

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: DISCOVERY KEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Catherine Lewis

SAC Chair: Christina Martinez and Camryn Del Rio Linton

Superintendent: E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Catherine Lewis | Bachelor of Science- Elementary Education, University of Central Florida; Master of Science, Nova Southeastern University; Education Specialist, Florida Atlantic | 3 | 10 | Principal of Discovery Key Elementary School 2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery: 70%, Science Mastery: 86%, Writing Mastery 81%, Learning Gains Reading: 74%, Learning Gains Math: 71%, Adequate Progress Lowest 25% Reading: 67%, Adequate Progress Lowest 25% Math: 65%. Principal of Discovery Key Elementary School 2010- 2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery: 88%, Science Mastery 89%, Writing Mastery 96%. AYP: 85%. SWD, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Students did not make AYP in Reading or Math. Principal of Calusa ES in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 89%, Math Mastery: 88%, Science Mastery: 80%, Writing Mastery: 92%. AYP: 90%. SWD did not make AYP in Reading, Hispanic students did not make AYP in Math. Principal of Calusa ES in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 91%, Math Mastery: 89%, Science Master: 78%, Writing Mastery: 94%. AYP: 97%. ED did |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|---|---|--|
| | | University; State of Florida Certification- School Principal all levels, Elementary Education (1-6), ESOL Endorsement, English 6-12. | | | not make AYP in Reading. Assistant Principal of Atlantic HS in 2007- 2008: Grade: C, Reading Mastery: 49%, Math Mastery: 69%, Science Mastery: 44%, Writing Master: 77%. AYP: 69%, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading. Black, ED, ELL and SWD did not meet AYP in Math. Assistant Principal of J. C. Mitchell ES 2006- 2007: Grade:A, Reading Mastery 88%, Math Mastery 89%, Writing Mastery 95%, Science Mastery 57%. AYP: 100%. 2005-2006: Grade A, Reading Mastery 85%, Math Mastery 79%, Writing Mastery 93%. AYP: 100%. 2004-2005: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 82%, Math Mastery 79%, Writing Mastery 93%. AYP: 100%. 2003-2004: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 84%, Math Mastery 72%, Writing Mastery 94%. AYP: 100%. |
| Assis Principal | Nina Lant | Early childhood Education- nursery/Kindergarten, Educational Leadership, All levels, Elementary Education, grades 1-6, ESOL endorsement, M/G Integrated Curriculum 5-9, Exceptional Student Education K-12, M/G Integrated Curriculum ESOL, Elementary Education3/ESOL | 4 | 4 | Assitant Principal of Discovery Key Elementary School 2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery:70%, Science Mastery: 86%, Writing Mastery 81%, Learning Gains Reading: 74%, Learning Gains Math: 71%, Adequate Progress Lowest 25% Reading: 67%, Adequate Progress Lowest 25% Math: 65%. Assistant Principal of Discovery Key Elementary School 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 90%, Math Mastery: 88%, Science Mastery 89%, Writing Mastery 96%. AYP: 85%. SWD, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Students did not make AYP in Reading or Math.Assistant Principal of Discovery Key 2009-2010: School Grade, A:90% reading, 89% math,90% writing, 83% science, 71% gains in reading,61% gains in math,lowest 25%; 60% making learning gains in reading. Lowest 25%, 56% in math. |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Name | Degree(s)/ Certification (s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| No data submitted | | | | |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | 1. Assign new teachers a mentor who is Clinical Education trained to assist them in the Educator Support Program process. | Principal and Assistant Principal | Ongoing | |
| 2 | 2. Continue to accept interns from local universities | Assistant Principal | Ongoing | |
| 3 | 3. Mentor program for all teachers | Assistant Principal | Ongoing | |
| 4 | 4. Attend district and college campus job fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. | Principal | Ongoing | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 70 | 2.9%(2) | 7.1%(5) | 45.7%(32) | 44.3%(31) | 30.0%(21) | 100.0%(70) | 8.6%(6) | 11.4%(8) | 68.6%(48) |

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 |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Eleanor Cohen | Mandy Edelstein | New Interim Teacher and Clinical Education Trained Teammate | Team Planning, weekly communication, model lesson plans, review Marzano. |
| Peggy Griffin | Gayla Angel | New Interim Teacher and Clinical Education Trained Teammate | Team Planning, weekly communication, model lesson plans, review Marzano. |
| KellyAnn Burger | Theresa Gray | New Interim Teacher and Clinical Education Trained Teammate | Team Planning, weekly communication, model lesson plans, review Marzano. |

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

District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity. Additionally, Discovery Key Elementary has implemented the School Wide Positive Behavior Support Program as part of the single school culture.

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.

Mrs. Lewis, Principal, provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI with fidelity, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, including students who are identified as ELL students, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and designates liaisons to communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 activities.

Exceptional Student Education ESE Teachers: Participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 instruction, and collaborate with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching and consultation.

The School Based Team (SBT) includes, Mrs. Lewis, Principal, Ms. Lant, Assistant Principal, Kelly Negri, ESE Coordinator, Michelle Burns, School Based Team Leader, Jenny Duesler, Guidance Counselor, April Black, School Psychologist, Carlee Knight, School Nurse, Leanne Franklin, SLP, June Neely-Williams, SAI Teacher, Analida Mortell, CLF and Tammy Cella, SACC Director. The SBT will identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and

intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with one another on evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in ways to identify a language delay, assessing and instructing, as well as identifying the appropriate intervention; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Language Facilitator, Analida Mortell, will provide support to students identified as ELL.

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 RtI/SBT will meet weekly to discuss students who are not meeting pupil progression. Based on the information discussed the team will determine the appropriate course of action to take. The students will be prescribed an intervention and progress monitoring tool that meets his/her needs. In order to effectively plan and implement interventions, the team will collaborate with the SAI teacher, Positive Behavior Support team and the Literacy, Math, Science and Writing committees as needed.

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 RtI Leadership Team will discuss the necessity of RtI with the School Advisory Council (SAC) in an effort to help develop, implement and maintain the SIP. The team will provide generic data on Tier 1, 2 and 3 targets, in an effort to ensure student privacy; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; will set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); will facilitate the development of a systematic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining and Summarizing); and align processes and procedures.

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.

Baseline data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)
Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) - K Only
Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics
Palm Beach Writes
K-4 Literacy Assessment System (Running Records)
Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR) SAI Students
Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
Office Discipline Referrals
Retentions

Absences/Tardies

Midyear data:

Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)
Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR) SAI Students
Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics
Palm Beach Writes

K-4 Literacy Assessment System

End of year data:

Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
FCAT Writes

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time, Learning Team Meetings and Professional Development Days. Small sessions will occur throughout the year to discuss the RTI process and the affect the process has a school-wide initiative as well as on individual students' basis. As updated information becomes available, the RTI Facilitator will share the information with the staff.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Catherine Lewis - Principal
Nina Lant - Assistant Principal
Peggy Griffin - Kindergarten
Eleanor Cohen - First Grade
Gerri Nevad - Second Grade
Gretchen Noranbrock - Third Grade
Melissa Serkin - Fourth Grade
Barbara Provenzano - Fifth Grade
June Neely-Williams - SAI

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

The LLT will meet monthly to evaluate and review the SIP goals as well as the effectiveness of the literacy professional development occurring during PDDs and Learning Team Meetings. The LLT will communicate with both the professional development team as well as the SBT to ensure the literacy initiatives are being implemented with fidelity..

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

- 1.Target our lowest 25% ensuring PD on using interventions that match student deficits
- 2.Oversee the progress of building and leveling classroom libraries to ensure that students have a variety of books to choose from that match their text levels and interests as well as books that have the right complexity levels.
3. Planning a comprehensive Family Literacy Night.
4. Overseeing the implementation of the 90 minute reading blocks and ensuring the fidelity of the implementation of balanced literacy in grades K-5
5. Implementation of Reciprocal teaching K-5
6. Implementation of the New Common Core standards.

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.

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: | There will be a 6% increase in the number of students receiving a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Reading data, 24% (95) of the students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Reading. | By May 2013, 30% of the students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Time constraints | Student achievement/data chats will be conducted with all students following the Fall and Winter Diagnostic assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses and set goals | Teachers and administration | Monitor students' progress on mini assessments as well as Fall to Winter Diagnostic | Mini assessment and Fall and Winter Diagnostics, and RRR's |
| 2 | New FCAT 2.0 - Cut levels and length of passages | Learning Team Meeting Discussions. Follow Learning Village Scope and Sequence | Teachers and administration | EDW (Diamond Report) | FCAT Weekly Diagnostic Testing SRI Common 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: | There will be an 8% decrease in the number of students performing at levels 4,5 and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 28% (7) of the students scored a level 4, 5 and 6 in Reading. | By May 2013, 20% of the students will score a 4, 5 and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment 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 anticipated barrier | Student participating in | Administration | Classroom walkthroughs | Analysis of |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | FAA will be instructed on grade grade level State standards with Grade level text to expose them to a rigorous curriculum. | and Ongoing analysis of formative and summative assessments | Marzano Observations. |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|

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: | There will be a 7% increase in the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in FCAT 2.0 Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Reading data, 53% (213) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Reading. | By May 2013, 60% of the students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading on FCAT 2.0. |

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 | Critical thinking skills embedded in instruction. | Ability grouping within departmentalized model. | Mrs. Lewis, Principal Ms. Lant, Assistant Principal | Administration and teachers will analyze student products during Learning Team meetings. | Instructional rubrics |
| 2 | Lack of enrichment opportunities | Students predicted at levels 4 & 5 will receive enrichment opportunities, utilizing the SRA labs for a minimum of 30 minutes per day. | Mrs. Lewis, Principal Ms. Lant, Assistant Principal | Analysis of student products | SRI scores, FCAT weekly assessments, as well as diagnostic scores. |
| 3 | Student motivation to independently read | Reading Counts will be implemented in grades K-5. | Teachers and administration | Analyzing the Reading Counts Management Tool | Reading Counts Management Tool |

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: | There will be an 8% increase in the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in Reading on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 60% (15) of the students scored a Level 7 in Reading. | By May 2013, 68% of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment 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 | | | | |

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: | There will be a 6% increase in the number of students receiving a Learning Gain on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Reading data 74% (172)of the students made Learning Gains. | By May 2013, 80% of the students in grades 4-5 will make Learning Gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | FCAT Reporting Categories will shift to higher order questions. | Learning Team Meetings will focus on new testing specifications. | Teachers and administration | Administration and teachers will review student assessment results including progress monitoring data to determine if students are making adequate progress toward benchmark | The district Diagnostic assessment and ongoing progress monitoring tools. |
| 2 | Accommodating different learning styles. | Implement differentiated instruction with fidelity. | Administration | Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan Checks | Formative and summative assessments including mini classroom assessments, Diagnostics and SRI |

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: | There will be an 8% increase in the number of students making Learning Gains in Reading on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 32% (8) of the students made Learning Gains in Reading. | By May 2013, 40% of the students will make Learning Gains in Reading on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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: | There will be a 5% increase of students in the lowest 25% making Learning Gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Reading data, 65% of the students in the Lowest 25% made Learning Gains in grades 4-5. | By May 2013, 70% of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 Reading FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1 | Students not meeting pupil progression require additional time for intensive reading instruction. | Students performing below grade level in reading will be provided with a minimum of 30 minutes of intensive instructional interventions that match student deficits. | Classroom teacher | Teachers will use a weekly progress monitoring tool to track response to intervention | Diagnostics |
| 2 | Students are not aware of their own progress including strengths and weaknesses. | Student achievement/data chats will be conducted with all students following the Fall and Winter Diagnostic assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses and set goals. | Teachers and administration | Monitor student's progress on Fall and Winter Diagnostics. | Fall and Winter Diagnostic |

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 # | | | | | |
| | In six years our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | |
| 5A : | | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 75 | 78 | 80 | 82 | 84 | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | The following subgroups did not meet 2012 Reading Targets: White, Black and Hispanic. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White 19%, Black 21% and Hispanic 32%. | By May 2013, 17% White, 20% Black and 31% Hispanic will not make satisfactory progress. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|---|--|
| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
| 1 | Lack of dedicated ELL teacher for our ELL students. | Use ESOL Endorsed teachers for the ELL students | Assistant Principal | Teachers and administration will review student assessment results. | Classroom evaluations and Diagnostics. |

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: | ELL subgroup did not meet 2012 Reading Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Ell 50% | By May 2013, 40% will not make satisfactory progress. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | SWD did not meet 2012 Reading Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| SWD 45% | By May 2013, 40% SWD will not make satisfactory progress. |

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 | Scheduling VE teachers into inclusion classrooms. | Implement an inclusion model and utilize continuous services. | Teachers and administration | Administration and teachers will review student assessment results including progress monitoring data to determine if students are making adequate progress toward benchmark. | The district Diagnostic assessment and ongoing progress monitoring tools. |
| 2 | Communication among teachers. | Teachers will meet during common planning time and LTMs to discuss student data for the purpose of driving instruction. | Teachers | Student data will be analyzed by teachers to determine if student is making adequate gains. | The district Diagnostic assessment and ongoing progress monitoring tools. |

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: | Economically Disadvantaged students did not meet 2012 Reading Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Economically Disadvantaged 33% | By May 2013, 31% Economically Disadvantaged students will net make satisfactory progress. |

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 transportation for afterschool tutorial. | Students will have the opportunity to participate in tutorial during their Fine Arts period throughout the tutorial window. | Reading Resource Teacher, RtI Facilitator. | Analysis of student data to determine if student is making adequate gains. | FCAT, On going progress monitoring tools. |

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 | | | | | | |

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 May 2013, 50% of the students taking CELLA will score proficient in Listening/Speaking. | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| Based on 2012 CELLA results, 44% (14) students scored proficient in Listening/Speaking. | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | No dedicated ESOL teacher. | Computer lab setting for reinforcement | CLF | Teacher observation | End of year CELLA |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------|
| 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 May 2013, 25% of the students taking CELLA will score proficient in Reading. | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | | | | | |
| Based on 2012 CELLA results, 19% (6) students scored proficient in Reading. | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | Differentiated Instruction Training for whole faculty. | Administration | Marzano observations of faculty | End of year CELLA |
| 2 | No dedicated ESOL teacher | CLF Tutoring | CLF/District Coordinator | | |

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 May 2013, 40% of the students taking CELLA will score proficient in Writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Based on 2012 CELLA results, 32% (10) students scored proficient in Writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|---|---|-------------------|
| 1 | No dedicated ESOL teacher | CLF Tutoring | CLF | Classroom assignments | End of year 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: | There will be a 7% increase in the number of students receiving a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Math data, 33% (133) of the students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Math. | By May 2013, 40% of the students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) on the 2013 Math FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Dealing with gaps in the new Math series (prior knowledge) | Continue teacher trainings. Continue to focus on Learning Village Scope and Sequence. | Teacher and Administration | Data Analysis | Common Assessments Diagnostic Testing and FCAT 2013 |
| 2 | 5th Graders taking FCAT on Computer | Provide mini lessons using technology. Practice using technology | Teacher and Administration | Data Analysis | Common Assessments Diagnostic Test and FCAT 2013 |

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: | There will be an 8% decrease in the number of students performing at levels 4, 5 and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in Mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 44% (11) of the students scored a level 4, 5 and 6 in Mathematics. | By May 2013, 36% of the students will score a 4, 5 and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in Mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | | Student participating in FAA will be instructed on grade level State standards with Grade level text to expose them to a rigorous curriculum. | Administration | Classroom walkthroughs and Ongoing analysis of formative and summative assessments | Analysis of Marzano Observations. |

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 May 2013, 62% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4-5) in Math on FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 60% (238) of the students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in math based on the 2011 Math FCAT. | By May 2013, 62% of students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4-5) in Math on FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Teachers are limited by time and materials to challenge these students within the classroom. | Provide learning support to students through a math enrichment FCAT tutorial program | Teachers and Administration | Diagnostic scores on the Fall and Winter score reports | FCAT 2013 |
| 2 | Clustering of students to establish critical thinking skills | Differentiating Instruction | Teachers | Diagnostic scores Fall and Winter Student products will be viewed during learning team meetings | FCAT 2013 |
| 3 | Filling the prior knowledge gaps from Math Series. | Common Assessments and Riverdeep Assessments Teachers in grades 3-5 will conduct daily activities such as Everyday Counts, Mountain Math, Think Central, Problem of the Day or Daily Math drills. Staff will utilize Learning Village scope and sequence, Core K-12 assessments and FCAT explorer. | Teacher and Administrator | Diagnostic scores on the Fall and Winter score reports. | FCAT 2013 |
| 4 | Lack of enrichment opportunities. | Students predicted at levels 4 and 5 will receive enrichment opportunities utilizing small groups, technology and math grab and go challenge opportunities. | Teacher and Administrator | Analysis of student products | Common Assessments and FCAT 2013 |

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: | There will be a 10% increase in the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in Mathematics on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 40% (10) of the students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in Mathematics. | By May 2013, 50% of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in Mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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: | There will be a 5% increase in the number of students receiving Learning Gains on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Mathematics data 70% (167) of the students made Learning Gains. | By May 2013, 75% of the students in grades 4-5 will make Learning Gains on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | New Math Standards | Common Assessments and Riverdeep Assessments Teachers in grades 3-5 will conduct daily activities such as Everyday Counts, Mountain Math, Think Central, Problem of the Day or Daily Math drills. Staff will utilize Learning Village scope and sequence, Core K-12 assessments and FCAT explorer. | Teacher and Administration | Diagnostic scores on the Fall and Winter score reports | FCAT 2013 |
| 2 | Lack of funding to provide a math coach or in-school math tutorial teacher. | Teachers will increase the use of manipulative and technology when teaching math skills. | Teacher and Administration | Classroom Assessments and Diagnostic scores for Fall and Winter | FCAT 2013 |
| 3 | Accommodating different learning styles. | Implement differentiated instruction with fidelity. | Administration | Classroom Walkthrough, Lesson Plan Checks, Gradequick and Edline | Formative and summative assessments including mini classroom assessments and diagnostic testing |

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: | There will be an 8% increase in the number of students making Learning Gains in Mathematics on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 32% (8) of students made Learning Gains in Mathematics.

By May 2013, 40% of the students will make Learning Gains in Mathematics on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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: | there will be a 9% increase of students in the Lowest 25% making Learning Gains on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics data, 61% of the students in the Lowest 25% made Learning Gains. | By May 2013, 70% of the students in the Lowest 25% will make Learning Gains on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|----------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | New Math Standards | Common Assessments and Common Riverdeep Assessments Teachers in grades 3-5 will conduct daily activities such as Everyday Counts, Mountain Math or Daily Math drills. Provide materials for teachers/students to use such as VMath Live, Grab & Go, Mega Math, etc. | Teacher and Administration | Data Analysis and Diagnostic Scores from Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012 |
| 2 | Vocabulary Knowledge | Interactive Word Walls, Oral Language Lessons, Math Notebook Students will use FCAT explorer to help enhance the needed vocabulary | Teacher | Data Analysis and Diagnostic Scores from Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012 and Classroom Assessments |
| 3 | Prerequisite Skills | Remedial Groups and review prerequisite skills Students will have review assignments on the computer using Riverdeep and Gizmo's to catch up on the prerequisite skills An FCAT tutorial program will be offered for students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5. | Teacher | Data Analysis and Diagnostic Scores from Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012 and Classroom Assessments |

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 # | | | | | |
| | In six years, our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 70 | 73 | 75 | 78 | 81 | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | The following subgroups did not meet 2012 Mathematics Targets: White, Black and Hispanic. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White 28%, Black 44% and Hispanic 30% | By May 2013, 23% White, 34% Black and 29% Hispanic will not make satisfactory progress. |

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 | The percentage of White and Hispanic students comprises a large number of students at the school with a wide range of ability levels, background knowledge, etc. These students are also highly mobile. | Small group instruction (during the school day) will be provided by teachers and RTI facilitator. | Teacher and RTI facilitator | Classroom Assessments and Diagnostic scores for the Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012/ A score of 3 or higher for each subgroup |
| 2 | Prerequisite Skills | Remedial Groups and review prerequisite skills Students will have review assignments on the computer using Riverdeep and Gizmo's to catch up on the prerequisite skills | Teacher | Classroom Assessments and Diagnostic scores for the Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012/ A score of 3 or higher for each subgroup |
| 3 | Vocabulary Knowledge | Interactive Word Walls, Oral Language Lessons, Math Notebook Students will use FCAT explorer to help enhance the needed vocabulary | Teacher | Classroom Assessments and Diagnostic scores for the Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012/ A score of 3 or higher for each subgroup |
| 4 | Next Generation Standards | Common Assessments and Riverdeep Assessments Teachers in grades 3-5 will conduct daily activities such as Everyday Counts, Mountain Math, Think Central, Problem of the Day or Daily Math drills. | Teacher | Classroom Assessments and Diagnostic scores for the Fall and Winter | FCAT 2012/ A score of 3 or higher for each subgroup |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Staff will utilize Learning Village scope and sequence, Core K-12 assessments and FCAT explorer. | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | ELL students did not meet 2012 Mathematics Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| ELL 50% | By May 2013, 36% will not make satisfactory progress. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | SWD did not meet 2012 Mathematics Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| SWD 45% | By May 2013, 44% SWD will not make satisfactory progress. |

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 | Prerequisite Skills | Remedial Groups and review prerequisite skills Students will have review assignments on the computer using Riverdeep and Gizmo's to catch up on the prerequisite skills | Teacher | Common Assessments and Diagnostic scores from fall and winter | FCAT 2013 |
| 2 | Teachers need time to collaborate, discuss data and plan appropriate math lessons. | Bi Weekly LTM meetings will be conducted for teachers and administration to collaborate, review assessment data, and plan lessons for diverse learners. | Teacher Administration | Common Assessments and Diagnostic scores from fall and winter | FCAT 2013 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------|
| 3 | FCAT 2013 administered on computer for 5th Grade | Provide 5th grade math teachers with time in the lab to practice computer based testing using Core K-12 and Think Central. | Teachers and Administration | Common Assessments and Fall/Winter Diagnostics | FCAT 2013 |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------|

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: | Economically Disadvantaged students did not meet 2012 Mathematics Targets. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Economically Disadvantaged students 41%. | By May 2013, 37% Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress. |

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 | The New Generation SSS are new to teachers and students. | Common Assessments and Riverdeep Assessments Teachers in grades 3-5 will conduct daily activities such as Everyday Counts, Mountain Math, Think Central, Problem of the Day or Daily Math drills. Staff will utilize Learning Village scope and sequence, Core K-12 assessments and FCAT explorer. | Teacher | Classroom assessments, Diagnostics. | FCAT 2012 |
| 2 | Teachers need time to collaborate, discuss data, and plan appropriate math lessons. | Bi Weekly LTM meetings will be conducted for teachers and administration to collaborate, review assessment data, and plan lessons for diverse learners. | Learning Team Facilitator Teachers Administration | Classroom assessments, Diagnostics. | FCAT 2012 |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Strategies and Activities for Differentiating Mathematics | Grade 4 Math | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all Grade 4 Math teachers | October 2, 2012 | Classroom Observation | Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Instruction | | | | | | |
| Strategies and Activities for Differentiating Mathematics Instruction | Grade 3 Math | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all Grade 3 Math teachers. | September 19, 2012 | Classroom Observation | Administration |
| Strategies and Activities for Differentiating Mathematics Instruction | Grade 5 Math | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all Grade 5 Math teachers | October 17, 2012 | Classroom Observation | Administration |

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 |
| Professional Development Offered by the district. | Substitute funds | SIP funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

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. | | There will be a 6% increase in the number of students receiving Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science. | | | |
| Science Goal #1a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| Based on 2012 FCAT Science data, 44% (65) of the students scored at Achievement Level 3 in Science. | | By May 2013, 50% of the students in grade 5 will score at Achievement Level 3 in Science. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1 | Students inexperience with critical thinking skills. | Teachers grades 3-5 will participate in "science fair" activities and/or will host parent science night. | Administration, Team Leaders | Science fair projects, parent participation log | 2013 FCAT results. |
| 2 | Inexperience with analytical thinking skills required for science. | Students will complete bellringers each day to help with the higher order questions. Students will be tested on key comprehension questions provided in the scope and sequence for science. | Administration and Teachers | Common Assessments Harcourt Chapter Test Diagnostic Testing | FCAT 2013 |
| 3 | Inexperience with hands on labs for the science curriculum. | Teachers will provide students with at least two labs that go along with the scope and sequence each week. | Administration and Teachers | Common Assessments and Diagnostic Testing | FCAT 2013 |
| 4 | K-5 science vocabulary development | Utilize a daily science notebook or journal All students will make and create the science vocabulary cards that are provided in the FCAT Workbook | Administration and Teachers | Common Assessments and Diagnostic Testing | FCAT 2013 |
| 5 | Limited amount of time for daily science instruction. | Teachers will integrate some of the science reading within their reading block. Teachers will also integrate written response questions within their writing block. | Administration and Teachers | Common Assessments and Diagnostic Testing | FCAT 2013 |

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: | There will be a 20% decrease in the percentage of students performing at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in Science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 20% (1) of the students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in Science. | By May 2013, no students will score a 4, 5 and 6 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in 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 |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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: | There will be an 8% increase in the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in Science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading data, 42% (62) of the students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in Science. | By May 2013, 50% of the students in grade 5 will achieve at or above Achievement Level 4 in 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 | Lack of enrichment opportunities. | Students predicted at levels 4 and 5 will receive enrichment opportunities, utilizing buckle down FCAT books, essential labs, FCAT explorer. | Administration | Analysis of student products. | FCAT 2012 |
| 2 | Scheduling, lack of time to increase science scores. | SECME club is an extracurricular science club for fifth grade students to enroll in. | Club Teachers | Analysis of student products. | FCAT 2012 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: | There will be a 20% increase in the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in Science on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 60% (3) of the students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in Science. | By May 2013, 80% of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment in 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 |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Physical Science Content Area Trainings | 3-5 Science | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all 3-5 Science teachers | September 27, 2012 | Classroom Observations | Administration |
| Earth and Space Science Content Area Trainings | 3-5 Science | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all 3-5 Science teachers | October 9, 2012 | Classroom Observations | Administration |
| Science Think Central | 3-5 Science | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all 3-5 Science teachers | October 18, 2012 | Classroom Observations | Administration |
| Life Science Content Area Training | 3-5 Science | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all 3-5 Science teachers | October 24, 2012 | Classroom Observations | Administration |

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 |
| Professional Development Offered by the district | Substitutes | SIP funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

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: | There will be a 6% increase in the number of students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 Writing FCAT, 84% (102) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in Writing. | By May 2013, 90% of the students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher on the 2013 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 | Teachers need time to collaborate, discuss data, and plan appropriate lessons. | Bi Weekly LTM meetings will be conducted for teachers and administration to collaborate, review assessment data, and plan lessons for diverse learners. | Administration and Learning Team Facilitators. | Palm Beach Writes and classroom assessments. | FCAT 2013 |
| 2 | Student motivation. | Continue using the Writing Process in all subjects daily. | Administration and teachers. | Teachers will monitor revision and editing process. | Palm Beach Writes combined with classroom assessments. |
| 3 | Vocabulary development | Interactive word walls, vocabulary notebooks and oral language lessons. | Teachers | Teachers will monitor students' writing samples for vocabulary development. | Palm Beach Writes combined with individual assessments. |
| 4 | Changes in the expectations for the writing test | Bi Weekly LTM meetings will be conducted for teachers and administration to collaborate, review assessment data, and plan lessons for diverse learners. | Administration and Learning Team Facilitators. | Palm Beach Writes and classroom assessments. | FCAT 2013 |

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: | There will be an 11% increase in the percentage of students scoring at 4 or higher in writing on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 results of the Florida Alternative Assessment, 67% (6) of the students scored at 4 or higher in Writing. | By May 2013, 78% of the students will score at a 4 or higher in Writing on the 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 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 |
| Professional Development offered by the district. | Substitute funds | SIP Funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

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 goal at Discovery Key is to have a high percentage of students attending each day. We are looking to increase the attendance rate and decrease the tardy rate for the 2012/2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| According to the 2012 school year records, the attendance rate at DKES was 73%. | By June 2013 the attendance rate will increase to 78% for all students. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| According to the 2012 school year records DKES had 255 students with excessive absences. | By June 2013, DKES aims to decrease the excessive absences rate to 240 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 the 2012 school year records DKES had 137 students with excessive tardies. | | By June 2013, DKES aims to decrease the excessive tardiness rate to 125 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 | Parental Support | Student Incentives (i.e. Breakfast, Patrol Buddy, Mentors, Individual Contracts) | Homeroom Teacher, Non-Instructional Support Staff, Guidance Committee | Data Analysis | Attendance Records |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| FCAT Scoring & Analyzing Narrative Writing | Grade 4 Writing | K-12 Curriculum | Open to all grade 4 writing teachers. | October 18, 2012 | Classroom Observation | Administration |

Attendance Budget:

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

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | The goal at Discovery Key is to limit the amount of students with suspensions. To achieve this goal all students must be aware of school wide rules along with the new SW-PBS procedures that Discovery Key is following. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| In 2012 the total number of in-school suspensions at Discovery Key was 3. | The expected number of in-school suspensions for the 2013 school year is 1. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| In 2012 the total number of students suspended in school was 3. | The goal for the 2013 school year is to reduce the number of students suspended in school to 2. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| In 2012 the total number of out-of-school suspensions was 20. | The goal for the 2013 school year is to reduce the total number of out-of-school suspensions to 10. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| In 2012 the total number of students suspended out of school was 16. | The goal for the 2013 school year is to reduce the number of students suspended out of school to 10. |

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 understanding and compliance to the school wide rules and expectations. | Utilize a school wide positive behavior approach system with a matrix to outline behavior expectations in all areas of the school. | SW-PBS Team | Referrals | EDW Reports |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | |

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> | Discovery Key will continue to meet 100% of the Five Star Criteria. |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
|---|--|

| | |
|------|------|
| 100% | 100% |
|------|------|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Communication | DKE Newsletter, Edline, Marquee Display, Individual Classroom Communications, PTA Website www.dke.pta.com | Administration, Teachers, PTA, Counselor | Data Analysis | Sign in sheets |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 2 | Childcare | School will provide childcare for school-aged children | Administration, Staff, PTA, Counselor | Data Analysis | 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 |

Additional Goal(s)

Single School Culture 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. Single School Culture Goal Single School Culture Goal #1: | | | All teachers will participate in the Single School Culture (SSC) philosophy of positive behavior by utilizing School Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS). | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | | 2013 Expected level: | | |
| 100% | | | 100% | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Informing all new staff about PBS initiatives that began last year | Team leaders will share information with each grade level to ensure all staff is receiving the same information about PBS. | Team Leaders, Admin. | School wide survey | Team leader meeting agendas. |

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 Single School Culture Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Professional Development Offered by the district. | Substitute funds | SIP funds | \$500.00 |
| Science | Professional Development Offered by the district | Substitutes | SIP funds | \$500.00 |
| Writing | Professional Development offered by the district. | Substitute funds | SIP Funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$1,500.00 |

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

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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

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

| Palm Beach School District DISCOVERY KEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 90% | 88% | 96% | 89% | 363 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 70% | 63% | | | 133 | 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) | 67% (YES) | | | 130 | 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 | | | | | 626 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Palm Beach School District DISCOVERY KEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 90% | 89% | 90% | 83% | 352 | 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% | 61% | | | 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? | 60% (YES) | 56% (YES) | | | 116 | 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 | | | | | 600 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |