
-----------	------------------	---	----	----	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
					<p>2011-2012: A grade: 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p> <p>2010-2011: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading,92% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 74% made learning gains in math; 67% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 70% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-</p>

CRT	Kimberlee Goodson	Bachelors Degree / Elementary Education 1-6	15	11	<p>100%</p> <p>2009-2010: A grade; 91% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 91% met high standards in writing; 74% met high standards in science; 60% made learning gains in reading; 66% made learning gains in math; 60% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 76% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2008-2009: A grade; 93% met high standards in reading,91% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 76% met high standards in science; 74% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>2007-2008: A grade; 90% met high standards in reading,86% met high standards in math 79% met high standards in writing; 65% met high standards in science; 66% made learning gains in reading; 62% made learning gains in math; 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 58% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-no</p> <p>2006-2007: A grade; 92% met high standards in reading,92% met high standards in math 87% met high standards in writing; 72% met high standards in science; 86% made learning gains in reading; 77% made learning gains in math; 94% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 66% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-yes-100%</p> <p>1999-2006 refer to FLDOE School Accountability Report</p>
.5 Instructional Support/Reading	Nancy Dudek	Masters Degree/Elementary Education	9		<p>2011-2012: A grade; 85% met high standards in reading, 81% met high standards in math, 92% met high standards in writing; 81% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 83% made learning gains in math; 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.</p>

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Lake Whitney Elementary operates as a Professional Learning Community.	Principal CRT, Instructional Support Grade Level Chairperson	6/13	
2	District requires hiring of highly qualified candidates.	Principal	6/13	
3	To retain highly qualified teachers, we have have teachers assist with the interviewing and selection of candidates.	Principal CRT, Instructional Support, Grade Level Chairperson	6/13	

4	A mentoring program and staff development also supports new teachers.	Principal CRT, Instructional Support Grade Level Chairperson	6/13	
---	---	--	------	--

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
51	3.9%(2)	17.6%(9)	60.8%(31)	17.6%(9)	39.2%(20)	100.0%(51)	7.8%(4)	0.0%(0)	64.7%(33)

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
Susan Bryant	Kellie Thomas-Anneus	Ms. Thomas-Anneus was Mrs. Bryant's senior intern and worked together on the same grade level.	Induction meetings, Clinical Education Class, classroom management, lesson plans, technology assistance, weekly meetings with the mentee and any other issues that may arise.
Anne O'hara Axtell	Jessica Ranieri	Ms. Ranieri was a severely handicapped paraprofessional last year. Mrs. Axtell is one of our PKVE teachers.	Induction meetings, Clinical Education Class, classroom management, lesson plans, technology assistance, weekly meetings with the mentee and any other issues that may arise.
Patricia Kroll-Whiffen	Denise Mock	Mrs. Whiffen is an experienced special area teacher.	Induction meetings, Clinical Education Class, classroom management, lesson plans, technology assistance, weekly meetings with the mentee and any other issues that may arise.
		Mrs. Lane is an experienced substitute and has worked	Induction meetings, Clinical Education Class, classroom management,

Robin Parker

Jessica Lane

well with Mrs. Parker in the past. They are both second grade teachers this year.

lesson plans, technology assistance, weekly meetings with the mentee and any other issues that may arise.

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal
Staffing Coordinator
CRT
School Psychologist
Speech Therapists
Guidance Counselor
Instructional Support Teachers
Classroom 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?

- The established MTSS team provides information about progress monitoring and intervention strategies for struggling students.
- Teachers meets regularly with the MTSS team to identify and monitor progress of students who are in need of interventions in the classrooms.
- The MTSS team along with the classroom teachers prescribes interventions and conducts progress monitoring of the interventions to determine success.

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?

Selected members of the MTSS Leadership Team assisted with the development of the school improvement plan. The school improvement plan incorporates the core principles of MTSS, which include early intervention; using scientific, research-based materials; using data to make decisions; and monitoring student progress to inform instruction.

MTSS Implementation

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

In order to increase areas of identified deficiencies in Reading, Math, Science, Writing and Behavior, FCAT scores, benchmark Data, FAIR and schoolwide discipline referrals will be analyzed by the Principal, CRT, grade levels, and the school's MTSS team at the beginning of the school year. Based upon the success of the plan that was implemented in the 2010-2011 school year, we will continue with the following MTSS plan.

The following actions were taken:

- The third through fifth grades analyzed FCAT and FAIR data, as well as school based assessments to determine student reading levels.
- Grade level reading groups were created within the 90 minute reading block.
- The established MTSS team provided information about progress monitoring and intervention strategies for struggling students.
- Teachers met regularly with the MTSS team to identify and monitor progress of students who were in need of interventions in the classrooms.
- The MTSS team along with the classroom teachers prescribed interventions and conducted progress monitoring of the interventions to determine success. This process is designed to decrease any disproportionate classification in Special Education.
- The lowest 5% of fourth graders received intensive remedial writing instruction given by the principal.
- Additional support via the Read 180 program was provided to identified students in fourth and fifth grades.
- One-on-one support was provided to identified students in all grade level K-5.
- Vertical dialog of data sharing was facilitated periodically throughout the year.
- Grade levels met weekly to facilitate instruction.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All staff members have been trained on the MTSS process and ongoing updates are provided as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Our MTSS team meets weekly to follow up with the progress monitoring of students needing additional support with academics or behavior. In addition, a staff member is charged with monitoring all students identified as a MTSS student and oversee the fidelity of interventions in the classroom.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal
Staffing Coordinator
CRT
School Psychologist
Guidance Counselor
Instructional Support Teachers

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

The LLT team meets to analyze data and to provide teachers with support for the implementation of the Common Core Standards. An instructional support teacher is assigned to assist teachers in with materials, strategies, and other support in order for them to collaborate through their Professional Learning Communities for the implementation of the Common Core.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year will be the implementation and preparation for the Common Core Curriculum as well as the integration of the high effect size strategies.

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.

N/A

*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:	On the 2012 FCAT, 25% (78) of our students scored at Level 3 on FCAT Reading in grades 3-5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT, 25% (78) of our students scored at Level 3 on FCAT Reading in grades 3-5.	On the 2013 FCAT, 28%(87)of our students will score at level 3 on FCAT Reading in grades 3-5.

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	Some teachers lack training with differentiated instruction.	Ability Grouping Provide ongoing professional development in differentiating instruction during 90 minute reading block MTSS interventions	Principal MTSS Team Staffing coordinator Instructional support CRT classroom teachers	Classroom Walk Throughs Data Meetings MTSS Progress Monitoring Meetings PLC's	FCAT FAIR District Edusoft Skill Based Assessments
2	New team members to the grade level: One in second, one in third, one in fourth and one in fifth.	Reading intervention, differentiating the curriculum, NGSSS, Common Core, and grade level calibrations.	Principal, CRT, Instructional support teachers, Grade Level experts.	Classroom Walk Throughs, Data Meetings, MTSS, Progress Monitoring Meetings, PLC's.	FCAT FAIR District Edusoft Skill Based Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 June 2012, 57% (175) of 3rd - 5th grade students scored at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 57% (175) of 3rd - 5th grade students scored at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Reading Test.	By June 2013, 60% (188) of the 3rd - 5th grade students will score at level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Reading 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	Students' lack of motivation to maintain high level of performance	Increase use of technology and provide additional high interest reading materials in order for students to maintain their high performance	Principal CRT classroom Teachers Instructional Support Media Specialist	Increase in library circulation, increase in students participating in the Accelerated Reader Program.	FCAT, FAIR, District Edusoft, AR goals, and Skill Based Assessments
2	Expanding the curriculum to challenge students performing above grade level.	Implementing enrichment groups, provide teachers with additional training using the Promethean boards, and additional technology integration.	Principal CRT, all Teachers	Classroom walkthrough, increase in student engagement, student responses with ActivExpressions, Edmodo usage.	FCAT FAIR District Edusoft Skill Based Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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.	In June 2012, 72%(158)made learning gains on FCAT
--	---

Reading Goal #3a:	Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 72%(158)made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	By June 2013, 75%(165) taking the FCAT Reading Test will make reading gains.

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	Maintaining FCAT levels for our high performing students.	Maintain a school-wide monitoring committee to monitor the progress of the high achieving students.	Principal, CRT, Instructional Support, MTSS Team, Teachers	Monitor student progress through formal and informal assessments.	FCAT results, Benchmarks, FAIR, Textbook Assessments, Check point assessments.
2	Teachers lack professional development with high effect size strategies	Provide teachers with professional development opportunities to learn more about high effect size strategies	Principal, CRT, Instructional Support, Teachers	iObservation, PLC notes, grade level meetings, exit slips from professional development sessions	Formal and informal Teacher Assessments through iObservation

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:	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
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 June 2012, 73% (38) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 73% (38) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 76% (41) students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers matching the most effective reading strategies and interventions to maximize student performance.	Incorporation of Marzano's High Probability strategies into daily lesson plans and researched based interventions.	Principal, CRT, Instructional support teachers, Classroom Teachers	Monitor Lesson Plans, Teacher Observations, ongoing progress monitoring	Classroom Assessments, Edusoft, FAIR, FCAT
2	Teachers lack training in the use of high effect size strategies	Provide teachers with professional development	Principal, CRT, Instructional support teachers, Classroom Teachers	Monitor Lesson Plans, Teacher Observations, ongoing progress monitoring	Formal and Informal Classroom Assessments, Edusoft, FAIR, FCAT
3	Students needing more direct instruction in reading.	Provide small group tutoring before and/or after school.	Principal, CRT, Classroom teachers, tutoring teachers	Identify students' area of difficulty, match resources to close the gap, monitor progress through progress monitoring techniques.	Formal and Informal Classroom Assessments, FAIR, FCAT

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 #					
	Lake Whitney will reduce its achievement gap by 50% over the next 6 years starting at 84% baseline data in 2010-2011 and ending at a 90% reduction in the achievement gap in 2016-2017.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	85%	86%	87%	88%	89%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2012, student subgroups not making AMO is as follows: Asian: 13% (4) Black: 40% (13) Hispanic: 19%(7) ELL: 39% (9) Economically Disadvantaged: N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, student subgroups not making AMO is as follows: Asian: 13% (4) Black: 40% (13) Hispanic: 19%(7) ELL: 39%(9) Economically Disadvantaged: N/A	In 2013, student subgroups expected of not making AMO is as follows: Asian: 10%(3) Black: 37% (10) Hispanic: 16% (6) ELL: 36% (7) Economically Disadvantaged: 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	Teachers monitoring all subgroups to ensure that they are all making adequate progress	Grade level PLC meetings, Student data chats, RTI/MTSS, IEP meetings	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Classroom Teachers, Support Personnel	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC meeting notes, progress monitoring, etc.	FCAT, Benchmark Assessment, Unit/chapter tests, common assessments, checkpoint assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In July 2012, 59% of our ELL students scored at the satisfactory level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In July 2012, 59% of our ELL students scored at the satisfactory level.	In July 2013, 59% of our ELL students will score at the satisfactory level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ensuring all ELL students make adequate progress in all subject areas	Grade level PLC meetings, Student data chats, RtI/MTSS, IEP meetings	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Classroom Teachers, Support Personnel	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC meeting notes, progress monitoring, etc.	FCAT, Benchmark Assessment, Unit/chapter tests, common assessments, checkpoint assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	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	Regular education and exceptional education teachers collaborating to ensure that all SWD students make adequate progress in all subject areas	Grade level PLC meetings, Student data chats, MTSS, IEP meetings	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Classroom Teachers, Support Personnel	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC meeting notes, progress monitoring, etc.	FCAT, Benchmark Assessment, Unit/chapter tests, common assessments, checkpoint assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In July 2012, 56% of our ED students scored at the satisfactory level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In July 2012, 56% of our ED students scored at the satisfactory level.			In July 2013, 68% of our ED students will score at the satisfactory level.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ensuring all Economically Disadvantaged Students make adequate progress in all subject areas	Grade level PLC meetings, Student data chats, RtI/MTSS, IEP meetings	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coaches, Classroom Teachers, Support Personnel Classroom Walkthroughs,	PLC meeting notes, progress monitoring, etc.	FCAT, Benchmark Assessment, Unit/chapter tests, common assessments, checkpoint assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core and Grade Level Calibration	K-5	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team	All Instructional personnel	August 2012 through May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC Agenda, Data Meetings, FCIM, MTSS, Formal and Informal teacher assessments.	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team
Differentiated small group instruction within the 90 minute reading block and interventions/enrichment block	K-5	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team	All Instructional personnel	August 2012 through May 20	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC Agenda, Data Meetings, FCIM, MTSS, Formal and Informal teacher assessments.	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team
Training for all teacher on Marzano's high effect size strategies in all subject areas.	K-5	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers,	All Instructional personnel	August 2012 through May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC Agenda and notes, Data Meetings, FCIM, Formal and Informal teacher assessments.	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
There is an error on this page and would not allow for the other fields to be entered. Evidence-based programs: Trainings for Read 180, Florida Ready, Houghton Mifflin			

Training Other budget items include: Technology: to engage student in the curriculum interactively (\$2,500 through general budget) Professional development: To provide teachers with professional development with Marzaqno's high effect size strategies (\$5,000) Other: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers and staff to attend off campus professional development (\$15,000)	Substitutes needed for teachers, Technology: Read 180, Kids College, FASTT Math, other computer software Professional Development: School-wide staff development Other: Conferences, FDLRS, on-line courses, substitutes	Title II, General Budget, Dolphin Education Fund, PTO	\$24,600.00
			Subtotal: \$24,600.00
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: \$24,600.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:		In 2013, 90% (36) students scored at the proficiency level in listening/speaking on the CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
In 2012, 87% (34) students scored at the proficiency level in listening/speaking on the CELLA.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students entering school with limited English proficiency skills.	Teachers will apply effective ELL strategies with delivering instructional	Principal, ELL Compliance Teacher, CRT, Classroom Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FCAT, CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	In 2013, 79% (32) students scored at the proficiency

CELLA Goal #2:	level in reading.				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
In 2012, 77% (30) students scored at the proficiency level 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.			In 2013, 79% (31) students scored at the proficiency level in writing.			
CELLA Goal #3:						
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:						
In 2012, 79% (31) students scored at the proficiency level 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	Students entering into the school with limited English proficiency.	Teachers will utilize ELL strategies when delivering instruction.	Principal, Compliance Teacher, Classroom Teacher	Formal and informal assessments	FCAT, CELLA	

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:	In June 2012, 28% (89) of our students scored at level 3 on FCAT Math in grades 3-5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 28% (89) of our students scored at level 3 on FCAT Math in grades 3-5.	On the 2013 FCAT, 31% (98) or more of our students will score at level 3 on FCAT Math in grades 3-5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not mastering basic math facts.	Additional classroom time devoted to skills practice.	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Precision Teaching materials, Promethean Planet, ActivExpressions, Fast Math	Ongoing: Classroom Assessments, Edusoft Fast Math
2	Teachers matching the most effective instructional strategy and intervention to maximize student performance	Provide teacher with professional development with high effect size strategies	Principal, CRT, Teachers	iObservation, formal and informal assessment, PLC notes	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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.	In June 2012, 48% (152) of 3rd - 5th grade students scored
--	--

Mathematics Goal #2a:	at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 48% (152) of 3rd - 5th grade students scored at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math Test.	By June 2013, 51% (160) of the 3rd - 5th grade students will score at level 4 or 5 on the 2012 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	Teachers continuing to challenge students performing above grade level.	Incorporating technology into daily lessons	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Classroom Walk Throughs, Lesson Plans	Classroom Assessments, Edusoft, 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	In June 2012, 83% (240) students made learning gains on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 83% (240) students made learning gains on FCAT Math.	By June 2013, 86% (270) students taking the FCAT reading test will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Students not proficient with basic math operations and concepts	Additional intervention strategies to promote master of math concepts; Promethean Activities FCAT Explorer, FAST Math, Florida Ready for fifth grade	CRT, Teachers	Grade level data meetings	Ongoing classroom assessments, Edusoft, 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	In June 2012, 72% (57) of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 72% (57) of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains on FCAT Math.	By June 2013, 75% (59) of the lowest 25% of students will make learning gains on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of strong foundation in basic math skills	Additional usage of computer based math programs: FCAT Explorer and Fast Math	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Analyzing reports from these programs	Ongoing classroom assessments, Edusoft, FCAT
2	Students needing more direct instruction in reading.	Provide small group tutoring before and/or after school.	Principal, CRT, Classroom teachers, tutoring teachers	Identify students' area of difficulty, match resources to close the gap, monitor progress through progress monitoring techniques.	Formal and Informal Classroom Assessments, FAIR, FCAT
	Students needing more	Provide small group	Principal, CRT,	Identify students' area of	Formal and

3	direct instruction in reading.	tutoring before and/or after school.	Classroom teachers, tutoring teachers	difficulty, match resources to close the gap, monitor progress through progress monitoring techniques.	Informal Classroom Assessments, FAIR, FCAT
---	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

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 # Lake Whitney will reduce its achievement gap by 50% over the next 6 years starting at 83% baseline data in 2010-2011 and ending at a 89% reduction in the achievement gap in 2016-2017.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	84%	85%	86%	87%	88%	

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:	In 2012, student subgroups not making AMO is as follows: Asian: 10% (3) Black: 59% (19) Hispanic: 30% (11) White: 14%(28) ELL: 43% (10) SWD: 67% (12) Economically Disadvantaged: N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, student subgroups not making AMO is as follows: Asian: 10% (3) Black: 59% (19) Hispanic: 30% (11) White: 14%(28) ELL: 43% (10) SWD: 67% (12) Economically Disadvantaged: N/A	In 2013, student subgroups will make AMO is as follows: Asian: 7% (2) Black: 53% (17) Hispanic: 27% (10) White: 11% (26) ELL: 40% (8) SWD: 64% (10) Economically Disadvantaged: 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	Teachers matching the most effective mathematical strategies and intervention to maximize student performance	We will provide professional development for teachers based upon high effect size strategies and common core	Principal, CRT, Instructional Support Teachers, Classroom Teachers	Monitor lesson plans, teacher observations, ongoing progress monitoring	FCAT

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	In June 2012, 55% (10) of our ELL students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 55% (10) of our ELL students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.	In June 2013, 76% (15) of our ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of English proficiency on the reading portion of the mathematics assessments	Incorporate ELL strategies in math lessons for ELL students	Principal, Compliance Teacher, Classroom Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FCAT

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In June 2012, 33% (10) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 33% (10) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.	In June 2013, 48% (13) of our SWD students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students limited proficiency with basic math skills	FASTT math	Classroom teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FCAT

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In June 2012, 44% (16) of our ED students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 44% (16) of our ED students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.	In June 2013, 71% (20) of our ED students will make satisfactory progress on the FCAT Mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers will ensure that all SWD students make adequate progress in mathematics.	FAST Math	Classroom Teachers	Formal and informal assessments	FCAT

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core and Grade Level Calibration	K-5	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team	All Instructional personnel	August 2012 through May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC Meetings, FCIM, MTSS	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team
Differentiated small group instruction within the math block and interventions/enrichment block	K-5	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team	All Instructional personnel	August 2012 through May 20	Classroom Walkthroughs, PLC Agenda, Data Meetings, FCIM, MTSS	Principal, CRT, Instructional Coach, Classroom teachers, MTSS team

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:	In June 2012, 45% (42) of 5th grade students scored at level 3 on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In June 2012, 45% (42) of 5th grade students scored at level 3 on FCAT Science.	In June 2013, 48% (45) of 5th grade students are expected to score at level 3 or higher on FCAT Science.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not identifying students who are not proficient with the Next Generation of Sunshine State Standards	Teacher training on NGSSS to identify student weaknesses	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Classroom Walk Throughs, PLCs	Ongoing classroom assessments, Edusoft, FCAT
2	Lack of materials and training for teachers and lack of hands on experiences for students	Teachers training on Science Boot Camp	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Classroom Walk Throughs, PLCs	Ongoing classroom assessments, Edusoft, FCAT, formal and informal assessments.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	In June 2012, 36% (33) of 5th grade students scored at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In June 2012, 36% (33) of 5th grade students scored at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science.	By June 2013, 38% (35) of 5th grade students will score at level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

		Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack knowledge of science vocabulary	Teachers will provide intensive focus on science vocabulary	CRT, Teachers	Lesson Plan checks	Ongoing classroom assessments, Edusoft, 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:	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
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						

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:	In May 2012, 92% (101) of 4th grade students scored at level 3 or higher on FCAT Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In May 2012, 92% (101) of 4th grade students scored at level 3 or higher on FCAT Writing.	In May 2013, we will maintain 92% (101) of 4th grade students scoring at level 3 or higher on FCAT 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	Maintaining 100% proficiency	Continue with Write Track training	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Monthly data meetings	Monthly writing prompts
2	Students lack of grammar skills and mechanics of writing	Teachers will embed writing across the curriculum.	Principal, CRT, Teachers	Monthly writing prompts, rubrics in daily writing	FCAT, Monthly writing prompts

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	The attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 96.5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 96.5%.	We will maintain the attendance rate of 96.5% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
According to EDW, 120 students were identified as having excessive absences during the 2011-2012 school year.	The 2013 expected number of students with excessive absences will be reduced by 5%, from 120 students during the 2013 school year to 115 students.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
According to EDW, 38 students were identified as having excessive tardies during the 2011-2012 school year.	The 2013 expected number of students with excessive tardies will be reduced by 5%, from 38 students to 36 students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents plan trips resulting in student absences.	Remind parents of the importance of the continuity of instruction.	Registrar	Education Data Warehouse.	Absentee rate.

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:	Lake Whitney has incorporated school-wide discipline procedures which has minimized the number of suspensions at our school.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
n/a	n/a				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
n/a	n/a				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 2 out of school suspensions.	In the 2012-2013 school year, we will maintain the number of out of school suspensions to 2.				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 2 out of school suspensions.	In the 2012-2013 school year, we will maintain the number of out of school suspensions to 2.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students enrolling into our school without knowing all school policies and procedures.	Orient new students to school procedures	Guidance Counselor	Number of referrals for Level 2 and above violations according to the Code of Student Conduct.	Discipline referrals.

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	During the 2011-2012 school year 40 parents attending the FCAT 2.0 parent night.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
During the 2011-2012 school year 40 parents attending	We expect to have 60 parents attend the FCAT 2.0

the FCAT 2.0 parent night.		parent night during the 2012-2013 school year.			
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	Due to scheduling conflicts, parents may chose not to attend this event.	We will survey parents of 3-5 grade students to determine if the presentation time should be moved.	CRT	Parent responses to the survey	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
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:		During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of our fifth grade students will have the opportunity for exposure to STEM activities.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students having limited practice for STEM activities	Classroom teachers will design lessons to incorporate STEM activities into math and science lessons.	Principal, CRT, Fifth Grade Classroom Teachers, Science Resource Teacher	Science interactive notebooks including STEM activities, rubrics, teacher observations.	FCAT, Edusoft Benchmark Test

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

Additional Goal(s)

Students who read on grade level by Age 9. Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students who read on grade level by Age 9. Goal Students who read on grade level by Age 9. Goal #1:			According to the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading assessment, 6% (6) students did not show grade level proficiency in reading by age 9.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
According to the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading assessment, 6% (6) students did not show grade level proficiency in reading by age 9.			By June 2013, we will decrease the number of students not showing grade level proficiency in reading by age 9 from 6% (6) to 3% (3) students.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of rigor for students in MTSS in tier II and tier III.	Provide opportunities for collaboration for teachers with the reading coach, CRT and grade level experts.	Principal, CRT, reading coach, classroom teachers	Increase the rigor of classroom interventions to address the needs of struggling readers in grades K-3.	FCAT Reading Level 3+, Grades 3, Progress monitoring tools (FAIR, FLKRS, CELLA, Common assessments, unit/chapter tests)

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Students who read on grade level by Age 9. Goal(s)

Students who become fluent in math operations. Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Students who become fluent in math operations. Goal		According to the 2011-2012 FCAT Math assessment, 5% (16) students did not show fluency in math operations in grades 3-5.			
Students who become fluent in math operations. Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
According to the 2011-2012 FCAT Math assessment, 5% (16) students did not show fluency in math operations in grades 3-5.		In June 2013, we will have decreased the number of students not showing fluency in math operations in grades 3-5 by 3% (9) students.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not mastering basic math facts, student not proficient with basic math concepts, lack of strong foundation with basic math skills.	Additional classroom time devoted to skills practice.	Principal, CRT, Classroom Teachers	Precision Teaching materials, Promethean Planet, ActivExpressions, FAST Math	FCAT Math, Edusoft, Fast Math, Kids College, progress monitoring tools (common assessments, unit/chapter test)

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Students who become fluent in math operations. Goal(s)

Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage Goal		In June 2012,Lake Whitney did not offer a fourth or fifth grade chorus.			
Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage Goal # 1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
In June 2012,Lake Whitney did not offer a fourth or fifth grade chorus.		By June 2013, all fourth and fifth grade students will have the opportunity to participate in our school chorus.			
Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students not being able	Entice student to want	Principal, music	Attendance sheets	Performances

1	to participate because of other obligations.	to participate in the chorus.	teacher, classroom teachers	both in school and out of school
---	--	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Maintain High Fine Arts Enrollment Percentage Goal(s)

Increase College and Career Awareness Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Increase College and Career Awareness Goal Increase College and Career Awareness Goal # 1:	In June 2012, 100%(10) of fourth and fifth grade teachers were trained in Destination College.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:

In June 2012, 100%(10) of fourth and fifth grade teachers were trained in Destination College.		By June 2013, we will implement 2 college awareness days school-wide.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students unaware of purpose of college	Provide awareness of higher education .	Principal, guidance counselor, classroom teachers	College awareness days, "Show Your Colors", morning announcement showcase of colleges	Participation in college color days

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

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

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

Budget:

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

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	There is an error on this page and would not allow for the other fields to be entered. Evidence-based programs: Trainings for Read 180, Florida Ready, Houghton Mifflin Training Other budget items include: Technology: to engage student in the curriculum interactively (\$2,500 through general budget) Professional development: To provide teachers with professional development with Marzano's high effect size strategies (\$5,000) Other: To provide professional development opportunities for teachers and staff to attend off campus professional development (\$15,000)	Substitutes needed for teachers, Technology: Read 180, Kids College, FASTT Math, other computer software Professional Development: School-wide staff development Other: Conferences, FDLRS, on-line courses, substitutes	Title II, General Budget, Dolphin Education Fund, PTO	\$24,600.00
				Subtotal: \$24,600.00
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: \$24,600.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/29/2012)

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

Meet to review School Improvement Plan, approve SAC by-laws, Advise the school on any ancillary academic or budgetary needs, create and distribute the SAC school-wide survey, publish survey results, advise the principal on school-wide concerns as a result of the survey.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Orange School District LAKE WHI TNEY ELEMENTARY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	92%	91%	81%	355	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	72%	74%			146	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	70% (YES)			137	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					638	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Orange School District LAKE WHI TNEY ELEMENTARY 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	91%	91%	91%	74%	347	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	67%	66%			133	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	60% (YES)	76% (YES)			136	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					616	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested