FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SAN CARLOS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Aida C. Saldivar

SAC Chair: Dr. Trent Brown

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 11/2/2012

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)
		Degrees: -Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education			2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5

Principal	Aida C. Saldivar	-Master's Degree: Educational Leadership Certifications: -Early Childhood Education (Nursery-Kindergarten) -Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) -School Principal (All Levels)	3	12	51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math
Assis Principal	Tammy Forkey	Degrees: -Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education -Master's Degree: Educational Leadership Certifications: -Elementary Education (1-6) -Primary Education (1-3) -Education Leadership (All Levels) -School Principal (All Levels)	16	5	2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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)
Basic Resource - Reading/Writing	Holly Morris	Bachelor's Degree: English Master's Degree: English Education Certifications: -Elementary Ed (K-5) -Secondary English -ESOL	11	11	2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math
		Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education 1-6			2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5

Position	Name	Degrees/Certifications	Years at Current School	Years as Administrator	Performance Record
Curriculum Specialist	Karen Wood	Master's Degree: Educational Leadership Education Specialist Degree: Brain Research Instructional Leadership Certifications: -Elementary Ed (1-6) -Educational Leadership -ESOL	8	3	70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math
Science Coach - Part Time	Shelly Trimner	Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education Master's Degree: Educational Leadership Certifications: -Elementary Ed (1-6) -Educational Leadership -ESOL	23	7	2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math
					2011-2012 School Grade: C

Position	Name	Credentials	Years		Performance Record
Reading Coach	Kathryn Reid	Bachelor of Science: Elementary Education K-6 Master of Arts: Reading Education K-12 with Reading Certification Certifications: -Elementary Ed (K-6) -Gifted Endorsement -Reading Certification -ESOL	1		(New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5
Math Coach	Nicholas Pietkiewicz	Bachelor of Science: Elementary Education 1-6 with a Concentration in Mathematics Certifications: -Elementary Ed (K-6) -ESOL	8		2011-2012 School Grade: C (New Cut Scores) 55% Meeting High Standards in Reading 49% Meeting High Standards in Math 85% Meeting High Standards in Writing 46% Meeting High Standards in Science 69% Making Reading Gains 63% Making Math Gains 74% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 47% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Subgroups: 55% of Total Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 62% of White Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 38% of Black Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 52% of Hispanic Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 70% of Asian Subgroup Achieving Level 3-5 51% of Economically Disadvantaged Achieving Level 3-5 13% of Limited English Proficiency Achieving Level 3-5 27% of Students with Disabilities Achieving Level 3-5 2010-2011 School Grade: B 79% Meeting High Standards in Reading 81% Meeting High Standards in Math 76% Meeting High Standards in Writing 54% Meeting High Standards in Science 40% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 55% of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math AYP Criteria Met: No 70% Scoring at or above grade level in Reading 72% Scoring at or above grade level in Math 94% Improved performance in Writing by 1% 30% of Students below grade level in Reading 28% of Students below grade level in Math 69% of Students on track to be proficient in Reading 71% of Students on track to be proficient in Math

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	Monthly meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	Professional Development aligned with School and District Goals.	Principal and Leadership Team	Ongoing	
4	Understanding of the professional development element of the new Teacher Final Evaluation, Domain 4. This would include participation in trainings, coursework, and certification.	District/Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
5	Allow teachers to observe peers by providing substitute teachers.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Teachers out of field 1% (1) Teachers out of field, ESOL 14% (10) Teachers NOT Eeffective or Highly Effective on 2012 Manager's Evaluation 0% (0) Paraprofessionals NOT Highly Qualified 0% (0)	1) Enrolling in gifted modules as offered by district schedule of trainings; pursuing the appropriate certification/endorsement. 2) Currently enrolled or enrolling in ESOL professional development; pursuing the appropriate certification/endorsement.

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
71	11.3%(8)	23.9%(17)	43.7%(31)	21.1%(15)	22.5%(16)	85.9%(61)	7.0%(5)	1.4%(1)	64.8%(46)

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
Jacklyne Erickson - Kindergarten	Karla Derbaum	Team member	-Observations -Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings focused on curriculum -Monthly meetings with administration to discuss data
			-Observations

Kaitlyn Smith - Kindergarten	Nicole Pabon	Team member	-Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings focused on curriculum -Monthly meetings with administration to discuss data
Desiree Ricks - 1st Grade	Teresa Green	Team member	-Observations -Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings focused on curriculum -Monthly meetings with administration to discuss data
Megan Siat - 1st Grade	Teresa Williams	Team member	-Observations -Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings focused on curriculum -Monthly meetings with administration to discuss data
Heather Jones - Music	Sara Campbell	Team member	-Observations -Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings
Katy Tinney - SLP	Valerie Miskovich (District Office)	Team member	-Observations -Collaborative planning -Sharing resources -Monthly APPLES meetings -30 Minutes of Professional Development weekly -Weekly team meetings

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSSS Leadership Team for San Carlos Park Elementary School consists of the following members:

Aida Saldivar: Principal
Tammy Forkey: Assistant Principal
Classroom Teacher
Kandace McGinn: MTSSS Team Facilitator/Guidance Counselor
Holly Morris: Basic Resource/ESOL/ELL Representative
Karen Wood: Curriculum Specialist
Kathryn Reid: Reading Coach
Nicholas Pietkiewicz: Math Coach
Robin Clark: School Psychologist
Rose Larken: Staffing Specialist
TBA: Behavior Specialist
Jeannette Schetrompf: Speech-Language Pathologist
Kaitlin Tinney: Speech-Language Pathologist
Maria Dees: OT Specialist
Bertha Cohen: OT Specialist
Rose Farnsworth: PT Specialist
TBA: Social Worker

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSSS Problem-Solving Team for San Carlos Park Elementary School meets on a weekly, or determined by student need basis, to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to identify students in need of further support and monitor the progress of students receiving interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are being met within a multi-tiered system of student supports. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's MTSSS Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

Principal/Assistant Principal:
-Facilitate implementation of the MTSSS problem-solving process
-Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
-Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSSS implementation when possible
-Attend MTSSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSSS change process
-Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Classroom Teacher:
-Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSSS folder (F.A.I.R., curriculum assessments, STAR or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotals) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of the school year or if transferring/withdrawing
-Attend MTSSS Team meetings to collaborate on and monitor students who are struggling
-Implement interventions designed by MTSSS Team for students receiving supplemental and
intensive supports
-Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Guidance Counselor:
-MTSSS Team Facilitator
-Schedule and attend MTSSS Team meetings
-Maintain log of all students involved in the MTSSS process
-Send parent invites
-Complete necessary MTSSS forms
-Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

Curriculum Specialist:
-Attend MTSSS meetings
-Research interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction for implementation
-Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students
-Conduct student observations when requested

Reading Coach/Math Coach
-Attend MTSSS meetings
-Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
-Implement supplemental and intensive interventions
-Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotals of interventions implemented
-Administer screenings
-Conduct student observations when requested

School Psychologist:
-Attend MTSSS Team meetings on some students receiving supplemental supports and on all students
receiving intensive supports
-Monitor data collection process for fidelity
-Review and interpret progress monitoring data
-Collaborate with MTSSS Team on effective instruction and specific interventions
-Incorporate MTSSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility
decisions

Speech/Language Pathologist:
-Attend MTSSS Team meetings for students receiving supplemental and intensive supports
-Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions or based on student need
-Assist with supplemental and intensive interventions through collaboration, training, and/or
direct student contact
-Incorporate MTSSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral and when making
eligibility decisions

ESE Staffing Specialist
-Consult with MTSSS Team regarding intensive interventions
-Incorporate MTSSS data when making eligibility decisions

Specialists (Behavior, OT, PT):

-Consult with MTSSS Team
-Provide staff trainings

Social Worker:
-Attend MTSSS Team meetings when requested
-Conduct social-developmental history reviews and share with MTSSS Team

ESOL/ELL Representative
-Attend all RtI Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP
paperwork
-Conduct language screenings and assessments
-Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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 MTSSS Leadership Team assists with analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

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.

San Carlos Park Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training plan for faculty and staff. School based MTSS contacts and administrators have been identified and are provided on-going staff development training regarding the MTSS problem-solving process throughout the school year in the areas of problem identification, instructional best practices, curriculum supports, data analysis, implementation of supplemental and intensive interventions, and behavior management techniques. Additionally, district personnel provide coaching and modeling to assist schools with strategies that are designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs with a multi-tiered system of student supports.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The Lee County School District has hired District level support personnel to sustain the implementation of the MTSS problem-solving process for all students within schools. They provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs within a multi-tiered system of student supports. These personnel are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, curriculum resources, behavior management techniques, research based practices, and problem-solving processes to support the academic and behavioral needs of students within a multi-tiered student support system.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Aida Saldivar, Principal
Tammy Forkey, Assistant Principal
Karen Wood, Curriculum Specialist
Holly Morris, Basic Resource (Writing Committee and ESOL Liaison)
Kathryn Reid, Reading Coach (Accelerated Reader Committee Liaison)
Patricia Pietkiewicz, Kindergarten Representative

Mallory Dolan, 1st Grade Representative
Donna Baldi, 2nd Grade Representative
Madeline Montosa, 3rd Grade Representative
Sara Thompson, 4th Grade Representative
Brooke Thomas, 4th Grade Representative
Yvonne Caldwell, 5th Grade Representative
Jeannette Schetrompf, ESE Representative
Katy Tinney, ESE Representative
ESE Representative/s

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

Monthly meetings, additional meetings scheduled as needed, to review data and determine goals/strategies/interventions/enrichment/remediation needs for grade levels.

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

-Review data and share with grade levels
-Ensure implementation of core reading and intervention reading with fidelity
-Share and discuss differentiated center ideas, instructional strategies, best practices
-Monitor progress of lowest 33% of students as discussed by grade level teams
-Monitor assessment results as discussed by grade level teams
-Parent education/involvement
-Goal to facilitate and develop students' love of reading

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.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School

Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	-
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
-	-

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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:	In 2011-2012, the number of students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading was 27% compared to the district average of 28%. In 2012-2013, the number of students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading will increase to 28% to meet the district average as reported by the Florida School Grade Report or Florida Alternate Assessment School Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 27% (3 students)	2012-2013: 28% (5 students)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Pacing of Unique Curriculum versus Characteristics of Specific Disability</td><td>-Exposing students to Unique Curriculum
-Professional Development training on pacing of Unique Curriculum
-Whole group and small group centers
-Reading, Math and Writing practice centers
-Manipulatives and visuals</td><td>-Principal
-Assistant Principal
-ESE Teachers</td><td>-IEP goals
-ESE Team minutes
-Monthly data meetings with Administration</td><td>-IEP
-Florida Alternate Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

		-Frequent repetition -Breakdown of tasks -Differentiated instruction -Increase time on task -Programs: Language for Learning, Edmark Reading -After school club developing social and verbal skills			

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.	In 2011-2012, 69% of students made learning gains in reading compared to the district average of 65%.

	Reading Goal #3a:		In 2012-2013, 71% of students will make learning gains in reading as measured by the Florida School Grade Report.		
	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	2011-2012: 69% (279 students)		2012-2013: 71% (298 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	Number of students scoring below proficient.

Proficient is determined to be a Level 3 or higher by the State of Florida. | -District provides free breakfast for all students -4 day training, "The Leader in Me" for teachers to implement in classrooms with students to develop life habits, increase self-esteem and increase achievement -Full time Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher in grades 3-5 -ESE Resource Teacher working with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed -All students (other than PreK and FAA) given instruction on grade level. -Triple III/Enrichment Workshop (30 minutes daily) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, and partial implementation in grades 2-5 (text complexity, close reading, text-based questions) -District required Professional Development -Computer Programs: FCAT Explorer, Compass Odyssey, Star Fall, Earobics, Education City, Read Naturally -Integrating Social Studies/Science reading in the reading block -Independent reading (up to 30 minutes daily) -Center Expectations to include Writing, Science/Social Studies reading, Computer -Emphasis placed on classrooms with lower achieving students when assigning mentors and/or volunteers | -Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Guidance Counselor -Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents | -Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -District and school-based assessments -Weekly grade level meetings -AR Diagnostic Reports -Teacher Data Collection Form (discussed at Monthly Data Meeting with Administration) -F.A.I.R. assessment in grades 3-5 | -Coaches log -Computer program reports -F.A.I.R. assessment results -District and School-wide assessment results - Exit slips from each professional development training to get feedback from teachers on the information learned - Do they need more? -Professional Development survey to determine teachers needs for upcoming trainings. |

	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
	3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in	

reading.

Reading Goal #3b:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	-

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # In 2011-2012 the number of students proficient in Reading in grades 3-5 was 55% compared to the District Average of 59%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55%	63%	66%	70%	74%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Subgroups making satisfactory progress in Reading: Black: 38% (Compared to District Average 39%) Hispanic: 52% (Compared to District Average 51%)

satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5B:

Reading Goal #5B:	In 2012-2013 the percentage of Subgroups making satisfactory progress in reading as measured by Florida School Grade: Black: 53% Hispanic: 60%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: Black: 38% (14 students) Hispanic: 52% (90 students)	2012-2013: Black: 53% (21 students) Hispanic: 60% (106 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	Number of Students in Reading Scoring in the Lowest 33% of Grades 3-5	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -4 day training, "The Leader in Me" for teachers to implement in classrooms with students to develop life habits, increase self-esteem and increase achievement -Full time Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher in grades 3-5 -ESE Resource Teacher working with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed -All students (other than PreK and FAA) given instruction on grade level. -Triple III/Enrichment Workshop (30 minutes daily) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, and partial implementation in grades 2-5 (text complexity, close reading, text-based questions) -District required Professional Development -Computer Programs: FCAT Explorer, Compass Odyssey, Star Fall, Earobics, Education City, Read Naturally -Integrating Social Studies/Science reading in the reading block. -Independent reading (up to 30 minutes daily) -Center Expectations to include Writing, Science/Social Studies reading, Computer	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Guidance Counselor -Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -District and school-based assessments -Weekly grade level meetings -AR Diagnostic Reports -Teacher Data Collection Form (discussed at Monthly Data Meeting with Administration) -F.A.I.R. assessment in grades 3-5	-Coaches log -Computer program reports -F.A.I.R. assessment results -District and School-wide assessment results - Exit slips from each professional development training to get feedback from teachers on the information learned - Do they need more? -Professional Development survey to determine teachers needs for upcoming trainings.

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:

	In 2011-2012, the percentage of English Language Learners

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:			(LY & LF) making satisfactory progress in reading was 36% compared to the District Average of 27%. In 2012-2013, the percentage of English Language Learners (LY) making satisfactory progress in reading will increase to 45% as measured by the Florida School Grade Report.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
2011-2012: 36% (36 students)			2012-2013: 45% (47 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	Language Acquisition	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -4 day training, "The Leader in Me" for teachers to implement in classrooms with students to develop life habits, increase self-esteem and increase achievement -Full time Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher in grades 3-5 -ESE Resource Teacher working with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed -All students (other than PreK and FAA) given instruction on grade level. -Triple III/Enrichment Workshop (30 minutes daily) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, and partial implementation in grades 2-5 (text complexity, close reading, text-based questions) -District required Professional Development -Computer Programs: Rosetta Stone, Imagine Learning, FCAT Explorer, Compass Odyssey, Star Fall, Earobics, Education City, Read Naturally -Integrating Social Studies/Science reading in the reading block. -Independent reading (up to 30 minutes daily) -Center Expectations to include Writing, Science/Social Studies reading, Computer -ESOL Paraprofessional -SIOP Interventions -1st year LY students must have 30 to 60 minutes daily of Rosetta Stone and Imagine	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Guidance Counselor -Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -District and school-based assessments -Weekly grade level meetings -AR Diagnostic Reports -Teacher Data Collection Form (discussed at Monthly Data Meeting with Administration) -F.A.I.R. assessment in grades 3-5	-Coaches log -Computer program reports -F.A.I.R. assessment results -District and School-wide assessment results - Exit slips from each professional development training to get feedback from teachers on the information learned - Do they need more? -Professional Development survey to determine teachers needs for upcoming trainings.

		Learning -2nd year LY students must have 15 to 30 minutes daily of Rosetta Stone and/or Imagine Learning			

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:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Reading was 27% compared to the District Average of 29%. In 2012-2013 the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Reading will increase to 41% as measured by Florida School Grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 27% (11 students)	2012-2013: 41% (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	Rigor of Curriculum used in Intensive Academics and Social Communications for Students on FCAT Track	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -Students may not be pulled from direct instruction -Additional reading intervention -4 day training, "The Leader in Me" for teachers to implement in classrooms with students to develop life habits, increase self-esteem and increase achievement -Full time Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher in grades 3-5 -ESE Resource Teacher working with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed -All students (other than PreK and FAA) given instruction on grade level. -Triple III/Enrichment Workshop (30 minutes daily) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, and partial implementation in grades 2-5 (text complexity, close reading, text-based questions) -District required Professional Development -Computer Programs:	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Guidance Counselor -Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -District and school-based assessments -Weekly grade level meetings -AR Diagnostic Reports -Teacher Data Collection Form (discussed at Monthly Data Meeting with Administration) -F.A.I.R. assessment in grades 3-5	-Coaches log -Computer program reports -F.A.I.R. assessment results -District and School-wide assessment results - Exit slips from each professional development training to get feedback from teachers on the information learned - Do they need more? -Professional Development survey to determine teachers needs for upcoming trainings.

		FCAT Explorer, Compass Odyssey, Star Fall, Earobics, Education City, Read Naturally -Integrating Social Studies/Science reading in the reading block. -Independent reading (up to 30 minutes daily) -Center Expectations to include Writing, Science/Social Studies reading, Computer			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Reading was 51% compared to the District Average of 50%. In 2012-2013 the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Reading will increase to 58% as measured by Florida School Grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 51% (155 students)	2012-2013: 58% (173 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	Socio-economic conditions (increased free/reduced lunch population)	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -4 day training, "The Leader in Me" for teachers to implement in classrooms with students to develop life habits, increase self-esteem and increase achievement -Full time Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher in grades 3-5 -ESE Resource Teacher working with students with disabilities that are mainstreamed -All students (other than PreK and FAA) given instruction on grade level. -Triple III/Enrichment Workshop (30 minutes daily) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, and partial implementation in grades 2-5 (text complexity, close reading, text-based questions) -District required Professional Development -Computer Programs:	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Guidance Counselor -Reading Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -District and school-based assessments -Weekly grade level meetings -AR Diagnostic Reports -Teacher Data Collection Form (discussed at Monthly Data Meeting with Administration) -F.A.I.R. assessment in grades 3-5	-Coaches log -Computer program reports -F.A.I.R. assessment results -District and School-wide assessment results - Exit slips from each professional development training to get feedback from teachers on the information learned - Do they need more? -Professional Development survey to determine teachers needs for upcoming trainings.

		FCAT Explorer, Compass Odyssey, Star Fall, Earobics, Education City, Read Naturally -Integrating Social Studies/Science reading in the reading block. -Independent reading (up to 30 minutes daily) -Center Expectations to include Writing, Science/Social Studies reading, Computer				

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
State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	K-5	State of Florida	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach	June 2012	-Lesson plans -Trainings for faculty -Observations -Classroom walk-throughs -Minutes from Grade Level meetings	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor
Close Reading (3 hours)	2-5	-Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach	-Instructional Staff in grades 2-5	September 6 or 7, 2012	-Lesson Plans -Observation of close reading lesson -Classroom walk-throughs -Collaborative team planning	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teachers
Common Core State Standards Overview (3 hour training) from district training, June 2012	K-5	-Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Instructional Staff	August 2, 2012	-Lesson Plans -Observations -Classroom walk-throughs -Minutes from Grade Level meetings	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teachers
Literacy Framework (1 hour training)	K-5	-Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Instructional Staff		-Lesson Plans -Observations of centers -Classroom walk-throughs -Minutes from Grade Level meetings -Monthly data meetings with Administration	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teachers

Enrichment Workshop (iii for students substantially below in Reading-enrichment for other students. 30 minutes daily.)	K-5	-Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Instructional Staff		-Lesson Plans -Observations of Enrichment Workshop Centers -Reports from Compass Odyssey computer program	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teachers
The Leader in Me (3-day training for teachers) Developing life habits/self-esteem, leading to higher achievement scores for students	-All Instructional Staff	Thomas Stephens	-All Instructional staff	Ongoing	-Bulletin Boards displaying the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students
Keys Climate Survey Review Staff determines areas of strength and areas of opportunities	-All Staff	-Keys Committee	-All Staff	Ongoing	-Minutes from grade level meetings -Monthly meetings with administration	-All Staff
Saxon Phonics Training	-2nd Grade	Company Representative	-2nd Grade Teachers -Teachers new to school in grades K-1	August 2012	-Lesson Plans -Observations -Classroom walk-throughs	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teachers
The Leader in Me (6 hour training) Implementing the habits in the classroom.	-All Instructional Staff	Thomas Stephens	-All Instructional Staff	October 2012	-Bulletin Boards displaying student work from the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Saxon Phonics	Last part of 2 year plan to change Phonics program in grades K-2.	After School Funds	$11,447.00
			Subtotal: $11,447.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Compass Odyssey Computer Program	Program purchased for all elementary schools in district by the district.	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	State program offered to all schools in Florida.	State/District	$0.00
Close Reading (3 hours)	Substitute teachers needed so teachers could attend 3 hour training.		$3,200.00
Common Core State Standards Overview (3 hour training) from district training, June 2012	Overview of the CCSS.	District Train the Trainers	$0.00
Literacy Framework (1 hour training)	Outline of expectations of the Reading Block. Combining core reading materials with CCSS and NGSSS.	None	$0.00
Enrichment Workshop (iii for students substantially below in Reading- enrichment for other students. 30 minutes daily.)	Expectations for iii for students substantially below in reading and enrichment for other students.	None	$0.00
The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	Developing 7 habits of highly effective people.	School Improvement Fund/After School Fund	$9,000.00
Keys Climate Survey	Provided by NEA	District	$0.00
The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	Implementing the 7 habits in the classroom.	After School Funds	$3,900.00
			Subtotal: $16,100.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida Ready	Test Prep Workbooks for Grades 3-5	After School Funds	$5,000.00
Charming Readers	Incentive for independent reading as measured by the Accelerated Reader program	After School Funds	$3,000.00
Library Books	Different Genres	Target Grant - $500 After School Funds - $2,669 Scholastic Dollars - $3,000	$6,169.00
			Subtotal: $14,169.00
			Grand Total: $41,716.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking was 26%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring proficient in Listening/Speaking will increase to 30% as measured by the Florida School Grade or CELLA results.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
2011-2012: 26% (43 students) 2012-2013: 30% (53 students)	
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	Language Acquisition	-Must be present for all direct instruction given by teacher -30 to 60 minutes daily of Rosetta Stone for first year LY students -30 to 60 minutes daily of Imagine Learning (computer program) for first year LY students -15 to 30 minutes of Rosetta Stone or Imagine Learning (computer program) for 2nd year LY students -SIOP interventions	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Specialist -Basic Resource Teacher/ESOL Contact -Classroom Teachers	-Computer reports -Teacher observation -Teacher anecdotal notes	-Lesson Plans -Computer reports -Classroom walk-throughs -2013 CELLA scores

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:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring proficient in Reading was 26% compared to the district average of 25%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring proficient in Reading will increase to 28% as measured by Florida School Grade or CELLA results.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

2011-2012: 26% (43 students)
2012-2013: 28% (50 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	Language Acquisition	-Must be present for all direct instruction given by teacher -30 to 60 minutes daily of Rosetta Stone for first year LY students -30 to 60 minutes daily of Imagine Learning (computer program) for first year LY students -15 to 30 minutes of Rosetta Stone or Imagine Learning (computer program) for 2nd year LY students -SIOP interventions	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Specialist -Basic Resource Teacher/ESOL Contact -Classroom Teachers	-Computer reports -Teacher observation -Teacher anecdotal notes	-Lesson Plans -Computer reports -Classroom walk-throughs -2013 CELLA scores

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring proficient in Writing was 24% compared to the district average of 25.9%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring proficient in Writing will increase to 26% to meet the district average as measured by the Florida School Grade or CELLA results.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

2011-2012: 24% (15 students)
2012-2013: 26%

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language Acquisition	-Must be present for all direct instruction given by teacher -30 to 60 minutes daily of Rosetta Stone for first year LY students -30 to 60 minutes daily of Imagine Learning (computer program) for first year LY students -15 to 30 minutes of Rosetta Stone or Imagine Learning (computer program) for 2nd year LY students -SIOP interventions	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Specialist -Basic Resource Teacher/ESOL Contact -Classroom Teachers	-Computer reports -Teacher observation -Teacher anecdotal notes -Writing samples	-Lesson Plans -Computer reports -Classroom walk-throughs -2013 CELLA scores

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	-
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
-	-

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring a Lever 4, 5, or 6 in Math was 9% compared to the district average of 25%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring a Level 4, 5, or 6 in Math will increase to 15% as measured by Florida School Grade or Florida Alternate Assessment School Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 9% (1 student)	2012-2013: 15% (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	Pacing of Unique Curriculum versus Characteristics of Specific Disability	-Math Coach modeling lessons -Exposing students to Unique Curriculum -Professional Development training on pacing of Unique Curriculum -Whole group and small group centers -Reading, Math and Writing practice centers -Manipulatives and visuals -Frequent repetition -Breakdown of tasks -Differentiated	-Principal -Assistant Principal -ESE Teachers -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach	-IEP goals -ESE Team minutes -Monthly data meetings with Administration	-IEP -Florida Alternate Assessment

	instruction -Increase time on task -Touch Math for one-to-one correspondence, adding and subtraction -After school club developing social and verbal skills			

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	

Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math was 47% compared to the district average of 61%. In 2012-2013 the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math will increase to 50% as reported by Florida School Grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 47% (190 students)	2012-2013: 50% (210 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Number of students scoring below proficient. Proficient is determined to be a Level 3 or higher by the State of Florida.	-District-wide Math focus -District provides free breakfast for all students -Training from the state in June on Common Core State Standards -Full time Math Coach -Minimum of 60 minutes of math built into the master schedule. -Triple III/Enrichment (30 to 60 minutes weekly) -Implementation of Common Core State Standards in grades K-1; partial implementation in grades 2-5 -30 minutes of district required Professional Development weekly -Common Core Math Training in grades K-5 -Sending home Family Topic letters at beginning of each math topic. -Increase the number of Mountain Math Centers or Bulletin Boards -Computer programs: Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, FASTT Math, Education City -ESE Resource Teacher -Family Math Night -School-wide basic math facts -Math Committee --Emphasis placed on classrooms with lower achieving students when assigning mentors and/or volunteers	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach -ESE Resource Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -Common District and School-wide assessments -Committee minutes -Teacher Data Input Form (for monthly data meeting with Principal)	-Lesson Plans -Exit slips from school-based trainings

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring proficient in Math was 49% compared to the District Average of 59%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring proficient in		

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	49%	63%	66%	70%	74%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Subgroups making satisfactory progress in Math: White: 57% (Compared to District Average of 68%) Black: 29% (Compared to District Average of 38%) Hispanic: 45% (Compared to District Average of 53%) In 2012-2013 the percentage of Subgroups making satisfactory progress in reading as measured by Florida School Grade: White: 67% Black: 44% Hispanic: 62%

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

2011-2012: White: 57% (100 students) Black: 29% (11 students) Hispanic: 45% (78 students)			2012-2013: White: 67% (113 Students) Black: 44% (18 Students Hispanic: 62% (110 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	Number of Students in Math Scoring in the Lowest 33% of Grades 3-5	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -At least 60 minutes of math daily built into Master Schedule -Full time Math Coach -Family Topic letters sent home at beginning of each Math topic explaining what students are learning -Increase Mountain Math Centers and Bulletin Board -Required Professional Development by the District -Implement Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, partial implementation in grades 2-5. -Following pacing in Math Academic Plan -Enrichment Workshops (30 minutes of Math enrichment weekly) -Computer based math programs -Differentiated Math centers -Weekly team planning -ESE Resource Teacher -Math Committee -Family Math Night -"The Leader in Me" life habits development	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -ESOL Contact -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -Common District and School-wide assessments -Committee minutes -Teacher Data Input Form (for monthly data meeting with Principal)	-Lesson Plans -Enrichment Workshop Plans -Observations -Computer program reports -District and school-wide Common Assessment Results -Classroom walk-throughs

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.	In 2011-2012 the percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in Math was 23% compared to the district average of 35%.
Mathematics Goal #5C:	In 2012-2013 the percentage of English Language Learners making satisfactory progress in Math will increase to 44% as measured by Florida School Grade.

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
2011-2012: 23% (23 students)			2012-2013: 44% (46 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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language Acquisition	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -At least 60 minutes of math daily built into Master Schedule -Full time Math Coach -Family Topic letters sent home at beginning of each Math topic explaining what students are learning -Increase Mountain Math Centers and Bulletin Board -Required Professional Development by the District -Implement Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, partial implementation in grades 2-5. -Following pacing in Math Academic Plan -Enrichment Workshops (30 minutes of Math enrichment weekly) -Computer based math programs (Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer, Imagine Learning, Rosetta Stone, FASTT Math, Education City -Differentiated Math centers -Weekly team planning -ESE Resource Teacher -Math Committee -Family Math Night -"The Leader in Me" life habits development -SIOP Interventions -1st year LY students must have: 30 to 60 minutes of Rosetta Stone daily and 30 to 60 minutes of Imagine Learning Daily -2nd year LY students must have 15 to 30 minutes of Rosetta Stone and/or Imagine Learning Daily -ESOL Paraprofessional	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -ESOL Contact -Parents	Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -Common District and School-wide assessments -Committee minutes -Teacher Data Input Form (for monthly data meeting with Principal)	-Lesson Plans -Enrichment Workshop Plans -Observations -Computer program reports -District and school-wide Common Assessment Results -Classroom walk-throughs

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Math was 22% compared to the District Average of 31%. In 2012-2013 the percentage of Students with Disabilities making satisfactory progress in Math will increase to 43%as measured by Florida School Grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 22% (9 students)	2012-2013: 43% (18 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	Rigor of Curriculum used in Intensive Academics and Social Communications for Students on FCAT Track	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material and cannot be pulled from direct instruction -At least 60 minutes of math daily built into Master Schedule -Full time Math Coach -Family Topic letters sent home at beginning of each Math topic explaining what students are learning -Increase Mountain Math Centers and Bulletin Board -Required Professional Development by the District -Implement Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, partial implementation in grades 2-5. -Following pacing in Math Academic Plan -Enrichment Workshops (30 minutes of Math enrichment weekly) -Computer based math programs (Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer FASTT Math, Education City -Differentiated Math centers -Weekly team planning -ESE Resource Teacher -Math Committee -Family Math Night -"The Leader in Me" life habits development	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher -Parents	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -Common District and School-wide assessments -Committee minutes -Teacher Data Input Form (for monthly data meeting with Principal)	-Lesson Plans -Enrichment Workshop Plans -Observations -Computer program reports -District and school-wide Common Assessment Results -Classroom walk-throughs

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:

	In 2011-2012 the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal E:

students making satisfactory progress in Math was 43% compared to the District Average of 50%.

In 2012-2013 the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress in Math will increase to 58% as measured by Florida School Grade.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 43% (131 students)	2012-2013: 58% (173 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	Socio-economic conditions (increased free/reduced lunch population)	-District provides free breakfast for all students -Must have access to grade level material -At least 60 minutes of math daily built into Master Schedule -Full time Math Coach -Family Topic letters sent home at beginning of each Math topic explaining what students are learning -Increase Mountain Math Centers and Bulletin Board -Required Professional Development by the District -Implement Common Core State Standards in grades K-1, partial implementation in grades 2-5. -Following pacing in Math Academic Plan -Enrichment Workshops (30 minutes of Math enrichment weekly) -Computer based math programs (Compass Odyssey, FCAT Explorer FASTT Math, Education City -Differentiated Math centers -Weekly team planning -ESE Resource Teacher -Math Committee -Family Math Night -"The Leader in Me" life habits development	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Math Coach -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher	-Lesson Plans -Computer program reports -Common District and School-wide assessments -Committee minutes -Teacher Data Input Form (for monthly data meeting with Principal)	-Lesson Plans -Enrichment Workshop Plans -Observations -Computer program reports -District and school-wide Common Assessment Results -Classroom walk-throughs

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	K-5	State of Florida	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach	June 2012	Lesson plans -Trainings for faculty -Observations -Classroom walk-throughs -Minutes from Grade Level meetings	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor
Common Core Implementation in Math	K-5	-Math Coach -5th Grade Teacher -2nd Grade Teacher	-Instructional Staff in grades K-5	September 2012 October 2012	-Lesson plans -Observations of math lessons -Classroom walk-throughs -Minutes from Grade Level meetings	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Math Coach -Basic Resource Teacher -Guidance Counselor
Keys Climate Survey Review Staff determines areas of strength and areas of opportunities	-All Staff	-Keys Committee	-All Staff	Ongoing	-Minutes from grade level meetings -Monthly meetings with administration	-All Staff
The Leader in Me (3-day training for teachers) Developing life habits/self-esteem, leading to higher achievement scores for students	-All Instructional staff	Thomas Stephens	-Administration -All Instructional Staff	Ongoing	-Bulletin Boards displaying the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students
The Leader in Me (1-day training for teachers) Implementing the habits in the classroom.	-All Instructional Staff	Thomas Stephens	-Administration -All Instructional Staff	Ongoing	-Bulletin Boards displaying student work from the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students

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
Compass Odyssey Computer Program	See same item in Reading Budget.	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Implementation in Math	Subs to cover classrooms so teachers in grades K-5 can attend 3 hour training.		$5,000.00
State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Enrichment Workshop (iii for students substantially below in Reading- enrichment for other students. 30 minutes daily.)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida Ready	Test Prep Workbooks for Grades 3-5	After School Funds	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
			Grand Total: $10,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in Science was 46% compared to the District average of 49%. In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring at or above a Level 3 in Science will increase to 49% to meet the district average as measured by the Florida School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
FCAT Science Results: 46% (56 students)	FCAT Science Results: 49% (67)

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
	Time Constraints in Daily Schedule	-Part time Science Teacher/Science Coach -Science Lab for grades 3-5 with classroom support for grades K-2 -FCAT Science Explorer grade 5 -Incorporating Science reading in the Reading block. -Science enrichment	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Specialist -Science Teacher/Coach -Classroom Teachers -Carlos Negron (District	-Lesson Plans -Assessment results -Monthly data meetings with Administration -Committee minutes -5th grade teachers attend training on P-Sell program -P-Sell research professors will conduct observations and provide feedback	-District and school-wide Common Assessment Results -Science Notebooks in grades 3-5 -Classroom walk-throughs

| 1 | | to Level 4 and 5 students in grades 4-5 -District Science Baseline and MidYear assessments -Selection as P-Sell research project for 5th grade -Science Committee -Science Notebooks in grades 3-5 -Web of Life (field trip) 4th Grade -Aquatic Systems Mosquito Education Program (week long program) 5th Grade | Coordinator of P-Sell project) | | |

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:	In 2011-2012 the number of students scoring at Levels 4, 5 or 6 was 0%. In 2012-2013 the number of students scoring at Levels 4, 5 or 6 will increase 20% as measured by the Florida School Grade Report or Florida Alternate Assessment School Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 0% (0 students)	2012-2013: 20% (1 student)

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
P-Sell Training	-5th	-Carlos Negron	-Grade 5	-Ongoing	-Observation -Participant product from training -Visits from Carlos Negron	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Science Teacher -Carlos Negron -Classroom Teachers
The Leader in Me (1-day training for teachers) Implementing the habits in the classroom	-All Instructional Staff	-Thomas Stephens	-All Instructional Staff	-Ongoing	-Bulletin Boards displaying the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students
The Leader in Me (3-day training for teachers) Developing life habits/ self-esteem, leading to higher achievement scores for students	-All Instructional Staff	-Thomas Stephens	-All Instructional Staff	-Ongoing	-Bulletin Boards displaying the 7 habits -Observation of students in hallways and classrooms -Monitor major assessment results	-Administration -School Staff -Parents -Students

Keys Climate Survey Review Staff determines areas of strength and areas of opportunities	-All Staff	-Keys Committee	-All Staff	-Ongoing	-Minutes from grade level meetings -Monthly meetings with administration	-All Staff

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
P-Sell Training for Grade 5 Teachers	P-Sell materials and training provided as part of study.	District/University Grant	$0.00
The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012, 45% of students scored at a level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writing in comparison to the District Average of 48.7%. In 2012-2013, the number of students scoring at a level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writing will increase to 49% to meet the District Average as measured by the Florida School Grade Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2011-2012: 45% (61 students)	2012-2013: 49% (67 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	Teacher knowledge of FCAT 2.0 Writing/2012 Calibration Scoring	-Pull and distribute information from state on FCAT 2.0 Writing and the Calibration Scoring guide -School-wide writing monthly -Monthly data meetings with Administration -Writing Committee -Increase time for students to write school-wide writing or practice essays in 4th grade to 1 hour	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Basic Resource Teacher -ESE Resource Teacher -Classroom Teacher	-Lesson Plans -Writing Committee Minutes -Monthly school-wide writes scores recorded on Teacher Data Input form -Monthly data meetings with Administration -Teacher collaborative review and grading	-Monthly School-Wide Writes Assessments -District Baseline, Mid-Year Assessments for 4th Grade -FCAT 2.0 Writing results -Classroom walk-through
2	Language Acquisition	-ELL students must not be pulled from direct teacher instruction -Computer programs: Rosetta Stone and Imagine Learning -Small group intervention -ESOL Paraprofessional	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Basic Resource Teacher/ESOL Contact -Teachers	-Lesson Plans -Observations -Monthly data meetings with Administration	-Monthly school-wide writing assessment -District, Mid-Year writing assessment for 4th grade -FCAT 2.0 Writing results -Classroom walk-through

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	-
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
-	-

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Unique Curriculum Pacing (specifically writing)	3	District ESE Department	Teachers in grade 4	TBD	-Teacher feedback on Evaluation Form -Student scores on FAA Writing assessment	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Basic Resource Teacher -Classroom teachers
FCAT 2.0 Writing 2012 Calibration Guide	3-4	District Language Arts Coordinator	Teachers in grades 3-4	TBD	-Teacher feedback on Evaluation Form -Student scores on school-wide writes	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Basic Resource Teacher -Classroom teachers
K-1 Rubric Training	K-1	District Language Arts Coordinator	Teachers in grades K-1	TBD	-Teacher feedback on Evaluation form -Monthly school-wide writes	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Basic ResourceTeacher -Classroom Teachers
Written Response to Reading	3-5	District Language Arts Coordinator	Teachers in grades 3-5	October 2012	-Teacher feedback on Evaluation form -Lesson Plans -Observation	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Curriculum Specialist -Reading Coach -Basic ResourceTeacher -Classroom Teachers

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training on FCAT 2.0 Writing and 2012 Calibration Scoring Guide	Information provided by State Training provided by District	District	$0.00
Training on pacing of Unique Curriculum (specifically writing)	Training provided by District	District	$0.00
K-1 Rubric Training (district created rubric)	Understanding how to score student work.	District	$0.00
Written Response to Reading	How to respond in writing to a piece of text read.	District	$0.00
The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$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

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:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

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:	
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In 2011-2012, 7,641 volunteer hours or 8.65 hours per student (880 students) as measured by the 5 Star Award. In 2012-2013, the number of volunteer hours will increase to 7,920 volunteer hours or 9.0 hours per student (880) students as measured by the 5 Star Award.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
7,641 Volunteer Hours 880 students = 8.65 volunteer hours per student	7,920 Volunteer Hours 880 students = 9.0 volunteer hours per student

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	Socio-economic conditions	-Invite parents to become part of the Parents Assisting Teachers PAT) -Recruit volunteers from the local universities: FGCU, Edison State -Encourage parents and grandparents to volunteer -Volunteer Breakfast -Recognition for volunteers -Coffee with the Principal and Lunch (both monthly) with students to get parents in the school -Encourage volunteering in school newsletter -Increasing father participation through nationwide program - Dad's of Great Students (D.O.G.S)	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Volunteer Coordinator -Teachers	-Letters to universities asking for volunteers -Orientation for volunteers -Volunteer breakfast -Volunteer recognition -Log for volunteers to keep track of hours	-Log and visual "thermometer" of volunteer hours

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

No Data Submitted

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Anti-Bullying 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. Anti-Bullying Goal Anti-Bullying Goal #1:	In 2011-2012 there were 0 bullying incidents, but 29 peer conflicts as measured by the district referral system. In 2012-2013 maintain 0 bullying incidents and decrease the number of peer conflicts by 3% to 27 or less.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
0 Bullying Incidents 29 Peer Conflicts	0 Bullying Incidents 27 Peer Conflicts

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time for instruction on what is bullying, how to report, and how to handle peer conflict.	-Implementation of Leader in Me (life habits) -Assistant Principal orients 5th grade students on what bullying is and how to report an incident -Guidance lessons for each grade level on what bullying is and how to report -Guidance lessons for each grade level on what peer conflict is and how to handle -Teachers take a district required training on how to recognize and handle bullying -Student behavior contracts reviewed and signed by student and parent -Curriculum Night - setting behavior expectations -Communication with parents about behavior daily in student agendas.	-Principal -Assistant Principal -Guidance Counselor -Classroom Teacher	-Observation -Number of referrals -Online district required training for teachers on how to recognize and handle bullying. -Professional Development for teachers on how to recognize, handle and avoid peer conflict.	-Referrals -Certificate of Completion for teachers on anti-bullying.

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 Anti-Bullying Goal(s)

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. Goal Goal #1:	.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
.	.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	.	.	.	.	.

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 Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Saxon Phonics	Last part of 2 year plan to change Phonics program in grades K-2.	After School Funds	$11,447.00
				Subtotal: $11,447.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Compass Odyssey Computer Program	Program purchased for all elementary schools in district by the district.	District	$0.00
Mathematics	Compass Odyssey Computer Program	See same item in Reading Budget.	District	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	State program offered to all schools in Florida.	State/District	$0.00
Reading	Close Reading (3 hours)	Substitute teachers needed so teachers could attend 3 hour training.		$3,200.00
Reading	Common Core State Standards Overview (3 hour training) from district training, June 2012	Overview of the CCSS.	District Train the Trainers	$0.00
Reading	Literacy Framework (1 hour training)	Outline of expectations of the Reading Block. Combining core reading materials with CCSS and NGSSS.	None	$0.00
Reading	Enrichment Workshop (iii for students substantially below in Reading- enrichment for other students. 30 minutes daily.)	Expectations for iii for students substantially below in reading and enrichment for other students.	None	$0.00
Reading	The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	Developing 7 habits of highly effective people.	School Improvement Fund/After School Fund	$9,000.00
Reading	Keys Climate Survey	Provided by NEA	District	$0.00
Reading	The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	Implementing the 7 habits in the classroom.	After School Funds	$3,900.00
CELLA	See Reading, Math and Writing Budgets			$0.00
Mathematics	Common Core Implementation in Math	Subs to cover classrooms so teachers in grades K-5 can attend 3 hour training.		$5,000.00
Mathematics	State sponsored training on Common Core State Standards including an Implementation Plan for the Common Core State Standards	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Mathematics	Enrichment Workshop (iii for students substantially below in Reading- enrichment for other students. 30 minutes daily.)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00

Mathematics	The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Mathematics	Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Mathematics	The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Science	P-Sell Training for Grade 5 Teachers	P-Sell materials and training provided as part of study.	District/University Grant	$0.00
Science	The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Science	The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Science	Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Writing	Training on FCAT 2.0 Writing and 2012 Calibration Scoring Guide	Information provided by State Training provided by District	District	$0.00
Writing	Training on pacing of Unique Curriculum (specifically writing)	Training provided by District	District	$0.00
Writing	K-1 Rubric Training (district created rubric)	Understanding how to score student work.	District	$0.00
Writing	Written Response to Reading	How to respond in writing to a piece of text read.	District	$0.00
Writing	The Leader in Me (18 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Writing	Keys Climate Survey	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
Writing	The Leader in Me (6 hour training)	See same item in Reading Budget.		$0.00
				Subtotal: $21,100.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Florida Ready	Test Prep Workbooks for Grades 3-5	After School Funds	$5,000.00
Reading	Charming Readers	Incentive for independent reading as measured by the Accelerated Reader program	After School Funds	$3,000.00
Reading	Library Books	Different Genres	Target Grant - $500 After School Funds - $2,669 Scholastic Dollars - $3,000	$6,169.00
Mathematics	Florida Ready	Test Prep Workbooks for Grades 3-5	After School Funds	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $19,169.00
				Grand Total: $51,716.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ꭎ Priority	ꭎ Focus	ꭎ Prevent	ꭎ NA

Are you a reward school: ꭎ Yes ꭎ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/31/2012)

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
School Improvement funds will be spent to directly support school improvement goals when/if the funds are allocated to schools.	$0.00

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

The School Improvement Plan was presented for approval by the School Advisory Council(SAC) on September 27, 2012

The purpose of the School Advisory Council is to perform the functions that are prescribed by the regulations of the School Board. The SAC will assist in the evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will give advice concerning the annual school budget, and will approve the use of the school improvement funds.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District
SAN CARLOS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	81%	76%	54%	290	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	61%	68%			129	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?	40% (NO)	55% (YES)			95	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					514	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District
SAN CARLOS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	77%	87%	50%	295	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%	64%			132	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	51% (YES)	57% (YES)			108	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					535	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested