

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Dr. Barbara Shirley

SAC Chair: Rick Royce

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

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	Dr. Barbara Shirley	BA- Elementary Education and Special Education from Westfield State College; MA in Learning Disabilities from The University of Tulsa; EdD in Educational	5	10	<p>Principal of Alta Vista ES in 2011-2012: Grade: A, 61% Satisfactory or Higher in Reading, 62% Satisfactory or Higher in Math, 84% Satisfactory or Higher in Writing, 57% Satisfactory or Higher in Science, 79 Reading Points for Gains, 85 Math Points for Gains, Reading Gains for Lowest 25% = 75, Math Gains for Lowest 25% = 87</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A, 78% Meeting High Standards in Reading, 72% Meeting High Standards in Math, 86% Meetings High Standards in Writing, 48% Meeting High Standards in Science. 68.7% made Learning Gains in Reading, 60.9% made Learning Gains in Math; 63% of Lowest Quartile made Learning Gains in Reading, 65% of Lowest Quartile made Learning Gains in Math AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; No Subgroup made AYP in Math</p>

		Leadership from Nova Southeastern University; Principal Certification-State of Florida			<p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73%; Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 55%; Writing Mastery: 94% improved performance by 1%, AYP: 85% of criteria met; BLACK did not make AYP in Reading or Math, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 75%, Math Mastery: 72%, Science Mastery: 26%. AYP: 95%, ELL and HISPANIC did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 65%, Science Mastery 36%. AYP 92%, SWD did not make AYP in Reading, BLACK and SWD did not make AYP in Math</p>
Assis Principal	Ms. Dehea Smith	BA-Elementary Education and MA-Elementary Education from University of Kentucky; Education Leadership Certification from University of South Florida	5	5	<p>Assistant Principal of Alta Vista ES in 2011-2012 Grade: A, 61% Satisfactory or Higher in Reading, 62% Satisfactory or Higher in Math, 84% Satisfactory or Higher in Writing, 57% Satisfactory or Higher in Science, 79 Reading Points for Gains, 85 Math Points for Gains, Reading Gains for Lowest 25% = 75, Math Gains for Lowest 25% = 87</p> <p>2010-2011: Grade: A, 78% Meeting High Standards in Reading, 72% Meeting High Standards in Math, 86% Meetings High Standards in Writing, 48% Meeting High Standards in Science; 68.7% made Learning Gains in Reading, 60.9% made Learning Gains in Math; 63% of Lowest Quartile made Learning Gains in Reading, 65% of Lowest Quartile made Learning Gains in Math AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Reading; No Subgroup made AYP in Math</p> <p>2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 73%; Math Mastery: 71% Science Mastery: 55%; Writing Mastery: 94% improved performance by 1%, AYP: 85% of criteria met; BLACK did not make AYP in Reading or Math, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 75%, Math Mastery: 72%, Science Mastery: 26%. AYP: 95%, ELL and HISPANIC did not make AYP in Math.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 66%, Math Mastery 65%, Science Mastery 36%. AYP 92%, SWD did not make AYP in Reading, BLACK and SWD did not make AYP in Math</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)
NA					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings with new teachers	Principal	On-going	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	On-going	
3	3. Provide mentors for new teachers	SCIP Mentors	On-going	
4	4. Weekly participation in PLC meetings	Curriculum Leader	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
46	13.0%(6)	17.4%(8)	41.3%(19)	28.3%(13)	80.4%(37)	0.0%(0)	6.5%(3)	2.2%(1)	63.0%(29)

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
Lisa Lampel	Kim Agosta	Ms. Agosta is a certified Elementary teacher who is new to our school. In an effort to support her success, a mentor has been assigned to help her in transitioning to her new school.	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly, both in their professional learning community and with each other to discuss school culture, procedures, routines, student progress monitoring, curriculum and instructional strategies.
		Ms. Whitehead is a certified	

Lisa Lampel	Cassandra Whitehead	Elementary and Art teacher who is new to our school. In an effort to support her success, a mentor has been assigned to help her in transitioning to her new school.	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly, both in their professional learning community and with each other to discuss school culture, procedures, routines, student progress monitoring, curriculum and instructional strategies.
Bev Leis	Stefanie Chiott	Ms. Chiott is a certified Elementary and Music teacher who is new to our school. In an effort to support her success, a mentor has been assigned to help her in transitioning to her new school.	The mentor and mentee are meeting weekly, both in their professional learning community and with each other to discuss school culture, procedures, routines, student progress monitoring, curriculum and instructional strategies.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I is a federally funded program designed to address the academic needs of low performing students in schools with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students and to assist them in meeting the state's high standards, particularly in the areas of reading, writing, science and mathematics. The district coordinates with Title II in ensuring staff development needs are provided and with Title IV 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants to provide after school programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

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

Title I, Part D

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

Title II

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

Title III

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

Title X- Homeless

District receives funds for programs that prevent the use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs and violence. Programs such as Second Step and Community of Caring support prevention of substance abuse and violence in around the school as well as promote character education. Law enforcement and Juvenile Justice are also program components. These programs foster a safe, drug-free learning environment that supports student achievement.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

Violence Prevention Programs

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

Nutrition Programs

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.

The school based RtI Leadership team is comprised of general education personnel that facilitate PS/RtI as a related but distinct process from the CARE (Children At-Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. At Alta Vista Elementary School the RtI Leadership Team is composed of:

Principal, Dr. Barbara Shirley, Assistant Principal, Ms. Dehea Smith, General Education Teachers: Tamara Marken, Sai Nguyen, Beth Wilson, Jodi Schafer and Cindy Bryant; Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Liaison Kurt Cummings and ESE Resource Teachers Pam Walter and Elizabeth Harner; English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Evangeline Fotos; Guidance Counselor Joy Bailey; Home School Liaison Dawn Clements; Speech Language Pathologist Mary Zahner and School Psychologist, Gina Portnowitz.

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 school based RtI Leadership team is comprised of general education personnel that facilitate PS/RtI as a related but distinct process from the CARE (Children At-Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. At Alta Vista Elementary School the RtI Leadership Team is composed of:

Principal, Dr. Barbara Shirley: Provides support by fielding questions in regards to PS/RtI, provides the resources, support, and PD needed for implementation and leads in the PS/RtI process

Assistant Principal, Ms. Dehea Smith: Provides support by fielding questions in regards to PS/RTI, provides the resources, support, and PD needed for implementation and leads in the PS/RTI process

Select General Education Teachers: Tamara Marken, Sai Nguyen, Beth Wilson, Jodi Schafer and Cindy Bryant provide information about the process to their teams and all stake holders, help monitor student progress related to tier interventions, collaborate with teams to build problem solving at all levels.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Kurt Cummings, Pam Walter and Elizabeth Harner and the English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Liaison, Evangeline Fotos, provide information to support teachers in their implementation, partners in instruction

Guidance Counselor:

Joy Bailey and part-time Guidance Counselor, Christina Rogers-Hehr, advise teachers, support the leadership and ownership in the PS/RTI process.

Home School Liaison:

Dawn Clements supports leadership and ownership in the PS/RTI process. Acts as a liaison between home and school to facilitate communication in the process.

Speech Language Pathologist:

Mary Zahner advises teachers, supports the leadership and ownership in the PS/RTI process.

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

The school-based RTI Leadership Team will employ continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the grade level teams, the SAC and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional need.

On a monthly basis, DBLT in collaboration with SBLT will oversee the implementation of the SIP Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based RTI Leadership Team devised a training for all of the teachers during the first two weeks of school in August to review the RTI process. During the school year, the RTI Leadership Team meets with teachers during PLC meetings and provides follow-up training through-out the school year as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Time is provided for the MTSS team to meet on a weekly basis. Members of the team collaborate and meet with individual teachers as well as the entire grade level to discuss students needing extra support. An MTSS progress spreadsheet is maintained on Sharepoint to facilitate conversations about students in need of extra support.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

School-based Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of our administrator, Dr. Barbara Shirley, Principal, Ms. Dehea Smith, Assistant Principal, Dr. Pam Walter, Mrs. Sai Nguyen, Mrs. Tamara Marken, Mrs. Beth Wilson, Ms. Jodi Schafer, Ms. Cindy

Bryant, Mrs. Kelly McWilliams and Mrs. Susan Aibel.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to review literacy activities that we were doing as a school. We review school data and made recommendations for areas of weaknesses. We discuss school events that would promote literacy, ie African American Read In, The Book buddy program books drives, author visits, etc.

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

The majof initiatives of the LLT this year will include increasing parent involvement in our Partners in Print nights with Kindergarten and 1st grade families, as well as increased participation in our Reading Curriculum nights.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/4/2012)

*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.

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.

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 26% (84) Level 3,4,5 - 57%(184)	Level 3 -30% Level 3, 4, 5 - 61%

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	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Using trained resource teachers to pull students to focus on specific instructional objectives to meet individual needs on a regular basis.	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessments to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Lack of academic vocabulary	Vocabulary is being specifically taught in each academic area	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessment to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
3	Lack of support for academics outside of the school day.	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays.	Administration, teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities.	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity.
4	Unidentified student needs	Maintain fidelity to MTSS/RTI	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher, MTSS team	MTSS minutes, PLC discussions, progress monitoring graphs	MTSS data, progress monitoring spreadsheets
5	Lack of exposure to higher level thinking	Increase the use of text complexity and higher order questioning strategies in class	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher	PLC conversations, classroom observations	Lesson plans, teacher observations
6	1.1. Low fluency rate affecting ability to take a timed test	1.1. Teaching decoding, phonics during Intervention Block.	1.1. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	1.1. Weekly Fluency Probe, Timed Cold Reads	1.1. Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, Weekly Fluency Probes
7	1.2. Unable to sustain focused reading	1.2. Gradually increase passage length, rigor and level of difficulty	1.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	1.2. Charting progress of the passages through maintaining student grades.	1.2. Grade or Data Book
8	1.3. Limited vocabulary/word analysis skills	1.3. Fidelity to Grammar /Robust Vocabulary section of Storytown	1.3.. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	1.3. Charting progress of vocabulary/word analysis through maintaining student grades.	1.3. Weekly Storytown 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4, 5 - 31%(100) Level 3,4,5 - 57%(184)	Level 4,5 - 35% Level 3,4,5 - 61%

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 goal setting and understanding consequences to not giving best effort	Specific instruction in goal setting and strategies, followed by on-going progress monitoring	Administration, PBS team, teachers	Review of Renaissance awards, analysis of progress monitoring	Renaissance award spreadsheet and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Providing differentiated activities that extend and not just remediate.	Administration, teachers, Eagle's Nest Volunteer Coordinator	Review of assessment data and feedback from Eagle's Nest.	Progress monitoring spreadsheets.
3	2.2. Proficient students spread out among grade level.	2.2. Regroup students within grade level according to proficiency levels	2.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	2.2. Discussions during PLC to create groups, creating fluidity amongst reading groups.	2.2. Benchmark tests, Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, Weekly Storytown Test, 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75%(132)	77%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge.	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3.	Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom	Providing focused differentiated activities and instruction that extend and not just remediate during Intervention Block	Administration, teachers, Eagle's Nest Volunteer Coordinator	Review of assessment data and feedback from Eagle's Nest	Progress monitoring spreadsheets
3	3.2. Unidentified student needs	3.2. Maintain fidelity to RTI process.	3.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration, SWST	3.2. SWST minutes, PLC discussions, Progress Monitoring Graphs	3.2. Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, 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
1	Lack of understanding on-grade level materials	Incorporate the use of grade-level materials in a variety of ways in the classroom	Administration, classroom teacher, resource teacher	Review of Lesson Plans, PLC conversations, TEAM Leader meetings	Progress monitoring spreadsheets

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(31)	76%

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 vocabulary.	Enhance instruction of vocabulary through use of word walls, Eglossary and explicit instruction.	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	Chart student progress	Progress monitoring spreadsheets and item analysis of assessments.
2	Wide variety of proficiency levels in classrooms	Focused differentiated instruction during academic blocks, especially reading and math.	Administration, teachers, resource teachers	PLC discussions, TEAM leader discussions	Progress monitoring spreadsheet
3	Lack of support for academics outside of the school day	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays	Administration and teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity

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 #					
	5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	62	65	69	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 reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 69%(63) Black: 53%(35) Hispanic: 57%(60)	White: 77% Black: 57% Hispanic: 64%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3.	Progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Lack of basic understanding of English in the home environment	Offer English classes after school including providing child care	Administration	Charting attendance at class as well as at other meetings on campus over the course of the year	Parent survey or feedback from class

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(20)	52%

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	Using ELL Leveled Readers and materials of each academic area.	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration, ESOL Liaison.	Charting growth through item analysis of weekly and theme tests.	Results of Item Analysis and charts.
2	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions and Thinking Maps. Incorporate ELL strategies into each lesson.	Administration, teachers, resource teachers ESOL team	Charting growth through item analysis of weekly tests	Result of item analysis and review of progress monitoring spreadsheet

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39%(21)	53%

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	Wide range of abilities in each classroom.	Providing support staff to assist with small group instruction.	Resource Teachers, Classroom teacher, Administration	Scheduling, charting progress of students	Master Schedule and Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	63%

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 support for academics outside of the school day.	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays.	Administration and teachers.	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities.	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity.
2	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, Thinking Maps	Teachers, Resource Teachers, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessments in AP1, AP2, AP3 as well as weekly tests	Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets

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
Higher Level Questioning	All	School District Personnel	Grade Level PLC meetings, K-5	On-going during PLC meetings	Classroom observations, PLC discussions, Lesson plans	Administration, Team Leaders
Text Complexity	All	School District Personnel	Grade level PLC meetings, K-5	on-going during PLC meetings	Classroom observations, PLC discussions	Administration, team leaders
Thinking Maps	All	Thinking Map trainers, school level and company level	Grade level PLC meetings, K-5 and Specials	On-going during PLC meetings	Classroom observations, PLC discussions	Administration, team leaders, Thinking Map teacher trainers

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

43%(20) GOAL 47%

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 exposed to English	Increase the use of conversational practice and dialogue in the classroom	ESOL team, teachers, resource teachers and Administration	CELLA results, weekly tests, progress monitoring spreadsheets	Progress monitoring spreadsheet
2	Test anxiety in a testing environment	Specific instruction in test taking strategies, including practice with timed tests throughout the school year, giving extended time on test, extending wait time for responses	ESOL team, teachers, resource teachers and Administration	CELLA results, weekly tests, progress monitoring spreadsheets	Progress monitoring spreadsheets

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:

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

49%(35) GOAL 54%

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 vocabulary across all academic areas	Embed ESOL strategies into all lessons, including pre-teaching specific vocabulary, using Thinking Maps to increase understanding of various levels of text complexity.	ESOL Team, teachers, resource teachers, Administration	Progress monitoring spreadsheets, monitor weekly tests, PLC conversations	Progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	Lack of support outside the school day, especially when parents are unable to communicate in English	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays	Administration and teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase

in the percent proficient. No target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

44%(33) GOAL 48%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of planning, rushing and reviewing what they write	Using Thinking maps to organize pre-writing thoughts in the classroom and in small groups	ESOL Team, teachers, resource teachers, Administration, Thinking Map leaders	Review thinking maps, review writing samples	Thinking maps, writing rubric spreadsheets
2	Lack of rich vocabulary	Using a variety of strategies to build vocabulary, use of Rosetta Stone, picture clues, visual vocabulary and the Oxford Picture dictionary	ESOL Teams, Resource teachers, classroom teachers, Administration	Review weekly tests, progress monitoring spreadsheets	Progress monitoring spreadsheets

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 29%(209) Level 3,4,5 - 79%(561)	Level 3 - 31% Level 3,4,5 - 81%

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	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Using trained resource teachers to pull students to focus on specific instructional objectives to meet individual needs on a regular basis.	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessments to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Lack of academic vocabulary	Vocabulary is being specifically taught in each academic area	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessment to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
3	Lack of support for academics outside of the school day.	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays.	Administration, teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities.	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity.
4	Unidentified student needs	Maintain fidelity to MTSS/RTI	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher, MTSS team	MTSS minutes, PLC discussions, progress monitoring graphs	MTSS data, progress monitoring spreadsheets
5	Lack of exposure to higher level thinking	Increase the use of text complexity and higher order questioning strategies in class	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher	PLC conversations, classroom observations	Lesson plans, teacher observations
6	1.2. Lack of vocabulary	1.2. Enhance instruction of math vocabulary through use of Math word walls, Mathesaurus, Eglossary	1.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	1.2. Chart student progress	1.2. Topic Tests
7	1.3. Lack of comprehension of math word problems	1.3. Teach key words in context	1.3. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	1.3. Chart student progress	1.3. Topic Tests
8	1.1. Understanding multi-step problems	1.1. Enhance teaching of strategies to dissect multiple step word problems	1.1. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	1.1. Chart student progress	1.1. Topic Tests
9	Understanding real-world application of problems	Using Sailor Circus and related strategies to teach students real world application of math	Teachers, Administration	Observation, PLC discussions	Attendance and observation

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

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

Mathematics Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Mathematics Goal #2a:

By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Level 4,5 - 23%(73)
Level 3,4,5 - 59%(188)

Level 4,5 - 25%
Level 3,4,5 - 61%

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 goal setting and understanding consequences to not giving best effort	Specific instruction in goal setting and strategies, followed by on-going progress monitoring	Administration, PBS team, teachers	Review of Renaissance awards, analysis of progress monitoring	Renaissance award spreadsheet and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Providing differentiated activities that extend and not just remediate.	Administration, teachers, Eagle's Nest Volunteer Coordinator	Review of assessment data and feedback from Eagle's Nest.	Progress monitoring spreadsheets.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in

mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(144)	85%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge.	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3.	Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom	Providing focused differentiated activities and instruction that extend and not just remediate during Intervention Block	Administration, teachers, Eagle's Nest Volunteer Coordinator	Review of assessment data and feedback from Eagle's Nest	Progress monitoring spreadsheets
3	3.2. Unidentified student needs	3.2. Maintain fidelity to RTI process.	3.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration, SWST	3.2. SWST minutes, PLC discussions, Progress Monitoring Graphs	3.2. Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets, 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 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
1	Lack of understanding on-grade level materials	Incorporate the use of grade-level materials in a variety of ways in the classroom	Administration, classroom teacher, resource teacher	Review of Lesson Plans, PLC conversations, TEAM Leader meetings	Progress monitoring spreadsheets

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(37)	84%

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 vocabulary.	Enhance instruction of vocabulary through use of word walls, Eglossary and explicit instruction.	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	Chart student progress	Progress monitoring spreadsheets and item analysis of assessments.
2	Wide variety of proficiency levels in classrooms	Focused differentiated instruction during academic blocks, especially reading and math.	Administration, teachers, resource teachers	PLC discussions, TEAM leader discussions	Progress monitoring spreadsheet
3	Lack of support for academics outside of the school day	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays	Administration and teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity

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 #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	53	58	62	66	70	

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:	By the 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified Level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 68%(60) Black: 53%(35) Hispanic: 61%(71)	White: 69% Black: 47% Exceeded AMO Target Hispanic: 58% Exceeded AMO Target

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessment in AP1, AP2 and AP3.	Progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Lack of basic understanding of English in the home environment	Offer English classes after school including providing child care	Administration	Charting attendance at class as well as at other meetings on campus over the course of the year	Parent survey or feedback from class

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:	By the 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified Level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(29)	49% Exceeded AMO Target

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	Using ELL Leveled Readers and materials of each academic area.	Teacher, Resource Teacher, Administration, ESOL Liaison.	Charting growth through item analysis of weekly and theme tests.	Results of Item Analysis and charts.
2	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions and Thinking Maps. Incorporate ELL strategies into each lesson.	Administration, teachers, resource teachers ESOL team	Charting growth through item analysis of weekly tests	Result of item analysis and review of progress monitoring spreadsheet

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.	By the 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified Level).
---	--

Mathematics Goal #5D:	There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(30)	51% Exceeded AMO Target

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	Wide range of abilities in each classroom.	Providing support staff to assist with small group instruction.	Resource Teachers, Classroom teacher, Administration	Scheduling, charting progress of students	Master Schedule and Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	5C.1. Understanding multi-step problems	5C.1. Enhance teaching of strategies to dissect multiple step word problems	5C.1. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	5C.1. Chart student progress	5C.1. Topic Tests
3	5C.2. Lack of vocabulary	5C.2. Enhance instruction of math vocabulary through use of Math word walls, Mathesaurus, Eglossary	5C.2. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin	5C.2. Chart student progress	5C.2. Topic Tests, Progress Monitoring Spreadsheet, Item Analysis

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%	56% Exceeded AMO Target

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 support for academics outside of the school day.	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays.	Administration and teachers.	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities.	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity.
2	Lack of background knowledge	Assessing background knowledge using visual charts, graphic organizers, discussions, Thinking Maps	Teachers, Resource Teachers, Administration	Charting growth through Item Analysis between Benchmark Assessments in AP1, AP2, AP3 as well as weekly tests	Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets
3	5D.1. Lack of vocabulary and background knowledge	5D.1. Enhance instruction of math vocabulary through use of Math word walls, Mathesaurus, Eglossary, develop background knowledge through hands	5D.1. Teachers, Administration	5D.1. Chart student progress	5D.1. Results of mini assessments through item analysis, progress monitoring spreadsheet

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
Incorporating Thinking Maps into Math Instruction	All Grade Levels	Thinking Map Teacher Trainers and Company Trainer	Grade Level PLC meetings	On-going	PLC meetings, Thinking Map Teacher trainer meetings	Administration, Thinking Map Teacher Trainers
Grade level topics, ie. Word Problems, Rounding, Subtraction with re-grouping	All grade levels	School District Personnel	Grade Level PLC meetings	On-going	Classroom Observations, PLC meetings	Administration, Team Leaders

Mathematics Budget:

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 38% (39) Level 3,4,5 - 52% (53)	Level 3 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 56%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Using trained resource teachers to pull students to focus on specific instructional objectives to meet individual needs on a regular basis.	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessments to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Lack of academic vocabulary	Vocabulary is being specifically taught in each academic area	Administration, teachers	Dialogues at PLC and review of progress monitoring assessment to determine effectiveness.	Item analysis of assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
3	Lack of support for academics outside of the school day.	Provide extra services afterschool and on Saturdays.	Administration, teachers	Chart attendance in the various extra-academic activities.	Attendance and progress monitoring specific to the activity.
4	Unidentified student needs	Maintain fidelity to MTSS/RTI	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher, MTSS team	MTSS minutes, PLC discussions, progress monitoring graphs	MTSS data, progress monitoring spreadsheets
5	Lack of exposure to higher level thinking	Increase the use of text complexity and higher order questioning strategies in class	Administration, Teacher, Resource Teacher	PLC conversations, classroom observations	Lesson plans, teacher observations
6	1.1. Lack of background knowledge and vocabulary	1.1. Incorporate Science topics into daily reading assignments including Science Leveled Readers.	1.1. Teacher, Resource Teacher, Admin, Science Lab Teacher	1.1. Charting progress of comprehension questions.	1.1. Weekly assessments
7	1.3. Limited time for hands on experiments with scientific method	1.3. Increase use of Guided Inquiries in classroom and Science Lab	1.3. Classroom teachers, Science Lab teachers, Admin	1.3. Progress monitoring in Science Lab books, classroom walkthroughs observing science lessons	1.3. Review of lesson plan books
8	Limited understanding of Physics and related Science topics	Collaboration between Sailor Circus and Specials team to teach Physics and related Science topics	Sailor Circus, Administration and teachers	PLC meetings, Team Leader discussions and classroom observation	Final performance

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

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

Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 14% (14) Level 3,4,5 - 52% (53)	Level 4,5 - 18% Level 3,4,5 - 56%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of goal setting and understanding consequences to not giving best effort	Specific instruction in goal setting and strategies, followed by on-going progress monitoring	Administration, PBS team, teachers	Review of Renaissance awards, analysis of progress monitoring	Renaissance award spreadsheet and progress monitoring spreadsheets.
2	Wide variety of ability levels in any given classroom.	Providing differentiated activities that extend and not just remediate.	Administration, teachers, Eagle's Nest Volunteer Coordinator	Review of assessment data and feedback from Eagle's Nest.	Progress monitoring spreadsheets.

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	5th grade	District Training Staff	5th grade	On-going	PLC collaborative meetings	Administration and teachers

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

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

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

81%(71)	83%
---------	-----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Inconsistent programs among grade levels.	1.1. Develop school wide writing program and implement with fidelity.	1.1. Classroom teachers, Writing Coach, Admin	1.1. Grade Level Rubrics, Common Assessments	1.1. Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets
2	1.2. Misunderstanding of grammar component	1.2. Realign grammar appropriate for writing and Storytown	1.2. Classroom teachers, Writing Coach	1.2. Grade Level Rubrics, Common Assessment	1.2. Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
--	---

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

17%(15)	35%
---------	-----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have trouble putting their thoughts into writing.	Use of thinking maps to help guide and structure thinking	Administration, teachers	Review of writing samples	Review of writing prompts, review of progress monitoring spreadsheet

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
Writing Training	3rd and 4th grade	School District Personnel	Grade Level PLC meetings	On-going	PLC meetings, Team Leader meetings	Administration, Team Leaders
Text Complexity and Writing	2nd through 5th	District and Out-of-District personnel	Grade Level PLC meetings	On-going	PLC meetings, Team Leader meetings	Administration, Team Leaders, Teachers

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	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease.</p>

Attendance Goal # 1:	If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.6%(646)	97.6%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
159	146
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
144	131

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 parent involvement and communication regarding excessive absences and/or tardies.	Initiate parent meetings to discuss strategies to improve excessive absences and/or tardies through face to face meetings at school, phone calls and home visits.	Home School Liaison, Teachers, Administration	Review the attendance data weekly.	Attendance data from AS400

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
56	51
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
35	32
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
59	53
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

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	Inconsistent positive rewards in students' lives with established behavior concerns	Establish the Kettle Club, a weekly positive behavior support geared for students with identified behavior needs	ESE staff, guidance, teachers, administration	Review of calls for assistance, discussions with teachers and students	Review of calls for assistance, student point sheets and data graphs

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

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>	By the year 2012, there will be an increase in the percent of parents attending school wide functions
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
98% participated in parent teacher conferences Less than 50% attended Curriculum nights Approximately 50% of K/1 families participated in Partners in Print	100% participation in parent teacher conferences 60% participation in Curriculum nights 60% participation in K/1 Partners in Print nights

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of motivation to attend meetings	Serve low cost meals and have students performing	Teachers and Administration	Parent feedback	Sign-in sheets
2	Many parents are limited in the English language	Provide night classes in English for parents	Administration	Parent feedback	Attendance and sign-in sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

<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 9/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Purchase teacher and student incentives	\$3,500.00

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

SAC meets regularly to discuss and provide guidance regarding all school activities including Title I activities and Parent Involvement activities as well as addressing other school needs.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	72%	86%	48%	284	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	69%	63%			132	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)	65% (YES)			128	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					544	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	77%	75%	75%	58%	285	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	71%	69%			140	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?	70% (YES)	86% (YES)			156	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					581	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested