

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SUGARLOAF SCHOOL

District Name: Monroe

Principal: Harry Russell

SAC Chair: Kelli Van Stry Fricke

Superintendent: Mark Porter

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/7/2012

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 | Harry Russell | Masters in Educational Leadership Florida State University, BS Political Science Florida State University | 2 | 9 | Principal of Sugarloaf Elementary/Middle School 2010-present-A Rated in 2011 and 2012. During 2011, Sugarloaf School made all AYP targets in math. Principal of Marathon High School 2007 to 2010 In 2008, MHS was graded an A school. In 2009, MHS was a B school. In 2009, 63% of MHS students met high standards in Reading and 77% met high standards in math. 87% met high standards in Writing and 46% met high standards in Science. In 2008, 67% met high standards in Reading, 81% in Math, 86% in Writing and 42% in Science. Prior to Marathon High School, Mr. Russell served as an assistant principal at Horace O'Bryant Middle School, which was a B school in 06-07, and A in 05-06, and a B in both 04-05 and 03-04. During the school years when Mr. Russell was present, an average of 62.25% of students met high standards in Reading, 63.25 % in Math, and 80.75% in Writing. 41% met high standards |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | in Science in 2006-2007. |
| Assis Principal | Wendelynn McPherson | Masters in Educational Leadership, BS in Elementary Education School Principal (All Levels); English 6-12; ESOL Endorsement; Reading Endorsement; Elementary; Primary Education | | 5 | Mrs. McPherson has been an Assistant Principal at MHS for four years during which the school has had a grade of A or B. The school grade is pending for 2012. 2008-2009 – Grade B - Proficiency: Reading 63%; Math 77%; Writing 87%; Science 46%; Gains: Reading 56%; Math 68%; Lowest 25%: Reading 53%; Math 57% 2009-2010 – Grade B - Proficiency: Reading 63%; Math 71%; Writing 83%; Science 47%; Gains: Reading 56%; Math 64%; Lowest 25%: Reading 48%; Math 52% 2010-2011 – Grade A - Proficiency: Reading 64%; Math 71%; Writing 81%; Science 45%; Gains: Reading 63%; Math 67% Lowest 25%: Reading 67%; Math 65% 2011-2012 – Grade pending 2001-2002 – Grade C – Proficiency: Reading 61%; Math 71%; Writing 49% - Gains: Reading 47%; Math 72% -Lowest 25%: 47% AYP not calculated |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N/A | | | | | |

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. Participation in Vertical Teaming | Subject Area Leader | June, 2013 | |
| 2 | 3. Participation in Lesson Study Teams | Assistant Principal | June, 2012 | |

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 |
|--|--|
| Out of Field Only-Karen McKenzie and Scott Smoot | Teachers are in the process of taking the necessary test to become Highly Qualified (HQ). These teachers are also partnered up with a subject area highly qualified teacher to provide curriculum support. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 42 | 0.0%(0) | 4.8%(2) | 47.6%(20) | 42.9%(18) | 50.0%(21) | 97.6%(41) | 16.7%(7) | 9.5%(4) | 57.1%(24) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|--|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Sugarloaf School Eligible Mentors: None Needed at this time. Diaz, Linda Palladino, Jill Smoot, Blake Thurber, Ann Marie | N/A-Currently no new teachers at Sugarloaf School | N/A | N/A |

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

NA-Sugarloaf is not a Title I School

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

PD

Title III

Title X- Homeless

At Sugarloaf School, our counselor, Rebecca Palomino is our homeless contact and works with students and families who fall into this category. She ensures that teachers and staff are made aware to ensure the students basic needs are met at school; such as, enrolling in free and reduced lunch, school t-shirts and classroom supplies.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

This program was used to target at risk students in the 5th grade and to help ensure not only academic help and support but also a smooth transition into the 5th grade. SAI also helps us to have reading coach support to ensure our struggling reading students in grades K-8 and receiving appropriate pedagogy based on a consult model.

Violence Prevention Programs

Sugarloaf School utilizes Stand Up and Be Safe program with our K-5 students. The program is anti-bullying and empowers students to report inappropriate behaviors toward them at school or home. In 6-8, we have a Project Alert program that target students in the 6th grade with staying drug free and violence free. Violence prevention, bullying prevention and drug free assignments are also included as interdisciplinary assignments in our classes.

Nutrition Programs

Sugarloaf School participated in a Health School grant last year that encouraged healthy eating and physical fitness. As a result, Sugarloaf School offers a wide variety of after school sports for boys and girls as well as a weight lifting program that stress nutrition and tracks students BMI and weight over the course of the school year. We also offer elementary PE and Middle School PE which also include nutrition as part of their curriculum.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

Sugarloaf School has a small Head Start program with one teacher and 10 students. The program is given the opportunity to attend schoolwide events, such as PBS rewards with the K students and the teacher is a part of pre-K to K transition meetings and vertical teaming with K and 1 teachers.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/Rti Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, data coach, counselor, BLPT members, the school psychologist, and general education teachers who are interested in participating in the PBS or Rti/PS processes.

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?

Principal – The principal as the instructional leader for curriculum and assessment, meets weekly with the Rti/PS and PBS teams (both teams are part of the MTSS Leadership Team) to monitor the process of each team, to provide professional development that supports the goals of the Rti/problem solving process school-wide, and to communicate with parents through the School Advisory Council as well as other school based avenues.

Assistant Principal – The assistant principal supports the leadership role of the principal and substitutes in the principal's role when necessary.

Data Coach- The data coach assists classroom teachers in the interpretation and use state, district and school based assessment and progress monitoring data, assists with all school-wide progress monitoring assessments, aids in progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis, as well as participates in school based professional learning communities.

Counselor – The counselor provides the necessary services to assist students and teaching staff which including counseling, monitoring and assessing progress, communicating with parents, working with area agencies as needed, and participating on the student services team and school based professional learning communities.

Building Level Planning Team members –BLPT members communicate and assist with specific groups of teachers regarding assessment, data collection and analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring of interventions. Members also meet with professional learning communities to discuss Rti strategies and/or a problem-solving methods to make instructional decisions within a multi-tiered model.

School Psychologist – The school psychologist evaluates students, analyzes data, informs staff and parents of data collected,

facilitates data-based decisions regarding student interventions/placement, and attends student services meetings as requested.

General Education Teachers- These classroom teachers are interested in the RtI/PS or PBS models and want to participate on the designated teams.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team meets with classroom teachers/grade level clusters/PLCs and/or Lesson Study groups to review and analyze data, to determine the details of the SIP (expected achievement levels), to determine strategies for meeting individual needs of multi-tiered students, and to support teachers in professional development. The RtI/PS model used is based on: 1) multi-tiered service delivery 2) problem solving approach 3) providing instruction/intervention 4) increasing levels of intensity 5) decisions determined by data and 6) continuous progress monitoring. This problem solving process supports the MTSS leadership team methods used.

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.

- Reading – FAIR K-8 (PMRN); STAR Gr. 1-8; STAR Early Literacy –K; Performance Matters – K-8
- Math - STAR Math – Gr. 2-8; Performance Matters – K-8
- Science – Performance Matters – Gr. 3-8

Progress Monitoring

- Reading – FAIR-PMRN; Focus -FL Achieves; K-5 Harcourt Assessment Materials; Spring Board Materials 6-8; Easy CBMs; Renaissance program Accelerated Reader-1-8; Performance Matters Progress Monitoring ; also refer to <https://portal.monroe.k12.fl.us/PortalSites/rti/default.aspx>.

- Math – Glencoe or Harcourt Assessment Materials; Easy CBMS; Renaissance program Accelerated Math 1-8; Scholastic Fastt Math 1-8; Performance Matters 1-8

- Science – Performance Matters 3-8

Diagnostic Assessments:

- Reading – FAIR and Performance Matters
- Math – Performance Matters
- Writing – E-folio 3-5, Performance matters 4 & 8

RtI- RtIDB

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district has on the sharepoint a MTSS manual that can assist schools about the MTSS team and requirements. Training will focus on: Reading – PMRN/FAIR K-8 (progress monitoring and diagnostic); Renaissance programs -STAR Gr. 1-8 and STAR Early Literacy –K (progress monitoring and diagnostic); Performance Matters K-8 (progress monitoring); K-5 Harcourt Assessment Materials (progress monitoring); Spring BoardMaterials 6-8;

Math - Renaissance program -STAR Math – Gr. 2-8 (progress monitoring and diagnostic); Performance Matters – K-8 (progress monitoring); Glencoe or Harcourt Assessment Materials (progress monitoring);

Science – Performance Matters – Gr. 3-8 (progress monitoring)

Writing –Performance Matters 4 & 8 (progress monitoring)

Behavior- RtI: B database research project (progress monitoring)

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Continue RtI implementation efforts into phase II at the school level. Define MTSS and show how RtI fits within the framework. Use resources found at <http://www.florida-rti.org/floridaMTSS/index.htm> to broaden current reference for teachers during faculty meetings. Align school resources within broader framework. Define a MTSS support team at the school level.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

Principal Harry Russell; AP W. McPherson; Reading Coach Victoria Fairbrother-Smith; Media Specialist ANne Marie Thurber

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

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, media specialist, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees should serve on this team which should meet at least once a month.

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

The principal further recognizes a Literacy Leadership Team is a management system and instructional team that encourages a professional learning community in order to support effective teaching and learning strategies in the area of reading. In order to expedite this philosophy, all faculty members must be informed of the objectives and responsibilities of the Literacy Leadership Team. Once formed, the LLT will regularly report objectives and findings to the faculty in order to maintain awareness of the goal of student achievement. In addition to the Reading Coach, the principal will choose representatives from the curriculum teacher leader teams, Library Media Aide, a cross section of relevant departments, grade levels, and/or special areas, and Building Level Planning Team (BLPT) members to be on the Reading Leadership Team. The average recommended team size is 8-10. Literacy Leadership Teams will meet monthly as needed. Initiatives will include grant projects with the Florida Council of Arts, Reading Is Fundamental, Accelerated Reader Independent Reading Goals, and others TBA.

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.

Sugarloaf School has a small Head Start Program, one teacher and ten students. The students in this program have opportunities during the school year to participate with K students, such as, during PBS rewards. The teacher also participates in vertical teaming meetings in K and 1.

*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.

Instructional staff will have on going professional development on WICR and AVID strategies and incorporate them into their lesson plans in all content areas. Reading teachers will develop IFC's (instructional focus calendars) that are accessible to all teachers through their professional learning communities and used for the implementation of reading strategies in the classroom. Instructional staff will use these resources as well as support from the Reading Coach to facilitate reading strategies across curriculum.

*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?

NA

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?

NA

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](#)

NA

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: | The overall AMO for reading proficiency is 69%. Of that, the goal is for 44% (181 students) to score Level 3. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 66% of students were proficient | Of 409 students, 181 (44%) will score Level 3. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transient students 2. Staff Reductions 3. More robust ELO program. 4. Poor attendance. 5. Full time reading and RtI coach | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction. 3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings. 5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program. 6. Media Specialist 7. Use of FCAT Explorer | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Administration | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Review FAIR and Performance Matters data reports. 2 Review of lesson plans. 3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mini-Assessment data reports. 2. Performance Matters 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance – STAR and AR 5. Harcourt classroom tests 6. Focus Achieves |

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: | FAA students will increase proficiency levels |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 50%(4/8) | 56% (5/9) or one more student will score at a level 4, 5 or 6 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 |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low communication skills • Low comprehension • Difficulty putting their thoughts into words • The need for a priority in technology for students with Autism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using pictures • Reading and discussing books and stories together • Repetition, repetition, repetition • Use of some sign language for one particular student • Increased use of the written word embedded in the daily routine • Encourage parental support for 30 minutes of reading per day • Leisure reading 20 minutes per day in the classroom • Teach Read Alouds with discussion • On-going strategies throughout the day • Pair picture with word sentences | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESE Teachers Staffing Specialist Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAR assessments • The growth shown monthly in the pre & post Tests --- Unique Learning curriculum • Star progress monitoring • FAIR Testing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique Learning Monthly Assessment • Quarterly Assessments-Star Reading & Math • FAIR • CBMs |

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: | The overall AMO for reading proficiency is 66%. Of that, the goal is for 25% (103 students) to score Level 4 or 5. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 66% of students were proficient | Of 409 students, 103(25%) will score Level 4 or 5. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transient students 2. Staff Reductions 3. Need for a robust ELO program. 4. Poor attendance. 5. Need a full time reading and RtI coach | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction. 3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings. 5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program. 6. Media Specialist 7. FCAT Explorer | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Administration | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Review FAIR data and Performance Matters reports. 2 Review of lesson plans. 3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mini-Assessment data reports. 2. Performance Matters 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance – STAR and AR 5. Harcourt classroom tests 6. Fccus Achieves |

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: | FAA students will increase proficiency levels. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38% (3/8) | 44% (4/9) |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low communication skills • Low comprehension • Difficulty putting their thoughts into words • The need for a priority in technology for students with Autism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using pictures • Reading and discussing books and stories together • Repetition, repetition, repetition • Use of some sign language for one particular student • Increased use of the written word embedded in the daily routine • Encourage parental support for 30 minutes of reading per day • Leisure reading 20 minutes per day in the classroom • Teach Read Alouds with discussion • On-going strategies throughout the day • Pair picture with word sentences | ESE Teachers Staffing Specialist Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAR assessments • The growth shown monthly in the pre & post Tests --- Unique Learning curriculum • Star progress monitoring • FAIR Testing • Generalization of skills in other environments • Improved classroom abilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique Learning Monthly Assessment • Quarterly Assessments-Star Reading & Math • FAIR • CBMs |

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: | 72% (102 students)will demonstrate learning gains in reading |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2012 FCAT 69% made learning gains in Reading for Grades 4-8. | 72% (102 students)will demonstrate learning gains in reading |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|----|---------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Transient students | 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR | 1. Building Level Planning Team. | 1 Review FAIR data reports. | 1.Mini-Assessment data reports. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | <p>2. Staff Reductions</p> <p>3. Need a robust ELO program.</p> <p>4. Poor attendance.</p> <p>5. Need of a full time reading and Rtl coach</p> | <p>assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year.</p> <p>2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction.</p> <p>3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring.</p> <p>4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings.</p> <p>5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program.</p> <p>6. Media Specialist</p> | <p>2. Classroom Teachers</p> <p>3. Administration</p> | <p>2 Review of lesson plans.</p> <p>3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings.</p> | <p>2. Performance Matters</p> <p>3. PMRN/FAIR</p> <p>4. Renaissance – STAR and AR</p> <p>5. Harcourt classroom tests</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|

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:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #3b:</p> | <p>FAA students will make at least one year's gain.</p> |
| <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> |
| <p>60% (3/5)</p> | <p>67% (6/9)</p> |

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low communication skills • Lack of comprehension • Difficulty putting their thoughts into words • The need for a priority in technology for students with Autism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using pictures • Reading and discussing books and stories together • Repetition, repetition, repetition • Use of some sign language for one particular student • Increased use of the written word embedded in the daily routine • Encourage parental support for 30 minutes of reading per day • Leisure reading 20 minutes per day in the classroom • Teach Read Alouds with discussion • On-going strategies throughout the day • Pair picture with word sentences | <p>ESE Teachers</p> <p>Staffing Specialist</p> <p>Administration</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAR assessments • The growth shown monthly in the pre & post Tests --- Unique Learning curriculum • Star progress monitoring • FAIR Testing • Generalization of skills in other environments • Improved classroom abilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique Learning Monthly Assessment • Quarterly Assessments-Star Reading & Math • FAIR • CBMs |

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:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #4:</p> | <p>On the 2012 FCAT, 73% of the lowest 25% in the school made learning gains. The goal will be for 75% (103 students) of the lowest 25% to make learning gains.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 73% (85 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains | 75% (103 students) of the lowest 25% will make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Transient students 2. Staff Reductions 3. Need for a robust ELO program. 4. Poor attendance. 5. Need of full time reading and RtI coach | 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction. 3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings. 5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program. 6. Media Specialist 7. FCAT Explorer | 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Administration | 1 Review FAIR and Performance Matters data reports. 2 Review of lesson plans. 3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. | 1. Mini-Assessment data reports. 2. Performance Matters 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance – STAR and AR 5. Harcourt classroom tests 6. Focus Achieves |

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 # | | | | | |
| | Proficiency level for 2012 will be 69% (284 students) | | | | | |
| 5A : | | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 66 | 69 | 72 | 75 | 78 | |

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 targets for Hispanic and white subgroups will be 55% (27 students) for Hispanic and 72% (156 students) for white. |
|---|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Hispanic - 51%; White - 69% | The targets for Hispanic and white subgroups will be 55% (27 students) for Hispanic and 72% (156 students) for white. |

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 | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information |
| 2 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transient students 2. Staff Reductions 3. Need for a robust ELO program. 4. Poor attendance. 5. Need of full time reading and RtI coach | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction. 3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings. 5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program. 6. Media Specialist | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Administration | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Review FAIR data reports. 2 Review of lesson plans. 3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mini-Assessment data reports. 2. Performance Matters 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance – STAR and AR 5. Harcourt classroom tests |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | On the 2012 FCAT, the ELL subgroup scored 18% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 25% (3 students). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18% proficient for 2012 | On the 2012 FCAT, the ELL subgroup scored 18% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 25% (3 students). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information | Same as targeted sub group information |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time • Scheduling • Completion of class assignments versus independent English instruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualize instruction to fit classroom schedules • Coordinate with classroom activities (i.e. reading textbook and skills) | ELL Contact Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confer with teachers • Monitor grades • Collect data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report cards • LAS Links • Benchmark testing • CELLA • FCAT |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | On the 2012 FCAT, the SWD subgroup scored 40% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 46% (42 students). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% proficiency for 2012 | On the 2012 FCAT, the SWD subgroup scored 40% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 46% (42 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 | 1. Transient students 2. Staff Reductions 3. Need of a robust ELO program. 4. Poor attendance. 5. Need of full time reading and RtI coach | 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 3 times during the school year. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR Strategies into regular classroom instruction. 3. Data notebooks for students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 4. Implement Lesson Study at PLC Meetings. 5. Implement a 'reading for pleasure' incentive program. 6. Media Specialist | 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Classroom Teachers 3. Administration | 1 Review FAIR data reports. 2 Review of lesson plans. 3. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. | 1. Mini-Assessment data reports. 2. Performance Matters 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance – STAR and AR 5. Harcourt classroom tests |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | On the 2012 FCAT, the ED subgroup scored 56% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 60% (97 students). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2012 FCAT, the ED subgroup scored 56% proficiency. | On the 2012 FCAT, the ED subgroup scored 56% proficiency. The AMO for 2013 is 60% (97 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 | 1. Transient Students 2. Staff Reduction 3. Need of a robust ELO program | 1. Implementation and administration of FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. 2. Incorporate AVID/WICR strategies into classroom instruction. 3. Instructional Focus Calendars for Reading/Language Arts. 4. Data notebooks for AYP students will be maintained for progress monitoring. 5. Implement Lesson Study at PLC meetings. | 1. Building Level Planning Team. 2. Reading Coach. 3. Classroom Teacher | 1. Review FAIR and Performance matters data reports. 2. Lesson planning and data review at grade level meetings. 3. ROAR Binder checks (6-8 Grade) | 1. Mini-assessment data reports. 2. Snapshot 3. PMRN/FAIR 4. Renaissance programs- STAR and AR 5. Performance Matters - Reading |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| WICR Strategies Lesson Study Charlotte Danielson | Reading | Team Leader or Teacher Leader | School-wide | Ongoing throughout school year | Teacher lesson plans and classroom walk through | Administration |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$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: | Students understand and converse fluently in academic and everyday English. Goal for 2013 - 69% (12 students) |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 65% (11/17 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time • Scheduling • Completion of class assignments versus independent English instruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualize instruction to fit classroom schedules • Coordinate with classroom activities (i.e. reading textbook and skills) | ELL Contact Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confer with teachers • Monitor grades • Collect data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report cards • LAS Links • Benchmark testing • CELLA • FCAT |

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: | Students can read fluently and can learn strategies for comprehension and literacy in English. 2013 goal is 69% proficiency (12 students) |
|--|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

51% (9/17 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time • Scheduling • Completion of class assignments versus independent English instruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualize instruction to fit classroom schedules • Coordinate with classroom activities (i.e. reading textbook and skills) | ELL Contact Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confer with teachers • Monitor grades • Collect data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report cards • LAS Links • Benchmark testing • CELLA • FCAT |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: | Students can express their ideas clearly and respond to literature using correct English conversions. 2013 goal is 69% proficiency (12 students) |
|--|--|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

53% (9/17 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time • Scheduling • Completion of class assignments versus independent English instruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individualize instruction to fit classroom schedules • Coordinate with classroom activities (i.e. reading textbook and skills) | ELL Contact Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confer with teachers • Monitor grades • Collect data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report cards • LAS Links • Benchmark testing • CELLA • FCAT |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$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: | On the 2012 math FCAT, 31% (53) of the students will score a level 3. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 31% (53) | On the 2013 math FCAT, 35% (60) of the students will score a level 3. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Increase funding for after school programs 2. Improved attendance rates | 1. Develop partnerships with local businesses and organize PTO fundraisers. 2. Utilize organizational skills * ROAR binder * Planner * Homework Sheets * Graphic Organizers * Use of daily agendas 3.A. Use of WICR strategies * Writing * Inquiry * Collaboration * Reading 3B. Utilize Instructional Focus Calendar along with district pacing guides 4A. PBS Incentive Program 4B. Recognition through quarterly certificates 5. Lesson Study 6. Vertical Teaming with the feeder high school for advance placement classes | 1. Classroom teacher 2. Grade level chairperson 3. BLPT Counselor 4. Administration | 1. Teacher observation and/or checklist 2. Performance Matters 3. Quarterly Reports 4. CWT | 1. Monthly planner/binder checks 2. FCAT results 3. Progress of students on assessments. 4. Performance Matters |

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: | 100% (3) of the FAA students will increase their proficiency levels. |
|---|--|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 100% (3) | 100% (3) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 1. achieving and maintaining class size 2A. online curriculum 2B. limited individual preparation time 3. Increase training opportunities for paraprofessionals | 1. provide allocations to meet specific needs 2. utilize additional staff support 3. increased training for all alternative educational staff members | 1. district/ administration 2. teacher/ administration 3. administration | 1. master schedule 2. paraprofessional PD | 1. mini-assessments 2. progress monitoring |

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: | On the 2013 math FCAT, 32% (54) of students will score a level 4 or above. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28% (48) | 32% (54) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | 1. Increase funding for after school programs 2. Expand opportunities for higher level thinking courses/advanced classes | 1. Utilize academic intervention times during the school day 2. Differentiated Instruction | 1. Classroom teacher 2. Administration/ Classroom teacher | 1. Quarterly Reports and/or data chats in our professional learning communities 2. Formative assessments and data chats in our professional learning communities 3. Lesson plans | 1. Progress of students on assessments 2. FCAT results 3. Algebra I EOC scores and FCAT results |

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: | 33%(1) FAA student will increase their proficiency level. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|--------|---|
| 0% (0) | 33% (1) of 3 students will achieve a level 7 in math on the 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 |
|---|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 2 | 1. More inclusionary opportunities in elementary school | 1. Train general education teachers in the inclusion process | 1. Teacher/advocate | 1. Class roster | 1. Increased inclusionary enrollment |
| 3 | 2. Increase resources | 2. Utilize older material (free and/or on-line) | 2. Principal | 2. Lesson plans | 2. Progress monitoring |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | In grades 4 – 5, 46% (55)of the students will made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT mathematics test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46%(50) | In grades 4-5, 50% (55) of the students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Expanding after school program 2. Improved Professional Development offerings 3. Closing achievement gap | 1. Seek out business partners and PTO fundraisers 2. Utilize organizational skills * ROAR binder * Planner * Homework Sheets * Graphic Organizers * Use of daily agendas 3. Use of WICR strategies: * Writing * Inquiry * Collaboration * Reading 4. Utilize Instructional Focus Calendar along with district pacing guides | 1.Administration/academic intervention teacher 2. Grade level chairperson 3. Classroom teacher | 1. FCAT results 2. Formative assessments and data chats in our professional learning communities 3. Formative assessments and data chats in professional learning community | 1.FCAT results/Performance Matters 2. FCAT results 3. Progress on student's 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:

| | |
|--|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. | During the 2012 FAA, no student made learning gains. 33% (1)of three students will make learning gains on the |
|--|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Mathematics Goal #3b: | 2013 Florida Alternative Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 0% (0) | 33% (1)of three students will make learning gains 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 |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Improve continuity with school calendar | 1. Develop instructional focus calendar | 1. Teacher | 1. Lesson Plans | 1. Unique Learning |
| 2 | 2. Behavior/health considerations | 2. Improve staff to student ratio | 2. Administration | 2. Decrease in non-academic and personal care time | 2. Improved behavioral outcomes on BIP |
| 3 | 3. Increase training opportunities for paraprofessionals | 3. Increase school district training | 3. Administration | 3. Paraprofessional attendance at trainings | 3. My Learning Plan |

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: | On the 2012 FCAT, in grades 4 and 5, 48% (12)of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in the Math FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48% (12)demonstrated learning gains | On the 2013 FCAT, in grades 4 and 5, 53% (13)of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in the 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 | 1. Transient students 2. Attendance 3. Funding for after-school programs 4. Increase Professional Development offerings 5. Closing the Achievement Gap | 1. academic intervention during the school day. 2. Increase usage of hands on manipulatives 3. Participate in the after school program. 4. PBS initiative 5. Truancy intervention | 1. Administration 2. Administration/ after school teacher 3. Grade level chairperson 4. Administration/ academic intervention teacher | 1. Mini-Assessments 2. Formative assessments and data chats in professional learning community 3. FCAT results/Performance Matters | 1. Progress on students on assessments/mid term exams 2. FCAT results/ Performance Matters |

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 # On the 2013 math FCAT the proficiency level will be 69% (117). 5A : |
|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 66% (112) | 69% (117) | 72% (122) | 75% (128) | 78% (133) | |

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 white subgroup not making satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT in mathematics was 27% (29), while the Hispanic subgroup was 6% (7). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 27% (29) Hispanic 6% (7) | On the 2013 FCAT Math, the White student not making satisfactory progress will be reduced to 20% (22) and Hispanic will be reduced to 5% (5). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Poor attendance 2. Improved funding for after-school 3. Staff reduction | 1. Attendance reports and letters sent home 2. Peer tutoring 3. Vertical team meetings | 1. Guidance counselor 2. Teacher 3. Grade level chair | 1. Lesson plans 2. Minutes from vertical team meetings/data chats 3. Data chats during vertical team meetings | 1. Mini-assessments 2. Progress monitoring 3. FCAT 4. Performance Matters |

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: | On the 2012 Math FCAT, the ELL subgroup had 54% (11) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 54% (11) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, 50% (6) of the ELL students will demonstrate 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 | 1. Peer tutoring 2. Increase ELL resources | 1. PD for teachers on ELL strategies/ PD 360 2. Incorporate activities with math skills | 1. Teacher 2. Math Vertical Team | 1. Chapter quiz and test | 1. Chapter test 2. Mini-assessments 3. CELLA 4. Performance Matters |

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: | On the 2012 FCAT, the SWD subgroup scored 46% (28) proficiency and 54% (32) were not proficient. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 54% (32) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, the SWD AMO target is 51% (30). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1. Expanded after school program. 2. PD on working in an inclusion classroom | 1. Peer tutoring program with elementary students 2. PD 360 | 1. Teachers 2. PD Contact | 1. Attendance roster for trainings 2. Attendance of SWD enrollment in afterschool program | 1. Performance Matters 2. Mini Assessments 3. My-Learning Plan |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | On the 2012 FCAT, the ED subgroup scored 54% (77) proficiency and 46% (66) were not proficient. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% (66) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, the ED AMO target is 58% (83) will be proficient and so 42% (60) 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 | 1. Expanded after school program 2. Increased training opportunities for teachers | 1. Seek out business partners and increase PTO fundraisers 2. Utilize PD 360 | 1. Principal and PD Contact | 1. Teacher participation and attendance during training | 1. My-Learning Plan |

Middle 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: | On the 2012 Math FCAT, 30% (74)of the students scored a Level 3. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30% (74) | On the 2013 Math FCAT 35% (86)of the students will score a level 3. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | 1. Secure more funding for after school programs 2. Increased PD opportunities for teachers 3. Improved Attendance | 1. Increase business partnerships 2. Utilize organizational skills * ROAR binder * Planner * Homework Sheets * Graphic Organizers * Use of daily agendas 3. Use of WICR strategies: * Writing * Inquiry * Collaboration * Reading 4. Utilize district pacing guides 5. Vertical teaming | 1. Classroom teacher 2. Classroom teacher Grade level chairperson 3. Elementary/ middle school math teachers | 1. Teacher observation and/or checklist 2. Formative assessments and data chats in our professional learning communities 3. Performance Matters 4. Advance placement in middle school | 1. Teacher observation 2.FCAT scores and professional development completion 3.FCAT data and class rosters. |

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: | On the 2012 FAA, 40% (2)of the students scored a 4, 5 or 6. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (2) | On the 2013 FAA, 60% (3)of the students will score a 4, 5 or 6. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------|
| 1 | 1. Achieving and maintaining class size 2. online curriculum/ limited individual preparation time 3. Increase training opportunities for paraprofessionals | 1. provide allocations to meet specific needs 2. utilize additional staff support 3. increased training for all alternative educational staff | 1. District/ administration 2. classroom teacher/ administration 3. administration | 1. Performance matters | 1. FAA scores |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | On the 2012 Math FCAT, 37% (91)of the students scored a 4 or 5. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (91) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, 40% (98)of the students will score a 4 or 5. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expanded opportunities for after school programs Robust professional development program Expand opportunities for higher level thinking courses/advanced classes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize academic intervention times during and after school <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Use of WICR strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Writing * Inquiry * Collaboration * Reading Utilize Instructional Focus Calendar along with district pacing guides Utilizing math counts program In house PD utilizing teacher expertise | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom teacher. Grade level chair and classroom teacher Classroom teacher | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports and/or data chats in our professional learning communities Formative assessments and data chats in our professional learning communities Lessons plans | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Progress of students on assessments Algebra I EOC scores and FCAT results FCAT results |

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: | Based on the 2012 FAA, 40%(2)scored a level 7. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40% (2) | Based on the 2013 FAA, 60%(3)will score a level 7. |

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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand inclusionary opportunities in elementary/ middle school Increase training | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Educate general education teachers in the inclusion process Utilizing all available | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom teacher/ advocate District personnel/ In house expertise | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> class roster | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased inclusionary enrollment Progress monitoring |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| opportunities for Paraprofessionals | resources in house and on the internet. | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|

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: | According to the 2012 math FCAT results, 67% (164) of the students made learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67% (164)of the students made learning gains | On the 2013 math FCAT, 70% (172)of the students will make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Utilize academic intervention 2. Expanded training/ professional development for teachers | 1. Academic intervention during the school day 2. Utilize organizational skills * ROAR binder * Planner * Homework Sheets * Graphic Organizers * Use of daily agendas | 1. Administration/ academic intervention teacher 2. Grade level chairperson | 1. FCAT results 2. Formative assessments and data chats in our professional learning communities | 1. FCAT results/ performance matters 2.FCAT results |

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: | 20%(2) of the 2012 FAA students made at least one year's gain. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% (1) | 40% (2) of the 2013 FAA students will make at least one year's gain. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Behavior/ health concerns 2. Expanded training opportunities for paraprofessionals | 1. Utilization of the school nurse. 2. Expanded use of behavioral specialist 3. In house PD provided by local staff with specific expertise | 1. Administration 2. PD Contact | 1. Pre and post testing 2. A decrease in non academic / personal care 3. PD attendance sheets | 1. Unique Learning 2. Improved behavioral outcomes on BIP 3. Use of My Learning Plan |

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

of improvement for the following group:

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | In grades 6-8 61% (35)of the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 61% (35) | In grades 6-8 65% (37)of the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 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 | 1. Expanded after-school programs 2. Transient students/attendance 3. Robust professional development program | 1. Increase usage of hands on manipulatives 2. Participate in ELO and peer support 3. PBS initiative and truancy intervention 4. Additional staff added | 1.Administration 2. Counselor 3. Administration | 1. Mini-Assessments 2. Formative assessments and data chats in professional learning community 3. Attendance records 4. Class rosters/ master schedule | 1. Progress on students on assessments/mid term exams 2. FCAT results/Performance Matters 3.Attendance reports and report cards 4.Meet state mandate |

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%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal # We will reduce our achievement gap by 3% per year. 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 66% (162) | 69% (170) | 72% (177) | 75% (185) | 78% (192) | |

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: | On the 2012 Math FCAT, the White subgroup 16% (39) did not make satisfactory progress and the Hispanic subgroup was 2%(6). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 16% (39) Hispanic 2% (6) | The White subgroup not making satisfactory progress in mathematics 2013 FCAT will be reduced to 12% (30), while the Hispanic subgroup will be reduced to 1% (3). |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 1. Limited resources 2. Robust professional development | 1. Use on-line material 2. Create schedules to benefit students | 1. Teacher 2. Guidance counselor 3. PD Contact | 1. Lesson plans 2. Master schedule 3. Lesson Plans | 1. Mini-assessments 2. Progress monitoring 3. FCAT 4. My Learning Plan |

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: | On the 2012 Math FCAT, the ELL subgroup had 54%(6)not making satisfactory progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 54% (6) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, the ELL subgroup will be reduced to 50%(5)not making 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 | 1. Expanded after school program 2. ELL teacher 3. Robust professional development | 1. Use on-line materials 2. WICR strategies/hands on manipulatives 3. Use in house expertise for training | 1. Teacher 2. PD Contact 3. Principal | 1. Lesson plans 2. After school attendance | 1. Progress Monitoring 2. My Learning Plan |

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: | On the 2012 FCAT, the SWD subgroup scored 46% (28) proficiency, as a result, 54% (32) were not proficient. The AMO for 2013 is 50%(30). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 54% (32) | On the 2013 FCAT Math, 50% (30) of the SWD subgroup will be proficient. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1. Expanded after school program 2. Robust professional development | 1. Targeted recruitment 2. Utilize in house expertise for training | 1. After school teachers 2. PD Contact | 1. After school attendance 2. Lesson Plans | 1. My Learning Plan 2. Progress Monitoring |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | On the 2012 FCAT, the ED subgroup scored 54% (77) proficiency, as a result, 46% (66) were not proficient. The AMO for 2013 is 42% (60). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% (66) | On the 2013 Math FCAT, 42% (60) of the ED subgroup will score proficient. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 1. Expanded after school program 2. Robust professional development | 1. Targeted student recruitment 2. Utilize in house expertise to provide training | 1. After school teacher 2. PD Contact 3. Principal | 1. After school attendance roster 2. Lesson Plans | 1. Progress Monitoring 2. My Learning Plan |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1: | 37% (22) of the students scored Level 3 on the 2012 Algebra EOC. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (22) of the students scored at level 3 | 40% (24) of the students will score level 3 on the 2013 Algebra EOC. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1. Improve organization and study skills 2. Attendance | 1. Develop active student notebook using Cornell notes 2. Send attendance notification letters home when student reach their fifth absence | 1. Teacher 2. Guidance counselor 3. Attendance Team | 1. Notebook Check at end of each chapter as well as chapter test scores 2. Attendance reports | 1. Mid- term scores and EOC scores 2. EOC |

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: | | | | | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2: | On the 2012 Algebra EOC, 47% (28)of the students scored level 4/5. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 47% (28) of the students scored at level 4 and 5 | On the 2013 Algebra EOC, 50%(30)students will score a Level 4 or 5. | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Not participating in after school tutoring 2. Improve study skills | 1. Provide a 5 week EOC boot camp 2. Increase spiral review/ test problems on chapter tests | 1. Classroom teacher 2. Classroom teacher | 1. ELO attendance 2. Chapter test and mid- term scores | 1. EOC scores |

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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: | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1: | N/A | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | N/A | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

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

End of Geometry EOC 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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 1. WICR Strategies 2. Vertical Team Meetings 3. Lesson Study 4. PD 360 | Mathematics | Grade level chair | Sugarloaf Faculty | on-going throughout the year | 1. Lesson plans 2. Meeting agendas 3. Minutes from lesson study | 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 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a: | 38% (21) Proficiency at grade 5 and 44% (38) proficiency at grade 8. This targeted group will make a 2% increase in order to meet high standards on the 2013 FCAT assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 62% (34) Proficiency at level 3 and above at grade 5 and 67%(58) proficiency at level 3 and above at grade 8. School wide proficiency level at 3 and above was achieved at 65 %(82). | School wide proficiency at level 3 and above at 70%. |

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 | <p>1.1. Expanded after school program</p> <p>1.2. Student Attendance</p> <p>1.3. Increase Parental involvement</p> <p>1.4. Robust professional development</p> | <p>1.1. All students will be presented science lessons with a hands-on approach where they will experience the science concepts first hand.</p> <p>1.2 All students in grades 5-8 will use an interactive science notebook.</p> <p>1.3 WICR strategies</p> <p>1.4 PBS Attendance incentives build into Monthly rewards.</p> <p>1.5 Differentiated instruction.</p> <p>1.6 Targeted interventions will be provided for struggling students through the RTI process.</p> <p>1.7 Utilize in house expertise</p> <p>1.8 Deliberate Practice K-5 Progress Monitoring</p> | <p>1.1. Teacher</p> <p>1.2. Principal/ AP</p> <p>1.3. PD Contact</p> | <p>1.1. Mini Assessments will be used to assess individual benchmarks.</p> <p>1.2 Monitoring of Attendance through quarterly reports.</p> <p>1.3. Lab reports will be used to assess students' knowledge of the scientific method in grades 5-8. All teachers will discuss student progress based on assessment data at mid –quarter intervals (Data Chats)</p> <p>1.4. After each strand has been taught, teachers will use unit tests to assess students' progress. Teachers will discuss outcomes of common assessments, administered to the target students periodically at grade level and or cluster.</p> | <p>1.1. Assessments and Progress monitoring that measure achievement of the New Generation Sunshine state standards. (N.G.S.S.S.) i.e.: FCAT Science, Performance matters progress monitoring, EOCs, unit assessments and mini assessments</p> <p>1.2. Performance Matters – Progress Monitoring assessments, Unit assessments and mini assessments that measure achievement of the N.G.S.S.S.</p> <p>1.3. Unit and mini assessments based on the N.G.S.S.S. Assessments and mini assessments that measure achievement of the Florida Science Standards. i.e.: FCAT Science, Performance matters – progress monitoring, unit assessments and</p> |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | Based on the 2012 FCAT science assessment, 5th grade 24% (13) proficiency at levels 4 and 5, 8th grade 23% (20) proficiency at levels 4 and 5. In order to maintain high standards 2% of the students at level 3 and below will be moved in the 2013 FCAT assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 5th grade 24% (13) proficiency at levels 4 and 5, 8th grade 23% (20) proficiency at levels 4 and 5 | Grade 5 27%(15) proficiency at levels 4 and 5, 8th grade 27% (23) of students will show proficiency at levels 4 and 5. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1.1. Expanded after school program 1.2. Student Attendance 1.3. Increase Parental involvement 1.4. Robust professional development | 1.1. All students will be presented science lessons with a hands-on approach where they will experience the science concepts first hand. 1.2 All students in grades 5-8 will use an interactive science notebook. 1.3 WICR strategies 1.4 PBS Attendance incentives build into Monthly rewards. 1.5 Differentiated instruction. | 1.1. Teacher 1.2. Principal 1.3. PD Contact | 1.1. Mini Assessments will be used to assess individual benchmarks. 1.2 Monitoring of Attendance through quarterly reports. 1.3. Lab reports will be used to assess students' knowledge of the scientific method in grades 5-8. All teachers will discuss student progress based on assessment data at mid –quarter intervals (Data Chats) 1.4. After each strand has been taught, teachers will use unit | 1.1. Assessments and Progress monitoring that measure achievement of the New Generation Sunshine state standards. (N.G.S.S.S.) i.e.: FCAT Science, Performance matters progress monitoring, EOCs, unit assessments and mini assessments 1.2. Performance Matters – Progress |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 1.6 Targeted interventions will be provided for struggling students through the RTI process. 1.7 Utilize in house expertise | tests to assess students' progress. Teachers will discuss outcomes of common assessments, administered to the target students periodically at grade level and or cluster. | Monitoring assessments, Unit assessments and mini assessments that measure achievement of the N.G.S.S.S. 1.3. Unit and mini assessments based on the N.G.S.S.S. Assessments and mini assessments that measure achievement of the Florida Science Standards. i.e.: FCAT Science, Performance matters – progress monitoring, unit assessments and mini assessments |
|---|--|---|---|

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Vertical Teams in | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| science K-8 District Science Training Lesson Study | K-8/Science | K. Walden Camila Burton Team Leaders | School Wide | Early Release dates District Professional Development days Team Meetings | Teacher lessons/lesson plans, Classroom Walk Throughs PD follow up activities. Online training Follow up activities and tests. | Classroom Teachers Team Leaders School and Distirct Administrators |
| WICR strategies Marking the Text PD360 | | | | | | |

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | | On 2012 FCAT, 53% of 4th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. The 2013 target for students making a level three or above will be 86% (52 students) On 2012 FCAT, 82% of 8th grade students scored at a level 3 or above. For 2013, 8th grade will maintain a 86% (71 students) making a level 3 or above. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 4th grade-53% (28) 8th grade- 82%(70) | | On the 2013 FCAT Writing Test, 86% (52 students)will make a level 3 or higher. On the 2013 FCAT Writing Test,86% (71)8th grade students will make a level 3 or above. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | 1. Absenteeism 2. Robust professional development program 3. Staff Reduction 4. Expand after school program | 1. Students will use quick writes, writing portfolios and the writing process daily. 2. Writing will be dated and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder. 3. Mini assessments, and quarterly assessments, the writing will be monitored for growth. 4. Note taking, modeling, learning logs, writing process, WICR strategies-marking the text, response writing, journals, write to rubric, webbing, quick writes, graphic organizer, anchor papers. | Classroom teachers ESE teachers | 1. Quarterly assessments 2. FCAT 3. Writing samples 4. Use of anchor papers | 1. Writing samples 2. Rubric scoring 3. Writing portfolios Writing samples. 4. FCAT |
|---|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|

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

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | NA | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| NA | NA | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| WICR Strategies Lesson Study Charlotte Danielson PD 360 | Language Arts | Team Leader or Teacher Leader | School-wide | Ongoing throughout school year | Teacher lesson plans and classroom walk through | Administration PD Contact |

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) 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: | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | | N/A | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| N/A | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. | |
| Civics Goal #2: | |
| | |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| PD 360 | 7th Grade | Teacher | Civics | On Going | My Learning Plan | Principal PD Contact |

Civics 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 Civics 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: | Sugarloaf School will reduce the number of students with excessive absences, 10 or more days, by 5% or 11 students. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 93.9% | 95% |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 290 | 279 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 119 | 30 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1.1 Loss of staff due to budget cuts: one counselor for 560 students, Need a CINS/FINS Counselor | 1.1 Create attendance intervention team that will proactively develop a parent awareness campaign that encourages students to be in school regularly and on time. 1.2 Utilization of PBS program to recognize students who attend school on a regular basis. 1.3 Deliberate Practice | 1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor 1.2 Principal, Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor 1.3 Principal and AP | 1.1 Bi-Monthly monitoring of TERMS and Pinnacle attendance data. 1.2 Number of reward programs associated with attendance incentives 1.3 Public Relations: Reaching out to stakeholders | 1.1 Number of students school wide receiving attendance incentives 1.1 Number of students school wide receiving attendance incentives |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1: | Reduce the number of OSS referrals by 10% or 6 students. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 66 | 60 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 41 | 37 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 41 | 37 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1.1. One counselor to service nine grade levels, need full-time CINS/FINS or Life Skills support | 1.1. Consistent utilization of Positive Behavior Support strategies across all grade levels | 1.1. Assistant Principal & Guidance Counselor | 1.1. Quarterly analysis of discipline data by the assistant principal and student services team | 1.1. TERMS database and RTI:B (database) |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | Increase the number of parents who complete the climate survey from 30 to 100 and 85% will indicate they attended 3 or more school events during the year. Out of 30 parents who completed the climate survey, 83% or 25 indicated they attended 3 or more school events during the year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 30/83% | 100/85% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | 1.1 The parent's willingness to complete and find value with the climate survey. 1.2 Accurate contact information in TERMS | 1.1 Partner with SAC to encourage parents to complete the survey and make computer available during curriculum night so parents can complete while visiting the school. 1.2 Connect Ed Reminder prior to all school events | 1.1 Principal 1.2 Data Entry | 1.1 Logs of attendance of events 1.2 Small number of bad calls when reviewing Connect Ed reports. | 1.1 Track the number of climate surveys being completed by parents weekly. NTI Program |

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: | | Sugarloaf School will develop and implement a STEM unit that has an aviation theme in grades K-8. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Staff Readiness | 1. STEM Focused Professional Development | 1. Principal | 1. Lesson Plans | 1. CWT/ Observation |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| PD 360 | K-8 | Walden | School-wide | Early Release days or team meetings | Lesson Plans or minutes from meetings | Russell |

STEM Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| | | | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| | | | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| | | | \$0.00 |
| Subtotal: \$0.00 | | | |
| Grand Total: \$0.00 | | | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE CTE Goal #1: | | | N/A | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Readiness of staff to add a CTE program | 1. Survey of interest with students: Fix a plan or fly a plan. 2. Survey of interest at the end of the unit. | 1. Principal/ AP | 1. Student participation during aviation night. | 1. Survey Results-Survey Monkey |

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

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Advanced Courses 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. Advanced Courses Goal Advanced Courses Goal # 1: | | Increase the number of students enrolled in Algebra. 80% (52) of students enrolled in the algebra courses will pass the EOC. | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | 2013 Expected level: | | | |
| 65 Students currently enrolled a 55% increase from 2010-2011 school year | | The number of students enrolled in algebra will increase by 30% in 2012-2013. 80% (52) of students enrolled in 2011-2012 will pass the EOC for Algebra. | | | |
| 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 | Staff reductions Robust Professional Development | Cornell Note taking Peer Support Participation in ELO Technology Hands on Manipulatives | Teacher Administration | CWT(classroom walk throughs) Teacher lesson plans Performance Matters Data reports | Performance matters-Progress monitoring EOC exams Teacher made assessments My Learning Plan |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| PD 360 | School Wide | Principal | K-8 | On Going | Lesson Plan | Observations CWT My Learning Plan |

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 Advanced Courses Goal(s)

AVID 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. AVID Goal | | | | | |
| AVID Goal #1: | N/A | | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | 2013 Expected level: | | | | |
| AVID program is not in use but the AVID strategies are used by teachers with students. | N/A | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | | | | | |

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 AVID Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| Writing | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| STEM | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| Writing | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| STEM | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| Writing | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| STEM | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| Writing | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | no funds allocated | \$0.00 |
| STEM | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 11/1/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|------------|
| Support of the after school program and excurricular activites at Sugarloaf School. | \$6,000.00 |

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

Monitoring and feedback with development of the School Improvement Plan. Professional development oportunites provided by principal and district personnell in a guest speaker format for the parents: Understanding Class Size, AMO's and Budgeting.

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

| Monroe School District SUGARLOAF SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 79% | 80% | 75% | 74% | 308 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 64% | 79% | | | 143 | 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? | 57% (YES) | 78% (YES) | | | 135 | 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 | | | | | 586 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Monroe School District SUGARLOAF SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 78% | 75% | 82% | 75% | 310 | 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 | 68% | 73% | | | 141 | 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? | 68% (YES) | 64% (YES) | | | 132 | 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 | | | | | 583 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |