# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GERALD ADAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Monroe

Principal: Dr. Fran Herrin

SAC Chair: Mrs. Lorraine Grobarek

Superintendent: Mr. Mark Porter

Date of School Board Approval: November 2012

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

# PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Doctorate of | | | Principal of Gerald Adams Elementary 2002-current<br><br>2011-2012: Grade A-Overall performance. Learning gains showed great improvement. The inclusion of SWD and ELL in proficiency levels brought those areas down slightly. Proficiency levels: Reading 55%; Math 66%; Writing 78%; and Science 48%. Learning Gains: Reading 78%; Math 84%; and Low 25-Learning Gains: Reading 82%; and Math 83%.<br><br>2010-2011: Grade B Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 61%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 67%, No subgroup made AYP in reading; and only the Black subgroup made AYP in math. |

| Principal | Anne F Herrin | Education-Teacher Leadership and Supervision, Walden University; Master of Science-Educational Leadership, Troy State Univeristy; BS in Education; University of South Florida; Principal's Certification-State of Florida. | 10 | 18 | 2009-2010: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 77%, Math Mastery: 87%, Science Mastery: 50%, Writing Mastery: 82%. AYP: 90%, BLACK, ELL, ED and SWD did not make AYP in reading; however, all subgroups made AYP in math through safe harbor.<br><br>2008-2009: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 87%, Science Mastery: 75%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 85%, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading; and ELL, SWD, Black, and FRPL did not make AYP in math.<br><br>2007-2008: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 82%, Math Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 64%. AYP: 90%, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading; and SWD did not make AYP in math.<br><br>2006-2007: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 81%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 62%, Writing Mastery: 70%. AYP: 97%: All subgroups made AYP in reading; and only ELL did not make AYP in math.<br><br>2005-2006: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 75%, Writing Mastery: 71%. AYP: 100%.<br><br>2004-2005: Grade C: Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 71%, Writing Mastery: 64%. AYP: 100%. |
| Principal | | | | | |

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math | Carol Schmidlin | MS in Administration and Supervision | 10 | 6 | 2011-2012: Grade A-Overall performance. Learning gains showed great improvement. The inclusion of SWD and ELL in proficiency levels brought those areas down slightly. Proficiency levels: Reading 55%; Math 66%; Writing 78%; and Science 48%. Learning Gains: Reading 78%; Math 84%; and Low 25-Learning Gains: Reading 82%; and Math 83%.<br><br>2010-2011: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 61%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 67%, No subgroup made AYP in reading; and only the Black subgroup made AYP in math.<br><br>2009-2010: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 77%, Math Mastery: 87%, Science Mastery: 50%, Writing Mastery: 96%. AYP: 90%, ELL, SWD, Black,and ED did not make AYP in reading; All subgroups made AYP in math (achieved via safe harbor).<br><br>2008-2009: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 87%, Science Mastery: 75%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 85%, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading; and ELL, SWD, Black, and FRPL did not make AYP in math.<br><br>2007-2008: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 82%, Math Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 63%, Writing Mastery: 64%. AYP: 90%, ELL and SWD did not make AYP in reading; and SWD did not make AYP in |

| | | | | | math. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2006-2007: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 81%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 62%, Writing Mastery: 70%. AYP: 97%: All subgroups made AYP in reading; and only ELL did not make AYP in math. |
| | | | | | 2005-2006: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 75%, Writing Mastery: 71%. AYP: 100%. |
| | | | | | 2004-2005: Grade C: Reading Mastery: 72%, Math Mastery: 71%, Writing Mastery: 64%. AYP: 100%. |
| Reading | Rob Taylor | M. Ed. University of Florida | 4 | 2 | 2011-2012: Grade A-Overall performance. Learning gains showed great improvement. The inclusion of SWD and ELL in proficiency levels brought those areas down slightly. Proficiency levels: Reading 55%; Math 66%; Writing 78%; and Science 48%. Learning Gains: Reading 78%; Math 84%; and Low 25-Learning Gains: Reading 82%; and Math 83%.<br><br>2010-2011: Grade B: Reading Mastery: 79%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 61%, Writing Mastery: 88%. AYP: 67%, No subgroup made AYP in reading; and only the Black subgroup made AYP in math.<br><br>2008-2010 Reading/Language Arts/ RtI Program specialist for MCSD. "A" District, (average over 2 yrs) 75% of students meeting high standards in reading, 64% making learning gains in reading, 60% of lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>2007-2008 Instructional coach at Gerald Adams. "A" school, 82% of students meeting high standards in reading, 65% making learning gains in reading, 64% of lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. |

## 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 | Regular Meetings of new teachers with Principal (SW 5) | Principal | on-going | |
| 2 | Assignment of a mentor to work with new staff members. We have a differentiated mentoring program to meet the needs of our new and/or beginning teachers (SW 5) | Principal/Mentors | on-going | |
| 3 | Culture of participation and shared decision-making (SW 5) | Principal/BLPT | on-going | |
| 4 | e-recruiting (SW 5) | HR Director | on-going | |
| 5 | Professional Development (SW 4, SW 5) | Principal/Academic Coaches | on-going | |
| 6 | Team Leader Support (SW 5) | Building Level Planning Team Representatives | on-going | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | 5.0%(2) | 10.0%(4) | 40.0%(16) | 45.0%(18) | 37.5%(15) | 100.0%(40) | 100.0%(40) | 5.0%(2) | 90.0%(36) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lynn Gallagher

Linda Marston | Celina Perez Yvette Toledo

Kristen Logan | Same Grade Level Experienced Mentor

Same Grade Level Experienced Mentor | Completion of our New Teacher Program to include modeling of highly effective classroom strategies, classroom management and student discipline support strategies, assisting with curriculum planning, use of pacing guides and instructional focus calendars. Providing guidance on school and district policies and procedures. |

# 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

School-Wide Model: Title 1 funds are utilized to support school efforts to ensure that all children have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high quality education. Title 1 funds supplement academic programs and provide additional resources to students and teachers at qualifying schools. Title 1 services provide additional assistance for students performing below grade level including academic assistance during the school day. Parental involvement is a key factor in the successful implementation of Title 1 programs, and Title 1 funds are utilized to enhance involvement opportunities. Parents are encouraged to attend SAC meetings, family reading events, student performances, and various academic fairs throughout the school year.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

Title II funds are utilized to support professional development and efforts to move all teachers to in-field effective teacher status. Funds are expended for numerous initiatives including bonuses for teachers who complete the Reading and ESOL Endorsement, support from a Professional Development contact at school site, stipends for professional development, Reading Specialist at district level to provide technical assistance and training, materials and supplies for training sessions, and reimbursement of testing fees and courses to remain or become highly qualified.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners. A Haitian Creole, Parent Liaison has been employed to improve communication and school-to-home relationships with the Haitian population.

Title X- Homeless

Transportation for after school programs, school supplies, backpacks, children and youth qualify for free/reduced lunch without application, referrals, CHIPS contact in every school, Student Residency Questionnaire to identify homeless children and youth.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) dollars are prioritized according to specific needs of students failing to achieve academically and advance as expected according to the district's Student Progression Plan. Specialized dropout prevention programs are funded according to articulated needs and program outcomes. In addition, every school, including charter schools, has an SAI dollar amount allocated for staffing academic support and intervention according to the needs of the school and the documented success of current initiatives. The Principal determines use of the SAI dollars in school-based allocations. Currently, these dollars are being used for salary/benefits of Reading Coaches, Academic Coaches, Intensive Reading Teachers, Intensive Math Teachers, paraprofessionals, and data management staff directly related to progress monitoring and academic intervention with non-proficient students and support for professional staff.

Violence Prevention Programs

Monroe County School District is committed to providing a safe and secure environment that encourages learning. One strategy is to utilize behavior shaping programs to ensure a safe-school climate which include Positive Behavior Support and Professional Crisis Management. Another strategy is to ensure students have access to learn the skills necessary to be good decision makers. Students are provided curriculum in character education that aides in the students' core developmental on fundamental life issues. Programs offered by MCSD and/or our community partners seek to increase the protective factors in youth while reducing risk factors. Those programs may include:
Mentoring (Take Stock in Children or the BIGS programs)
Service Learning Projects
Assemblies
Challenge Day/Be The Change Transition Programs
PEACEJAM
Too Good For Violence
Anti-Bullying Programs

Nutrition Programs

The Monroe County School Health Advisory Council collaborates with MCSD to ensure students and families are provided information to make healthy decisions both at school and at home regarding nutrition and physical activity. MCSD offers a balanced school breakfast and lunch program with access to free and reduced pricing for students-in-need. The school community is committed to offering only healthy snacks at all times on the school campus.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

Head Start is a national, federally funded program, providing comprehensive services to preschool children and their families. These services include educational, social, medical, vision, dental, nutritional, and mental health services.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

We also have 1 Pre-K ESE class and 2 Voluntary Pre-K class.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Our RtI Leadership Team consists of:

Principal, Fran Herrin--The role of the Principal is to provide direction for the use of data-based decision-making, to direct or conduct assessments of RtI skills of school staff, to support and review intervention support and documentation, to open the calendar for professional development to support RtI implementation, and to communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Oversees all processes. RtI Coach, Lance Benson-- The coach's role includes providing quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to supporting interventions (at Tier 1, 2 and 3), the RtI Coach continues to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. She also tracks time lines. Coordinate the SST process and chairs the meetings.

ESE Staffing Specialist, Gretchen Weiss--Oversees the ESE program and works with teachers and therapists on interventions for academics and behavior Reading Coach, Rob Taylor- Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans. Oversees the reading program and assists teachers in creating interventions for all areas of reading. Academic Coaches: (Taylor and Carol Schmidlin) Develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Can act as the facilitator on the School-Based RtI Leadership Team to guide the members through the problem solving process.

Academic Coach (Math), Carol Schmidlin--Oversees the math program and assists teachers in creating interventions as they relate to math. She also serves as the data coach and can facilitate data reporting.

General Education Teacher: (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Special Education Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. ELL Teachers: Educate the team on the role language acquisition plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language acquisition skills. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities. School Psychologist, Dave Fappiano--Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities. School health personnel-Star Norris and Beth Oropeza ensure that health screenings and health related issues are properly addressed and monitor any issues that can affect students academic and emotional growth. Behavior Specialist, MaryAnn Nichol--provides strategies and suggests behavioral interventions.

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?

Our School-Based RtI Leadership Team meets on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the school-wide Problem Solving/Response to Instruction Program(PS/RtI). First, we work to consistently build consensus and maintain the

infrastructure necessary for successful continuation of PS/RtI through training, professional development and coaching. As we fully implement PS/RtI, the School-Based RtI Leadership Team is responsible for routinely reviewing Tier 1, 2 and 3 data as a team and will use that data to inform the problem solving process that will be used to ensure student success at every tier. The team will also ensure treatment fidelity/integrity by providing the support necessary to teachers and staff for all instruction and intervention plans developed through the problem solving process. To provide a structure for team meetings, each RtI Leadership Team member will be assigned a role and corresponding responsibilities: • Chair: Oversees the implementation of PS/RtI school-wide and helps to coordinate and effectuate the efforts and action plans of the School-Based RtI Leadership Team. • Facilitator: Supports the team's efforts through active involvement, reporting team efforts to staff, and leading the team in the problem solving process at School-Based RtI Leadership Team meetings.

• Time Keeper: Manages the time spent in meetings on a specific topic, issue or problem. Helps to move the meetings along and ensure that we use the time we have efficiently and effectively.

• Tier 1 and Tier 2 & 3 Case Managers: The case managers will monitor the progress of action plans developed by the School-Based RtI Leadership Team for their respective tiers between meetings and report results to the team. *Depending on the number of team members this role can be filled by one or multiple people i.e. A Tier 1 Case Manager and a Tier 2 & 3 Case Manager, a Tier 1, 2 & 3 Case Manager or a Case Manager for each Tier.

• Recorder: Creates meeting agendas, takes meeting minutes and creates action plans during problem solving sessions and communicates them to the team and appropriate personnel.

The Principal is responsible for coordinating the RtI Leadership team. The first step in the process is for teachers to identify a problem and implement interventions. Any member of the RtI can assist the teacher for assistance. If adequate progress is not achieved, the teacher will then complete a referral packet including pre and post test data, descriptions of the interventions, parent conferences, etc. A meeting with the parents, teacher and the RtI Team will be scheduled to determine if further interventions will be done or if the child will move forward in the evaluation process. A case manager is assigned to observe and follow up with the teacher.

Academic coaches facilitate grade level meetings once a week. These meetings are used to analyze data, share best practices and to discuss progress of individual students and problem solve.
The school administration meets with each grade level at least once per month. Grade level performance data, classroom walk-through data, professional development and best practices are shared at these meetings. Overall school achievement goals are tracked by grade level and many issues will be brought to the BLPT as part of the school-wide decision-making model and vertical communication model. Learning communities are scheduled once a month. All instructional staff are assigned to a committee based on each person's strength areas. There is representation from each grade level as well as special areas. Data and strategies are shared at these meetings to assess progress on the School Improvement Plan and to allow for vertical teaming.

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 team will be involved with the creation of the SIP. Their responsibilities include:

• Analysis of school-wide and disaggregated data.
• Development of the RtI portion of the plan.
• Organizing/Developing Tier 1, 2 and 3 services and supports.
• Professional Development needs and planning.

The RtI Leadership Team reviews the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) with learning communities on a monthly basis. If changes need to be made in the plan, recommendations are made to the Building Level Planning Team (BLPT) and the SAC Chair. These changes are processed through BLPT and presented at SAC for input. Changes are made as necessary. In the spring of each year, the learning communities review the plan and make recommendations for the new SIP based on the data received from Performance Matters, FCAT, Text or Teacher-made assessments and the FOCUS mini assessments. These recommendations are presented for discussion to SAC who also have input into the final writing of the plan.

---

## MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: K-2 Reading FAIR in Reading; Performance Matters in Math, Reading and Science Universal Screening: • Reading – FAIR (PMRN), K-5 (Performance Matters), K-5 (STAR & Early Literacy) • Math – K-5 (Performance Matters) Progress Monitoring: • Reading – FAIR (PMRN), K-5 (Performance Matters – CBM's and progress monitoring assessments), K-2 (District Harcourt Assessment Team Materials *tests, directions and graphs will be available on the RtI SharePoint site shortly, https://portal.monroe.k12.fl.us/PortalSites/rti/default.aspx. • Math – K-5 (Performance Matters – CBM's and progress

monitoring assessments) FOCUS mini assessments in grades 3-5. Diagnostic Assessments: • Reading –FAIR (PMRN), DAR Science Grades 5, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Assessment in science (grade 5 only) and previous year's FCAT data. Writing Grade 4,SMILE Writing Curriculum and Quarterly assessments and previous year's FCAT data. Grades K-5-- Teach Me Writing--School-based progress checks Frequency of Data Days: Once a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The District RtI Leadership Team will continually provide training and technical assistance to School-Based RtI Leadership Teams. The trainings provided will be outlined in the MCSD Problem Solving and Response to Instruction Plan and will include training modules such as the Problem Solving Process, data analysis and instructional decision making guidelines as well and the general education and special education laws. After the trainings are provided the School-Based RtI Leadership Team will be responsible to train their entire school staff and provide any coaching, professional development and technical assistance necessary.

Professional development has been provided as GAE was a pilot school in RTI through the University of South Florida. This professional development will continue via the District RTI Coach and the RTI Coordinator. Training will take place in monthly faculty meetings and in grade level or pod meetings. The focus of the training for this school year will be 1) RTI: Problem-Solving Model--Building Consensus, Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RTI and 2) RTI: Challenges to Implementation Data Based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions. The RTI Coach will continue to offer training in data analysis and technology to supporting data analysis as needed. Other PD may be offered if need arises from grade level or school-wide team input.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The district MTSS team meets throughout the year to provide direction to school-wide teams. The school principal, Fran Herrin, serves as a member of this team. Additionally, the allocation of a guidance counselor to facilitate the MTSS processes and professional development for teachers as multiple programs have been integrated to take a full-service approach to the problem-solving process.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Rob Taylor-Reading Coach
Carol Schmidlin-Academic Coach
Gretchen Brown-Media Specialist
Kathy Collins-ESE Specialist
Fran Herrin-Principal
Ann Marie Dillon – General Education Teacher
Gloria Pascual (ELL Teacher)

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

The LLT meets quarterly to review school-wide reading and writing data, focusing on trend data. Professional Development opportunities are planned aligning with the data trends. Whole-school student reading and writing initiatives are developed or adjusted based on the data and the success of prior initiatives.

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

The LLT will review Assessment Period 1 school-wide data once the students have completed the assessments to determine school-wide needs. Based on trends from last year, we are expecting to focus energy and resources toward strengthening the differentiated instruction model throughout the school by focusing on the Lesson Study approach to build teacher confidence in the planning process which results in appropriate instruction for all students, regardless of their ability level. We will also continue to focus on ensuring that our Tier 1 instruction in all grade levels is at the appropriate level and support the classrooms which are unable to attain or maintain the 80% mark. The CWT process will be utilized to insure appropriate instructional techniques are being utilized to achieve higher literacy rates throughout the school. Student reading and writing initiatives will include: Accelerated Reading goals, School-wide writing prompts, PAKER nights, and parental involvement lunches.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

> The GAE Faculty works closely with district personnel and local Pre-School directors to share information regarding curriculum standards, social-emotional target levels, and health/safety issues in order to increase readiness to start school.
>
> Students who are enrolled in VPK, Head Start, and Pre-K ESE receive instruction from certified teachers who are able to recognize at-risk and high performing 4 year olds. Progress is monitored through the Galileo program throughout the year.
>
> Events such as parent information meetings, Kindergarten Round-Up (early registration), and Pre K ESE transitional IEP meetings are held each spring. Teachers, parents, staffing specialists, and representatives from community agencies such as the Early Learning Coalition of Miami-Dade/Monroe as well as Easter Seals and Wesley House Family Services work together to assess and plan for the needs of the individual student to ensure a smooth transition and positive start to Kindergarten. MCSD has a formal agreement with the Early Learning Coalition of Miami-Dade/Monroe and Wesley House Family Services.
>
> Continual collaboration between staff/parents/agencies has proven to be successful. When the need arises, Pre-K ESE students are enrolled in an extended-year Summer Program to help these at-risk students maintain their progress. VPK summer classes are offered to qualifying 4 year olds.

## *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: | Currently 57% (120 students) of our grade 3-5 students are on track to be proficient in reading per the 2012 state/federal data. Test data from the 2012 FCAT demonstrate that we need to address weaknesses in the following content clusters: Grade 3: Reading Application; Grade 4: Reading Application, and Literary Analysis (Fiction/Non-Fiction) Grade 5: Vocabulary, Reading Application, Literary Analysis (Fiction/Non-Fiction,and Informtional Text. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 57% (120 of 212) of the students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test in Reading. (SW 1) | 64% (142 students) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 |

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time for Professional Development Reduction in personnel to adequately support initiative | Create a Professional Learning Community (PLC) to study the 22 Components of Great Teaching by Charlotte Danielson. Initiate Lesson Study for the cadres (4-5 teachers); (2-3 teachers) and (K-1) with an emphasis on "marking the text" to increase comprehension and to guide children to making sense of the essential ideas within the text. | Fran Herrin/Carol Schmidlin-PLC Coordinators Rob Taylor/Mary Ellen Richichi-- Lesson Study Facilitators | Minutes of meetings and teacher feedback CWTs to see the components and strategies being implemented. Authentic student work samples that show effective use of marking the text. | FCAT Scores Increased achievement on Performance Matters from baseline to end of year results |
| 2 | Reduction in Support Staff | Implement an intervention time to maximize the use of personnel and facilitate the differentiated instructional groups. (SW 9) | Fran Herrin, Principal | CWT's, Progress Monitoring Assessments 1,2 and 3 | Performance Matters-Data Reports; Conferences and grade level meetings. |
| 3 | A high percentage of at-risk students that lack pre-requisite skills | Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO's) in grades K-5 through our tutoring Program. (SW 9 and SW 2) | Principal, Fran Herrin | Progress Monitoring Assessments 1, 2, and 3. Intervention Success Rate throught RTI Process | FCAT Scores, Performance Matters Reports, Focus Mini-Assessments |
| 4 | New FCAT 2.0--higher level of analysis required | Infuse Model Lessons and Document Based Questions using the Leveled History Theme Baskets (SW 8, SW 3) | Teachers | CWT's, Progress Monitoring Assessments 1,2 and 3 | FCAT Scores |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Century 21 Program not renewed. | Use Title One funds to run a mimimal program. | Rob Taylor | Student progress monitoring and unit test scores | FCAT Scores |
| 6 | Students lack ownership of learning and responsibility for outcomes. | Individual student data chats and goal setting to create an ownership of learning and academic success | Teachers Principal | Number of students who make quarterly goals. | Goal sheets |

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: | 1 of 6 students scored a level, 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA-- equating to 17%. With 5 of 6 scoring a Level 4 or higher which equates to 83%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 1 of 6 students scored a level, 4, 5, or 6 on the FAA-- equating to 17%. | 50% of our students taking the FAA will score a level 4-6. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reduction in staff | Create intervention blocks and use inclusion teachers in multiple grade levels. | Fran Herrin, Principal | Progress Monitoring | FAA Scores |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | 25% of the students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading Test. (SW1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 16% (32 of 203) of our students scored a level 4 on the 2012 FCAT Test. | 25% (110)of students in grades 3-5 will achieve a level 4 or higher in FCAT 2.0 |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time for adequate extension and enrichment activities. | 2.1 Tiered Instructional delivery in the form of whole class, small group and individual instruction will be used in the form of the Differentiated Instruction model throughout the school. (SW 3, SW 2, SW 9, SW 8) Grade level instructional blocks that are differentiated to facilitate | 2.1 Administration, Academic Coaches | 2.1 Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walk-throughs. | FCAT Data |

| | | the necessary enrichment/extension to move or maintain a level 4 or 5 (SW 8) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Century 21 after school Program not renewed. | Use Title One funds and enrichment blocks to supplement educational opportunities | Administration, Academic Coaches | Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walk-throughs. | FCAT Data |
| 3 | Student regression from level 4 or higher. | Track student achievement data, set realistic goals and use data chats to focus student learning. | Teacher/Reading Coach | Students attaining quarterly goals. | FCAT Scores/learning gains |

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: | 4 of 6 (67%) students scored at or above a level 7 on the FAA in 2012. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 4 of 6 students scored at or above a level 7 on the FAA in 2012. | 80% of our students taking the FAA will score a level 7 or higher on the FAA. |

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 | Reduction in staff | Use inclusion teachers to support multi-grade intervention blocks. | Principal | Fidelety checks | FAA Data |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | In 2012, 78% (210) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FCAT reading test.(SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 70% (142 of 203) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FCAT reading test. (SW 1) | In 2013, 78% (162) will make learning gains in reading on FCAT 2.0. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3.1. The anticipated barrier to our students achieving Reading Goal #3 is students receiving targeted instruction, based on student data that reflects Tier 1, 2 and 3 instructuional | Tiered instructional delivery in the form of whole class, small group and individual instruction will be used in the form of the Differentiated Instructional Model throughout the school. | 3.1. Administration, Academic Coaches | 3.1. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walkthroughs. | 3.1. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings |

| 1 | needs, throughout the teaching cycle | (SW 3, SW 8, SW 9) Grade level instructional blocks that are differentiated to facilitate the necessary enrichment/extension to move or maintain a level 4 or 5. (SW 2) | | | focused on student achievement data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Reduction in instructional staff members that provided interventions and academic support | Co-planning for grade level teachers (SW 5, SW 8)<br><br>Utilization of paraprofessionals and inclusion teachers to optimize time in academic schedules. (SW 2)<br><br>Grade level intervention blocks that are differentiated by skill level. | Grade Level Teachers | Lesson Plan review; CWTs | FCAT Scores |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | 4 of 6 students made learning goals in the FAA. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 4 of 6 students made learning goals in the FAA. | 80% of our students taking the FAA will make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Varying instructional needs of students and a reduced staff. | Utilize the inclusion teachers to support instruction in self-contained classrooms. | Principal | Progress data | FAA Data |

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | In 2012, 82% of the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FCAT reading test. This is a 42% increase from 2011. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 82% of the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains on the FCAT reading test. (SW 1) | In 2013, 80% (30 students) of the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in reading on FCAT 2.0. |

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 | 4.2. Tier 1, 2 and 3 instructional plans developed at the RtI meetings must be carried out by educational professionals at the classroom level. | 4.2. Documentation of student progress, both individual and small group, must occur and the ongoing Problem Solving Process must occur to insure consistent positive Response to Intervention. (SW 2) | 4.2. Intervention and Inclusion teachers , Academic Coaches, Administration. | 4.2. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walkthroughs. | 4.2. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |
| 2 | Chronic tardies and high rates of truancy that interfere with the continuity of instruction | Work to involve students in school leadership roles such as safety patrol and/or the morning announcement to encourage coming to school and being on time.<br><br>Work with parents and community agencies to remove obstacles that prevent regular school attendance. (SW 6) | Intervention and Inclusion teachers, Coaches and Administration | Review of weekly attendance and individual conferences with students as needed. | Pinnacle Reports |
| 3 | 4.1. Appropriate Tier 2 and/or 3 identification and instruction must occur for students in the lowest 25% of grades 3-5 to achieve learning gains. | 4.1. Problem-solving steps in the course of RTI and pod meetings will be followed, using student data to guide the decision-making process. (SW 8) | 4.1. Intervention and Inclusion teachers, academic coaches | 4.1. Weekly lesson plan review, progres monitoring and student data reviews, followed by classroom walk-throughs | 4.1. Progress monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBMs), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |

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, 57% of the students were proficient.  The data below shows our growth model.  By 2017, 79% of our students will be proficient. 5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 57 | 64 | 68 | 71 | 75 | |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | The current level of performance for the various groups represents the following: all subgroups met the reading target except our white subgroup. However, they did making reading gains.(SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 61% (54); Black 49% (43); Hispanic 52% (82); Asian (NA); and American Indian (NA). (SW 1) | 64% (142 students) of all ethnic subgroups (White, Black an Hispanic) will score a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Reading Assessment. Additionally, we will consider adequate progress for 2012--lowering the percentages of students performing below grade level in ethnic subgroup by a minimum of 10%. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5A.1. All ethnic subgroups (except white): The primary anticipated barrier with ethnic subgroups overlaps with the ELL group. Targeted language instruction, precise Problem Solving processes and high-quality instruction must be in place to support Reading Goal #5A. | 5A.1. Utilize the Tiered Instructional delivery system, which develops from data collection and review at each RtI meeting, and the Problem Solving approach to develop an solid instructional plan that is reviewed and adjusted often, based on the student(s) response to intervention. (SW 2, SW 8) | 5A.1. ESOL teacher, RtI Coach, Academic Coach, Classroom Teacher, Administration | 5A.1. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walkthroughs. | 5A.1. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |
| 2 | 5A.2. Tier 1, 2 and 3 instructional plans developed at the RtI meetings must be carried out by educational professionals at the classroom level. | 5A.2. Documentation of student progress, both individual and small group, must occur and the ongoing Problem Solving Process must occur to insure consistent positive Response to Intervention. (SW 2, SW 8) | 5A.2.. RtI coach, Academic Coaches, Administration. | 5A.2. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walkthroughs. | 5A.2. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | The percent of ELL students below grade level in reading in 2011 was 54% (31 students). This year with the updated tests and standards, 44% of our ELL population were proficient. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 44% (26 students) of the ELL group is currently on track to be proficient in reading. | 44% (32 students)of ELL students will be proficient in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. For 2013, we will consider adequate progress to be a 10% reduction of ELL students performing below grade 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 | 5B.1. The anticipated barrier includes a distinct need for targeted language instruction, precise Problem Solving processes and high-quality instruction must be in place to support Reading Goal #5B. | 5B.1.In order to meet the goal, the language instruction must be targeted to meet student needs and delivered efficiently. This will occur during periods of the day when the students are being serviced by ESOL teachers, as well as in the classroom, by the classroom teacher. Careful monitoring and tiered instructional delivery is vital to the process. | 5B.1.ESOL teacher, Classroom teacher, RtI Coach, Academic coaches, Administrators. | 5B.1. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walkthroughs, Targeted observations. | 5B.1. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |
| 2 | Lack of resources to support Haitian Creole Students | Continue to find translators that can make home connections and translate instructional materials. | ELL Teachers | La Fame' Parent Group-- and inventory of materials available to parents | Climate Surveys and group discussions with Haitian families |

| | | Continue to acquire print materials as they become available. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Prerequisite reading skills need to be strengthened. | Use of the Fast Forward Reading Inervention Program. | Teacher<br><br>Reading Coach | Improvement in FF scores | FCAT scores |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | The percentage of proficient SWD students was targeted to be 23%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (34 students) of the SWD group were proficient on the 2012 FCAT. | 30% (25 students) of SWD students will be proficient in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. We will consider a 10% reduction in the SWD subgroup performing below grade level to be adequate progress for 2013. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of Pre-requisite skills. | Tiered Instructional delivery in the form of whole class, small group and individual instruction will be used in the form of the Differentiated Instruction model throughout the school. (SW 2)<br><br>Intervention blocks to address gaps in curriculum; and use of the grade level inclusion teacher to support the DI and IEP goals. (SW 9) | Classroom teacher, ESE teacher, RtI Coach. | Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walk-throughs. Targeted observations<br><br>Review of IEP goals | Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data<br><br>FCAT Scores |
| 2 | Lack of Pre-requisite skills. | Use of the FAST Forward Intervention Program. | Teacher<br><br>Reading Coach | Improvement in scores from FF. | FCAT Scores |

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | The percentage of proficient Economically Disadvantaged students target tobe proficient was 46%. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 49% (65 students) of the Economically Disadvantaged group is currently on track to be proficient in reading. (SW 1) | 51% (80 students)of Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. Adequate Progress for 2012 would be considered a 10% decrease in the number of students below grade level in this subgroup. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5D.1. The anticipated barrier to our students achieving Reading Goal #5D is students receiving targeted instruction, based on student data that reflects Tier 1, 2 and 3 instructuional needs, throughout the teaching cycle. | 5D.1. Tiered Instructional delivery in the form of whole class, small group and individual instruction will be used in the form of the Differentiated Instruction model throughout the school. (SW 2, SW 9) | 5D.1.Classroom Teacher, RtI Coach, Academic Coaches, Administrator. | 5D.1. Weekly Lesson Plan review, progress monitoring student data reviews followed by Classroom walk-throughs, and targeted observations. | 5D.1. Progress Monitoring and other assessments review (FAIR, Performance Matters, FOCUS, CBM), Problem Solving meetings focused on student achievement data |
| 2 | Working families and time to support instruction at home. | Utilize our Title One after school program to facilitate academic support | Title 1 Tutors Principal | CWTs during ELOs<br><br>Grade Level meetings-teacher feedback | Grades<br><br>FCAT Scores |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Smart Centers | K-2 | Jeanne Sanford/Michael Robinson | K-2 academic teachers | Pre-planning PD, after-school PD | Lesson plans<br><br>CWTs | Reading Coach |
| Marking the Text, PLC | K-5 | Rob Taylor | All academic teachers | School-scheduled early release days | Artifacts<br><br>Progress monitoring<br><br>student work samples | Reading Coach<br><br>BLPT Members |
| FCAT 2.0 | 3-5 | Rob Taylor | All academic teachers | School-scheduled early release days | Artifacts<br><br>Progress monitoring<br><br>student work sample | Reading Coach<br><br>Principal |

## Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Smart Centers | Social studies reading centers | district funding | $32,000.00 |
| FCAT 2.0 Resources | Pre-post tests, intervention books | Title 1 funds | $2,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $34,500.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Smart Board supplies | Light bulbs, pens, batteries | Title 1 | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Marking the Text, PLC | Supplies | discretionary funding | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |

| Other | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $35,100.00 |

# 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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | In all grade levels, we will score a minimum of 70% proficient on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: |
|---|

| Spring 2012 CELLA Data shows the following: KG-8% proficient; Grade 1-47% proficient; Grade 2-100%-proficient; Grade 3-35%-proficient; Grade 4-53% proficient; and Grade 5-67% proficient. Additionally, in all grades levels there are high percentages of "High Intermediate" scoring 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 | Reduction in personnel to work individually or in small groups to assist students | Reinforce strategies that grade level teachers should be using based on their population of ELL students | ELL Teachers | Progress Monitoring<br><br>Observations | CELLA Scores |
| 2 | Students come to our school from varying countries with vastly different levels of educational experiences and readiness. | Use of introductory software to support newcomers. | Technician and ELL Teachers | Data Reports | CELLA Scorea |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. |
|---|

| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | During 2013 school year, we will see an increase in reading proficency in all grades levels by 10%. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: |
|---|

| 2012 Spring CELLA Data reflects the following data: KG--no students proficient 100% (13/13) are in the begining or low intermediate group. In grade 1-20% (3/15) were proficient; Grade 2-47% (7/15) proficient; Grade 3-40% (6/15) proficient; Grade 4-60% (9/15) proficient; and Grade 5--82% (9/11)-proficient. |
|---|

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Technology | Work with IT to get | ELL Teachers/TRT | Data Reports | CELLA Scores |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | compatability issues that make ELL software unavailable to students | repaired | | | |
| 2 | Poor attendance or long trips to native countries that create learning gaps | Work with parents to impress the importance of regular school attendance | Guidance Counselor | Attendance Records | FCAT 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: | During the 2013, all grade levels will increase proficiency in writing by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 2012 Spring CELLA data reflect a need to improve overall writing skills. In grade K-9% (0/13) were proficient in writing. In grade 1-29% (4/14) were proficient; Grade 2--47% (7/15) were proficient; Grade 3-40% (6/15) were proficient; Grade 4--60% (9/15) were proficient; and Grade 5-55% (6/11) were proficient in writing. | |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Reduction in personnel--difficult to provide strategic interventions in all classrooms. | Use of intervention blocks to co-teach students from multiple teachers. | ELL Teachers | Data Chats<br><br>Progress Monitoring | CELLA Writing scores |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Use of Fast Forward Program | | Title One | $16,800.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $16,800.00 | |
| 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 |
| Fast Forward PD | | | $6,450.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $6,450.00 | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $0.00 | |
| | | Grand Total: $23,250.00 | |

*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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | Currently 66% (134 students)of our students scored a level or higher on the FCAT Mathematics Test. The only subgroup that did not make the target score was the Black subgroup. However, they did show improvement in math. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| Students scoring at level 3 in 2011 were: Grade 3 (36% - 24 students); Grade 4 (43% - 29 students); and Grade 5 (35%-26 students). Grades 5 also showed a large percentage (30%) of students scoring in level 2. (SW 1) | 69% (146 students)of students in grades 3-5 will score a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0. |

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time for Professional Development<br><br>Reduction in personnel to adequately support initiative | Create a Professional Learning Community (PLC) to study the 22 Components of Great Teaching by Charlotte Danielson.<br><br>Initiate Lesson Study for the cadres (4-5 teachers); (2-3 teachers) and (K-1) with an emphasis on "marking the text" to increase comprehension and to guide children to making sense of the essential ideas within the text. | Fran Herrin/Carol Schmidlin-PLC Coordinators<br><br>Rob Taylor/Mary Ellen Richichi--Lesson Study Facilitators | Minutes of meetings and teacher feedback<br><br>CWTs to see the components and strategies being implemented.<br><br>Authentic student work samples that show effective use of marking the text. | FCAT Scores<br><br>Increased achievement on Performance Matters from baseline to end of year results |
| 2 | 1.1.<br><br>Integration of Common Core Standards<br><br>Change of FCAT 2.0 format | 1.1.<br>Continued training in series. (SW 4)<br><br>Continue to infuse SUMS curriculum to supplement Core Instruction. (SW 2)<br><br>Use of Destination Math to reinforce skills. | District coordinator<br><br>Principal<br><br>Classroom teacher<br><br>Carol Schmidlin (Academic Coach) | Ensure that teachers are using materials offered in the adopted text.<br><br>Check plan books/CWT<br><br>Grade level data meetings.<br><br>PM data | Beginning, middle and end of year assessment.<br>End of unit tests<br><br>Grade level assessments linked to New Generation Sunshine State Standards. (Performance Matters)<br><br>Benchmark assessment used to monitor student progress and predict success of FCAT<br><br>FCAT data in grades 3-5 |
| | Absenteeism and tardies that break the continuity of instruction | Teachers will monitor and report students that fall into these categories. | Classroom Teacher<br><br>RtI Coach | Review of weekly attendance<br><br>Teacher SST Referrals | Pinnacle Reports<br><br>Grades |

| | 3 | Recruit students who are not attending regularly or on time into leadership role such as safety patrol or TV news to encourage attendance SW 2) | | | FCAT Scores |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | 2 of 6 (33%) students who took the FAA scored in levels 4, 5, or 6. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 2 of 6 (33%) students who took the FAA scored in levels 4, 5, or 6. | 50% of our students taking the FAA will score in Levels 4-6. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reduction in staff | Use inclusion teachers in the full-time classrooms for intervention support. | Principal | Progress Monitoring | FAA Data |

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | We currently find a decrease in the number of students at grade 3 and 5 that are able to maintain a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Test. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The current level of performance for students scoring levels 4-5 is: Grade 3 (25%--17 students); Grade 4 (37%--25 students); and Grade 5 (15%--11 students). (SW 1) | The percent of students scoring a level 3 or 5 will increase by 10% in each respective grade level. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2.1.<br>Transition to newly adopted textbook.<br><br><br><br><br>Next Generation Sunshine State Standard<br><br>Change of FCAT 2.0 format | 2.1.<br>Continued training in series. (SW 4) Implementing the enrichment strategies found in the text<br><br>Differentiated instructional groups that allow for extension of curriculum. (SW 2, SW 3) | 2.1 Principal<br><br><br>Classroom teacher<br><br><br><br>Carol Schmidlin (math coach) | 2.1.<br>Ensure that teachers are using materials offered in the adopted text.<br><br>Solicit parent involvement by calling home and having events at school that educate parents on the current academic expectations.<br><br>Check plan books/CWT Differentiated instruction Grade level data | 2.1.<br>Beginning, middle and end of year assessments. End of unit tests<br><br>Enrichment kit from Harcourt Math<br><br>Benchmark assessment used to monitor student progress and predict success on FCAT |

| 2 | Planning time required to create extension and enrichment activities. | Grade level common planning. (SW 5)<br><br>Differentiated instructional groups with grade level rotations. (SW 9) | Grade level teachers.<br><br>Carol Schmidlin (math coach) | Check plan books/CWT Differentiated instruction Grade level data meetings. | meetings.<br><br>FCAT Scores<br><br>Benchmark assessment used to monitor student progress and predict success on FCAT<br><br>FCAT Scores |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | 4 of 6 (67%) scored a level 6 or higher. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 2 of 6 (33%) of our student who took the FAA scored a level 7 or higher. | 67% of our students who take the FAA will score a level 7 or higher. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reduction in ESE support. | Use of inclusion teachers to facilitate interventions in the full time VE classrooms. | ESE Teachers | Progress Monitoring | FAA Data |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | In 2012, 84% (171 of 203 students) made learning gains in math. This is an increase of 27% from 2011. We will increase our learning gains to 70%. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 84% (171) of our students made learning gains as measured by the FCAT. (SW 1) | The percent of students making learning gains will maintain at 84% (178 students). |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Time needed to identify deficient math strands. | Small, flexible groups in order to teach targeted strands. (SW 9, SW 2)<br><br>Common planning time for grade levels. (SW 5) | Principal<br><br>Classroom Teacher<br><br>Math Coach | Check plans /pacing guides<br><br>CWTs<br><br>Grade level data meetings<br><br>Targeted skills assessment | Beginning, middle and end of year assessment test<br><br>Benchmark assessment used to monitor student progress and predict success on FCAT<br><br>FCAT Scores |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Additional time needed for grade level activities or enrichment. | Extension Groups offered to high performing students to maintain high levels of performance (SW 2) | Grade level teachers | Grade level data meetings Targeted skills assessment | Performance Matters Assessments FCAT Scores |
| 3 | Diverse student poplulation that requires extensive differentiation of instruction | Use of Accelerated Math (AM) (SW 3, SW 8) ELO Program that addresses skills acquisition (SW 9) | Principal | Targeted skills assessment | FCAT Scores |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: | 4 of 6 students (67%) made learning gains in math as measured by FAA. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 4 of 6 students (67%) made learning gains in math as measured by FAA. | 75% of our students will make learning gains as measured by the FAA. |

| 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 | Reduction in ESE staff. | Use of grade level inclusion teachers to support ESE rooms. | Principal | Progress monitoring data grades | FAA Data |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | In 2012, 83% of our low 25 made gains in math. This percentage is increased by 12%. (SW 1) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In the 2012 school year, 83% (42) of our lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. (SW 1) | 85% (31 students)of our lowest 25% will make learning gains in math as measured by the FCAT. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | New FCAT 2.0--Next Generation Standards. | Differentiated grouping in mathematics to address student needs. (SW 9) Professional development for teachers of the new format and standards. (SW 4) Orientation for parents and students as to the | Academic Coach Principal | Progress Monitoring of skill acquisition through Accelerated Math, Performance Matters and Harcourt Assessments | Performance Matters Focus Assessments FCAT Scores |

| 1 | | changes and expectations. (SW 6) | | | |
| | | After school program to provide instructional support. (SW 9, SW 2) | | | |
| | | Use of Accelerated Math Program to set and track appropriate learning goals for students. (SW 3) | | | |
| 2 | Lack of Pre-requisite skills. | Use of ELO program to scaffold necessary skills in a pre-teaching model and then reinforce the skills per the pacing guide. (SW 9, SW 2)<br><br>Differentiated classroom groups with each grade level during the daily intervention block. (SW 9) | Grade Level Teachers<br><br>Academic Coach | Progress Monitoring of skill acquisition through Accelerated Math, Performance Matters and Harcourt Assessments<br><br>CWTs | Performance Matters<br><br>Focus Assessments<br><br>FCAT Scores |

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 #<br>We will use the state provided AMOs to close the achievement gap.<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 66 | 69 | 72 | 75 | 78 | |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | The only subgroup to make anticipated target was the Black subgroup. All subgroups made gains in math. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Our ethnic group performance was as follows: White (62%); Black (62%); and Hispanic (57%). (SW 1) | We have set the following targets for our subgroups in 2013: White (66%); Black (65%); and Hispanic (61%. (SW 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Many of our Black and Hispanic students have limited language acquisition. | Incorporate visual cues and learning aides such as the SMART Boards into instruction. (SW 2)<br><br>Build academic vocabulary (SW 3) | Classroom Teachers<br><br>ELL teachers | Progress monitoring testing<br><br>CWTs<br><br>Monthly data meetings | FCAT Scores |
| 2 | Lack of pre-requisite skills | Use ELO Program to pre-teach and remediate skill deficiencies (SW 9) | Math Coach | CWTs in ELO<br><br>Data Meetings to track | FCAT Scores |

| | | | | progress | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | Our school has a diverse group of ELL students representing 35 different countries. Our main languages are Spanish and Creole. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 61% (38) of our ELL students scored a level 3 or higher on last year's FCAT. (SW 1) | 66% (41 students)of our ELL students will score a level 3 or higher on the FCAT. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of Pre-requisite skills | ELO Program after school SW 9, SW 3)<br><br>Differentiated learning groups (SW 8)<br><br>Intervention blocks to teach prerequisite skills (SW 9) | ClasroomTeachers<br><br>ELL teachers | Progress Monitoring Data | FCAT Scores |
| 2 | Lack of home-school connection due to language issues. | Use of bilingual staff to facilitate communication and share academic expectations with parents. (SW 6) | Principal | La Familia' and Le Fame meetings with Parents | Climate Surveys |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | 47% (25) of SWDs were proficient in 2012. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 47% (25) of our students with disabilities scored at or above level 3 on the FCAT in 2012. (SW 1) | 47% (27 students) of our students with disabilities will score a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Math Test. |

<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Pre-requisite skills are lacking | Intervention Blocks during the day to reinforce skills.<br><br>ELO Program to reinforce skills and to teach pre-skills needed for the pacing guide. (SW 9) | Grade level inclusion teachers | Lesson Plans<br><br>CWTs | FCAT Scores |

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal E: | 60% (91) of the students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup made AYP in 2012. Gerald Adams made its projected target. (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% (91) of our students performed at a level 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Math Test. (SW 1) | 61% (93 students) of our grade 3-5 students will score at or above Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. |

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

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of Pre-requisite skills. | Tiered instructional delivery in the form of whole class, small group and individual instruction will be provided in the form of our school-wide differentiated model.<br><br>Intervention blocks as part of the daily schedule to address gaps in the curriculum; (SW 9)<br><br>Use of the grade level inclusion teacher and paraprofessional to facilitate the DI model and IEP goals. (SW 3)<br><br>Use of SMART Boards to provide the visual clues and representations that facilitate learning. (SW 2) | Classroom Teacher, ESE Teacher, and Principal | Weekly lesson plan review, progress monitoring, student data chats, CWTs and targeted observations.<br><br>Review of IEP goals<br><br>Monthly data meetings | Progress Monitoring and other assessments<br><br>FCAT Scores |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FCAT 2.0/Common Core Implementation --depth and rigor | 3-5 (FCAT)<br><br>K-2 (CC) | Carol Schmidlin | school-wide and grade level | Faculty meetings/grade level meetings | CWTs<br><br>Lesson Plans | Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

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

| | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
|---|---|---|

| **Technology** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

| **Professional Development** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| PLC-Common Core and FCAT 2.0 standards | Supplies | Discretionary | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |

| **Other** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $100.00 |

*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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | There is a need to decrease the number of students scoring levels 1 and 2 by 30%. Grade 5 students are expected to score level 3 or above in the 2012-2013 school year. Additionally, there is a need to address rigor and pacing in the overall school curriculum. This is evidenced by the low percentages in levels 4 and 5. We must continue to implement a school-wide model to implement a PK-5 science curriculum that provides the necessary prerequisite knowledge and vocabulary. (SW 1) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The percent of students scoring level 3 or above decreased by 16% points. 45% (33) of our students in scored a level 3 or higher. Though we experienced a decrease in proficiency, we did have 26% of our students scoring in level 2. Many of these scores were within 5 points of level 3. (SW 1) | 55% (40 students) of the students in grade 5 will be proficient in science as measured by the FCAT Science Test(Level 3 or higher). |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students lack prerequisite science background knowledge and academic vocabulary to master the curriculum. The master schedule prohibits adequate time for advancement of science. | The master schedule will reflect increased science instructional minutes for all fifth classes and provide for daily interaction between fifth grade science teacher and fifth grade students. (SW 2)<br><br>Quarterly monitoring through the use of K-4 Science Quarterly Tests. | Principal | Weekly Monitorng of Lesson Plans<br><br>Require use of FCAT Science Explorer/FCAT FOCUS Mini-Assessments<br><br>Monthly Monitoring of Instructional Focus Calendar<br><br>Monthly Data Chats with Science Teacher | FCAT Scores,<br><br>Classroom Observation<br><br>Classroom Walk Throughs<br><br>Performance Matters (Progress Monitoring Tool) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Data analysis shows 57% of students scored levels 1 or 2 on Science FCAT. | Data chat with fifth grade science teacher. Identify possible barriers to meeting 2012-2013 Science FCAT goals. (SW 9, SW 3, SW 2)<br><br>Identify strategies and research-based best practices to address barriers. Strategically address individual student science misconception and needs for remediation. Addressed in Instructional Focus Calendar. (SW 2) | Science Teacher | Rely on Focus mini-assessments as targeted intervention for annually assessed benchmarks. Use data to provide additional supports as needed. Performance Matters assessments will be the major data source discussed in data chats as well as new standards and FCAT 2.0 format. | Involve all fifth grade teachers in data discussions using data from above evaluation tools. Fifth grade team decides what/how modifications are need for current strategies.<br><br>FCAT Scores |
| 3 | Instructional Time to properly address the Science Curriculum with fidelity in grades K-5. | Incorporate non-fiction science content into the 90 minute reading block.<br><br>Focus on grade level "BIG Ideas in Science" to include academic vocabulary. | Classroom Teacher | Weekly Monitoring of Lesson Plans Monthly Monitoring of Instructional Focus Calendar | Classroom Observation<br><br>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 group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | 1 of 3 (33%) students scored in levels 4-6 on the FAA. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 1 of 3 ( 33%) students scored in levels 4-6 on the FAA. | 50% of our students taking the FAA will score in levels 4-6. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Reduction in ESE staffing | Use of inclusion teachers to support full-time classrooms | Principal | Progress Monitoring Data | FAA Data |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | In 2012, 13% (9) of our students scored a level 4 or 5. (SW 1) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48% of the students were proficient in science in 2012. Weak science literacy demonstrated by students entering fourth grade. (SW 1) | 20% (15 students) of our grade 5 students will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science test. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teacher recruitment/willingness in developing and coordinating science lessons/kits and rotation. | Reinforce systemic science instruction throughout grades K-5. Collaborate and develop targeted science lessons with kits by grade levels, K-3. (SW 2, SW 3) | Principal and Grade Level Building Level Planning Team Members | Monthly meetings with grade level BLPT members.<br><br>SIP science support team will assist in the development of science lessons/kits and problem solving process.<br><br>Review grade level meeting minutes for science instruction discussion/planning.<br><br>Principal assists with determining needs for effective science teaching.<br><br>Adopted Textbook Assessments<br><br>Performance Matters (progress monitoring tool) | FCAT Scores |
| 2 | Adequate time for enrichment. | Collaborate and develop targeted science lessons that create extension activities. (SW 3) | Science teacher | Data Meetings, focus assessments | FCAT Scores |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | 1 of 3 (33%) of our students scored a level 7 or higher on the FAA Science test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 1 of 3 (33%) of our students scored a level 7 or higher on the FAA Science test. | 67% of the students will score a Level 7 or higher on the FAA. |

| 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 | Reduction in staff | Include full-time access students into science labs and experiental learning groups | Inclusion teachers | Progress Monitoring | FAA Data |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Core Program Implementation | K-5 | District Science Coordinator | faculty meetings<br><br>grade level meetings | Early release days<br><br>after-school | Lesson Plans<br><br>CWTs<br><br>Grade level minutes | Principal |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Science Kits | Science funding | district--2 years ago | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| 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: $200.00 |

*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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | The diverse needs of our student population which include a high percentage of ELL and SWD students, has created a need to implement a school-wide writing program beginning in grade K. Additionally, an intensive focus on language acquisition and vocabulary in all grade levels must occur to increase academic vocabulary and address lacking prerequisite skills. (SW 1) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2012 FCAT Writing scores, 78% of our students scored a 3.5 or better. (SW 1) | On the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 75% (49 students) in the 4th grade students will be proficient in area of writing. (Scoring a 4 or higher) |
| 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 adequate planning and monitoring | A designated block of time will be alloted for writing in K-5 | Administration/Teachers | CWTs, lesson plan reviews | Prompts given monthly |
| 2 | Lack of confidence in teaching process writing that gradually moves to formulaic writing. | Teachers in grade K-4 will implement The Teaching Me Writing Curriculum and strategies. Grade 4 will use the Rapid Results portion of the SMILE program (SW 2) | Administration | CWTs, lesson plan reviews | Examination of student work by teachers, Academic Coach and Principal |
| 3 | Students lacking adequate academic vocabulary and exposure to a print rich environment to increase that vocabulary | Expand classroom libraries, take-home reading materials and exposure to an array of fiction and non-fiction literature that will facilitate growth in academic vocabulary. (SW 2)

Extended Media Hours to encourage student and parental involvement. (SW 6)

Family Reading Nights. (SW 6)

Use of the ELO Program to facilitate our motivational AR Program. (SW 9) | Classroom Teachers, Media Specialist, Teachers and parents | Review of Accelerated Reader Goals and choice of recreational reading materials | Percentage of students meeting Accelerated Reading Goals and parent participation in PAKER (Family Reading Nights). |
| 4 | Students lacking prerequisite writing skills | Teachers in grade K-4 will implement The Teach Me Writing Curriculum and strategies. Grade 4 will use the Rapid Results portion of the SMILE program (SW 2)

Continuation of the Writing Camp for all 4th graders. (SW 3)

Teachers will conduct post-writing conferences with students to review their writing and to provide students the opportunity to reflect on their work and to edit the piece. (SW 9) | Administration/Teachers | CWTs, lesson plan reviews | FCAT Scores |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.

Writing Goal #1b: | 100% of our students were proficient in writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| We only had one student take the FAA Writing test and that student scored an 8. | 100% of our students taking the FAA will score at Level 4 or higher on the FAA. |

| | 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 | Reduction in ESE Staff | Use of inclusion teachers to include students in writing camp and writing activities. | Inclusion Teacher-grade 4 | Writing samples | FAA Data |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rubric training on the revised FCAT 2.0 rubric. | Grades 3-4 | Rob Taylor | Grades 3-4 | After -school | Rubric scoring of writing samples | FCAT Writes scores |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| SMILE Writing Materials | Writing support materials | discretionary | $3,200.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $3,200.00 | |

| 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 |
| PLC on Rubric Scoring | Supplies | Discretionary | $100.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $100.00 | |

| Other | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $0.00 | |
| | | Grand Total: $3,300.00 | |

*End of Writing Goals*

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | The monthly ADA was reviewed and there were not any notable fluctuations in our attendance rate. (SW 1) |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| The average daily attendance (ADA) for the 2012 school year was 96.9%. (SW 1) | The average daily attendance (ADA) for the 2013 school year will be 97.50%. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 30% (159 students in grade K-5) had excessive tardies during the 2012 school year. | We will reduce the number of students with excessive absences. During the 2013 school year, only 15% (77 students) of our students will reach 10 or more days absent. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 30% (160 students in grade Pk-5) had excessive tardies during the 2012 school year. | We will reduce the number of students with excessive tardies. During the 2013 school year, 16% (80 students) of our students will reach 10 or more days tardy. |

| 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 | Cultural Barriers | Work with parents to address a plan to get students to school and have them arrive on time. (SW 6)<br><br>Educate parents on the importance of school and creating positive work habits. (SW 6) | Guidance Counselor | Parent Surveys<br><br>Attendance Data reviewed monthly. | Attendance Data |
| 2 | Transportation Issues | Collaborate with transportation to increase and improve communication with parents. (SW 10) | Principal | Fewer parent complaints | Parent Surveys |
| 3 | Established patterns are difficult to break | Use of parent meetings to facilitate action plans. (SW 6)<br><br>Positive Behavioral Support Plans for individual students (SW 9)<br><br>Use of motivational/leadership programs to facilitate change. These include Safety Patrol and TV Announcement Program (SW 2)<br><br>Implement the new truancy program with fidelity. | Club Sponsors<br><br>Principal | Review Monthly Attendance/Tardy reports | Annual Reports on Attendance |
| 4 | Parent Work Schedules | Later Start Time for school (with early morning program for parents who need it). | District Director | Parent Surveys<br><br>Examination of Tardy and Absentee rates on | Annual Reports of attendance |

| 5 | Road Construction throughout city | Be flexible--do not schedule reading or math at the beginning of the day | City Manager | Tardies and late bus information | Student grade reports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | a monthly basis | |

---

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent learning activity on scope and sequence of curriculum and the importance of regular attendance | PK-5 | Guidance Counselor | Parents | November | Use Adams Topics and Individual parent conferences as needed.<br><br>Attendance Liaison | Guidance Counselor |

---

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: | Gerald Adams School has implemented the Positive Behavior System with success. We anticipate the continuation of this program and continued reductions in referrals that result in suspension (in and out of school). (SW 1) |
|---|---|
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| During the 2012 school year, 49 in-school suspensions were given. (SW 1) | During the 2013 school year, the number of ISS Assignments will be reduced to 35. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| The 49 in-school suspension assignments involved 24 students in our school. | Using the PBS model currently in-place, we will reduced the number of students receiving ISS to 15. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| The total number of out-of-school suspensions was 36. | We will reduce the total number of out-of-school suspensions to 30. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| The 36 OSS days involved 14 students. | We will reduce the number of students being suspended to 10. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reduction in personnel to supervise the non-structured parts of the day (lunch, recess, etc). | School-wide implementation of PBS. (SW 2) | Principal | Review of monthly discipline data.  Meeting with parprofessionals to review and modify supervision plan if necessary. | End-of Year OSS and ISS data. |
| 2 | High population of SWD students. | RTI Training on behavioral interventions (SW 2) | District Behavior Specialist  General Ed and Inclusion Teachers | SST minutes--Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions | SST Minutes |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Positive Behavioral Support | PK-5 | Guidance Counselor | School-wide | Faculty Meetings | CWTs, Referral data | Principal |

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<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*\*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | As a Title One School, we complete the on-line Title 1 version of the Parent Involvement Plan. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| We met our goals for the 2012 School Year---see on line PIP. | See on line plan--(SW 6) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | See plan | na | na | na | na |

## 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<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | Our needs assessment shows that 66% of all 3-5 are proficient in math. Additionally 82% of our students made overall learning gains in math; and 82% of our low 25% also made gains. The area of concern is that of science where only 48% of our students were proficient.<br><br>Our STEM Goal 1: We will maintain or improve our math performance, and raise our proficiency in science to 75%. |
| 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 | Teachers lack content knowledge to effectively teach science skills. | Science pull-out program and content area training on grade level standards. | Principal<br><br>District Science Coordinator | Progress Monitoring data<br><br>FOCUS Data | FCAT Scores |
| 2 | Teachers and students are lacking in technology skills to utilize the abundance of resources available. | Infuse technology PD for teachers into our PD Model--Use PD 360<br><br>During Media time, focus on technology skills for students.<br><br>During PAKER Nights reinforce the skill and share technology resources with parents. | School TRT<br><br>Principal | CWTs<br><br>Data Chats | FCAT Scores<br><br>Usage Reports |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

## FINAL BUDGET

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

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | Smart Centers | Social studies reading centers | district funding | $32,000.00 |
| Reading | FCAT 2.0 Resources | Pre-post tests, intervention books | Title 1 funds | $2,500.00 |
| CELLA | Use of Fast Forward Program | | Title One | $16,800.00 |
| Science | Science Kits | Science funding | district--2 years ago | $200.00 |
| Writing | SMILE Writing Materials | Writing support materials | discretionary | $3,200.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $54,700.00 |

### Technology

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | Smart Board supplies | Light bulbs, pens, batteries | Title 1 | $500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |

### Professional Development

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | Marking the Text, PLC | Supplies | discretionary funding | $100.00 |
| CELLA | Fast Forward PD | | | $6,450.00 |
| Mathematics | PLC-Common Core and FCAT 2.0 standards | Supplies | Discretionary | $100.00 |
| Writing | PLC on Rubric Scoring | Supplies | Discretionary | $100.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $6,750.00 |

### Other

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $61,950.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance**

| ☐ Priority | ☐ Focus | ☐ Prevent | ☐ NA | |
|------------|---------|-----------|------|---|

Are you a reward school:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

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

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

The SAC will review and monitor the implementation of the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan. Members will actively participate in creating a Needs Assessment to determine the needs of parents as well as the training most appropriate and most appealing. Using the school-based managment model, parents will be trained in shared decision-making and the role of SAC. They will also have input in the selection and implementation of programs, fund-raisers and school-wide activities. Finally, the SAC will have input in reviewing and modifying the School SIP and Parent Involvement Plan and the parent input and climate survey for 2011-2012 school year. This datum and overall academic data will be used by the SAC in the formation of the 2013 School Improvement Plan.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Monroe School District**
**GERALD ADAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2010-2011**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 79% | 80% | 85% | 61% | 305 | 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 | 55% | 57% | | | 112 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● 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 | | | | | 512 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

**Monroe School District**
**GERALD ADAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2009-2010**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 77% | 87% | 82% | 50% | 296 | 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 | 66% | 70% | | | 136 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>● Improve FCAT Levels<br>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 66% (YES) | 78% (YES) | | | 144 | 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 | | | | | 576 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |