

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: SEA GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Beverly Budzynski

SAC Chair: Melanie Schwartz

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Beverly Budzynski | Ed.S. Educational Administration | 2 | 10 | <p>Prior performance record for the FY12 school year is as follows: School grade A, Reading meeting standards 83% (361), Math meeting standards 81% (354), Writing meeting standards 88% (130), Science meeting standards 67% (94), Reading making learning gains 81% (214), Math making learning gains 82% (215), Reading lowest 25% gain 92% (53), Math lowest 25% gain 91% (52), AMO progress for Reading 85, AMO progress for Math 82.</p> <p>According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district.</p> |
| Assis Principal | Mitchell Kinstler | M.Ed. Educational Administration | 4 | 7 | <p>Prior performance record for the FY12 school year is as follows: School grade A, Reading meeting standards 83% (361), Math meeting standards 81% (354), Writing meeting standards 88% (130), Science meeting standards 67% (94), Reading making learning gains 81% (214), Math making learning gains 82% (215), Reading lowest 25% gain 92% (53), Math lowest 25% gain 91% (52), AMO progress for Reading 85, AMO progress for Math 82.</p> <p>According to statute, the Superintendent has the authority to strategically place administrators within the school district.</p> |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reading | Mary Jarrett | BS Education Masters in Reading | 1 | 4 | <p>Prior performance record for the FY12 school year is as follows: School grade A, Reading meeting standards 83% (361), Math meeting standards 81% (354), Writing meeting standards 88% (130), Science meeting standards 67% (94), Reading making learning gains 81% (214), Math making learning gains 82% (215), Reading lowest 25% gain 92% (53), Math lowest 25% gain 91% (52), AMO progress for Reading 85, AMO progress for Math 82.</p> <p>Demonstrates a history of academic excellence and successful past experience with Lely Elementary student population. Holds reading certification.</p> |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | Monthly New Teacher Orientation Meetings with new teacher | Peer mentor | May 2013 | |
| 2 | Assign new teacher a peer mentor | Principal | August 2012 | |
| 3 | PLC Meetings held twice per month at each grade level | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, School Counselor, Team Leader, | May 2013 | |
| 4 | Student Progression meetings held quarterly to discuss student progress and teacher needs | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, School Counselor | May 2013 | |
| 5 | Quarterly grade specific RTI meetings to discuss struggling Tier 2 and 3 learners | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist, School Counselor | May 2013 | |
| 6 | Assistance provided by Reading Coach when writing student Progress Monitoring Plans (PMP's) | Reading Coach, Intervention Support Specialist | May 2013 | |
| 7 | Use of CTEM process as vehicles to discuss instruction. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders | May 2013 | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 61 | 3.3%(2) | 9.8%(6) | 24.6%(15) | 62.3%(38) | 60.7%(37) | 100.0%(61) | 13.1%(8) | 3.3%(2) | 91.8%(56) |

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 |
|---------------|------------------|--|--|
| Sarah Vasquez | Michael Atkins | Ms. Vasquez is a fourth grade teacher, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career. | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction Co-teach and modeling of lessons Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings |
| Kathrene Pitt | Amy McCormish | Mrs. Pitt is a fifth grade teacher, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career. | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings |
| Nancy Crosby | Jennifer Damasco | Mrs. Crosby is a school counselor, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career. | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings |
| Tawnie Bligh | Hope Cliff | Mrs. Bligh is a third grade teacher, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career. | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal – Beverly Budzynski
Assistant Principal – Mitchell Kinstler
Intervention Support Specialist – Edward Schreiber
Reading Coach – Mary Jarrett
School Psychologist – Julie Cosgrove
School Counselor – Nancy Crosby
Speech – Margaret Froitzheim, Stephen Cosgrove

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work

with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Core team meets twice a month and as needed. These meetings will include the intervention support specialist, classroom teacher, administration, reading coach, school counselor and other involved staff. The intervention support specialist will serve as the school coordinator. The team analyzes and desegregates benchmark testing, informal and formal assessments and assessments from interventions to make sure all students are making gains. If a student is not making gains, we will adjust the intervention to meet the needs of that student.

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

The MTSS leadership team takes an active role in developing and implementing the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The team met and analyzed and desegregated the data from FCAT 2.0. Through this process we developed targeted areas of need and are implementing strategies through the SIP to meet the needs of our learners. We are looking at the Common Core State Standards and addressing these changes through the school improvement process.

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.

Data Sources (Tier 1):

- * FAIR
- * Quarterly Reading Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Mathematics Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Science Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Writing Benchmarks
- * FCAT
- * TERMS - Behavior Data
- * Student Pass - Attendance / Discipline

Data Sources (Tier 2):

- * FAIR
- * Quarterly Reading Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Mathematics Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Science Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Writing Benchmarks
- * TERMS - Behavior Data
- * Student Pass - Attendance / Discipline

Data Sources (Tier 3):

- * FAIR
- * Quarterly Reading Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Mathematics Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Science Benchmarks
- * Quarterly Writing Benchmarks
- * TERMS - Behavior Data
- * Student Pass - Attendance / Discipline

Data Warehouse, a district program, is used to house multiple forms of student assessment information. It includes universal data as well as places to input formative and custom assessment progress monitoring data. Individual, small group, class and school-wide data can be accessed and graphed. Data can be graphed in a multitude of ways (bar, line pie, scatter plot) to monitor student growth. Additionally, qualitative information is available. PLC notes and parent conferences can be recorded and accessed as needed.

TERMS, both a district and state data-base, is a repository of students' current and historic demographic and academic data. TERMS "talks" to Data Warehouse so that district student data are always current.

Student Pass, a district-developed program, tracks student attendance and discipline. Data are entered in Student Pass enabling reports on attendance, excessive tardiness, office discipline referrals, ISS and OSS.

School teams meet in grade level teams as Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Teams examine the standards to be taught, share best practices, engage in building common formative assessments and review data. Quarterly benchmark tests will be analyzed during PLC time. We will specifically look at individual students, as well as, teachers strengths/areas that need improvement. As a team they have strengthened their core teaching and have established that 80% of their students will meet the requirements. Re-teaching will occur as needed for the Tier 1 students. Data Warehouse has been designed to record the minutes from these meetings as well as to follow the progress of groups and individual students. This Tier 1 data will be used during PLCs to follow the rate of student progress over time. Teachers share results and best practices.

If students fail to meet with success in Tier 1, students are referred to the school's MTSS team and Tier 2 strategies. The Data Warehouse data management system continues to follow the student's progress as monitored by the PMP. Online assessments and other data points are tracked on the charts and graphs in the Data Warehouse.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A variety of methods will be used to train staff on MTSS. Job embedded coaching will be used to train PLC teams in the following processes that support instruction and intervention: problem-solving, developing progress monitoring plans, data collection and data analysis. Online self-paced modules are available through our ANGEL online learning platform. ANGEL also houses a variety of resources including video clips, intervention ideas, behavior management techniques, data collection tools, etc. to support the professional growth of staff. In addition, live trainings in differentiated instruction and utilizing MTSS/RtI in the classroom are available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS is supported in multiple ways. The master schedule is designed to provide common planning time for PLCs to plan and discuss core instruction, progress monitoring plans and data collection and analysis. Time is also allotted for professional learning opportunities. Data Warehouse reports and tools support PLCs in monitoring the fidelity of the implementation. These reports, along with teacher surveys and other data sources, are utilized to determine the types of professional learning opportunities and targeted supports that staff will need to effectively implement MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Mary Jarrett--Chairperson
Beverly Budzynski, Mitchell Kinstler, Edward Schreiber, Nancy Crosby

Reading Resource Committee ~
Mary Jarrett--Chairperson
Mary Meyer, Isabel Liria, Deborah Marino, April White, Tawnie Bligh, Doreen Pagnotto, Kathy Pitt, Pete Ferrante

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

In the weekly LLT meetings, the Reading Coach updates the team in any concerns in the area of reading. She relays information that was brought forth from the Reading Resource Committee to the LLT. The Reading Resource Committee meets monthly with the Reading Coach. The committee is made up of one representative from each grade level, related arts, Exceptional Student Education and Pupil Services. The Reading Coach shares state, county and school level information regarding reading curriculum and instruction. This information is then shared back to the teams as a result of the meetings. Members also present their ideas, needs and concerns regarding reading instruction. The meetings provide an opportunity for grade level to grade level articulation and problem solving. The committee provides input for in-service topics, instructional material needs and opinions on initiatives. Members of the Reading Resource committee are also contacted individually to discuss grade level specific issues.

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

A major initiative this year is analysis of data (FCAT, FAIR, quarterly benchmarks, district assessments) to provide differentiated instruction at all grade levels.
Implementation of LLI (Leveled Literacy Interventions) with targeted Tier 2 students and identified Tier 3 students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.O: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | To increase the number and percentage of students reaching proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 24% (104) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading. | In 2013, it is expected that 24% (104) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/ benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/ benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| | 4. Use of Informational | 4a. Content area | Principal | Teachers use of reading | Quarterly |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 4 | Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Students will identify an individual goal for achieving a level 3 or 4 on the scale and write a contract for the work he/she will do to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will be provided training in implementing and analyzing Running Records to help students set their goal. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Running Records, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Identify clear collaborative grouping strategies and expectations that hold individuals within groups accountable for specific tasks/talk/written responses. Level 3 students should easily move to independent practice when groups have followed a specific structure, enabling individuals to successfully demonstrate mastery of the specific benchmark. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with complex texts. TE will use "close reading" and other tools to prepare students for complex text reading. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans |

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:

Due to movement of students from Levels 4 - 6 to 7 and above we expect the current percentage of 8% to be reduced to 0%. We currently have no students that scored below a Level 4 in reading.

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 8% (1) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4, 5 or 6 in reading proficiency. | | In 2013, it is expected that 0% (0) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 4, 5 or 6 in reading proficiency. | | | |
| 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 | 1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 1b.1. Provide Universal Design Lessons (UDL) based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation. | 1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) Raz Kids Discrete Trial Trainer My Reading Coaches CTEM |
| 2 | 1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses. | 1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. | 1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 3 | 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information. | 1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts. | 1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

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: | To increase the number and percentage of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 59% (257) of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading. | In 2013, it is expected that 65% (280) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor – Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction – Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies (Kagan) that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction – Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Students will write a contract for achieving a 4 on the scale, identifying the specific mastery-level work they will complete to demonstrate exemplary standard/benchmark success. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. During independent practice, ask learners to develop higher order questions to be used to lead a Socratic seminar based on the text. Over time, give all L 4&5 learners opportunities to lead the class in a Socratic discussion using the questions they've developed. Implementation of Junior Great Books. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Student Notebooks, Student Interviews |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate , using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |

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: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Reading proficiency from 85% (11) to 93% (15). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 85% (11) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7, 8 or 9 in reading proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 93% (15) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 7, 8 or 9 in reading proficiency. |

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 |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | 2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 2b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive | 2b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 2b.1. Progress Monitoring Data-collected through Pre-and Post-test Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | | information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | | | Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 2 | 2b.2. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information. | 2b.2. Teachers will provide explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts. | 2b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 2b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 3 | 2b.3 Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses. | 2b.3 Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. | 2b.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 2b.3 Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 2b.3 Assistive Technology Evaluation ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |

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: | To increase the percentage and number of students making Learning Gains in reading from 81% (214) to 83% (225). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 81% (214) of students made Learning Gains in reading. | In 2013, 83% (225) of students will be expected to make Learning Gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | | | |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |
| | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 7 | | and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | | | rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | To increase the number and percentage of students making learning gains in reading from 67% (4) to 70% (1). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Reading Test indicate that 67% (4) of students with significant cognitive disabilities made learning gains in reading proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 70% (1) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will make learning gains in reading proficiency. |

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 | 3b.1. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable responses. | 3b.1. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating modes of communication in IEP development. b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies based on individual student needs for instructional presentation, responses and engagement. | 3b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 3b.1. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 3b.1. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 2 | 3b.2. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 3b.2. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 3b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | 3b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 3b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| | 3b.3. Students lack practice in | 3b.3 Teachers will provide | 3b.3. Principal, Assistant | 3b.3. Progress Monitoring | 3b.3. Unique Learning |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3 | utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, applying the reading process, and interpreting information. | explicit instruction and practice in the use of text features to: locate information, compare details from informational sources, complete sequenced directions, and analyze information in graphs/charts. | Principal, Reading Coaches, Literacy Leadership Team, IEP Team Members | Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | To increase the percentage of number of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 92% (53) of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. | In 2013, 93% (63) of students in Lowest 25% will be expected to make learning gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | | | | Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | <p>1b. During small group guided practice (GRM) TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed (OPM)</p> | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>2b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>3b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>4b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Reading Goal # | | | | |
| | | 5A : <input type="text"/> | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | To increase the number and percentage of students making satisfactory progress in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on state FCAT data the current level of performance in reading is: White: 93% (272) Black: 65% (13) Hispanic: 66% (64) Asian: 100% (4) American Indian: 90% (9) | Based on state FCAT data the expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year in reading is: White: 94% (283) Black: 69% (12) Hispanic: 69% (63) Asian: 100% (9) American Indian: 91% (8) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor – Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction – Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | plans. | | | |
| 3 | <p>3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p> | <p>3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences)</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes</p> |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | <p>1b. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs.</p> | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>2b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.</p> | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>3b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier.</p> | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>4b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-</p> | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating,</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| 8 | group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier. | and Strategies | Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
|---|---|----------------|---|

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: | To increase the number and percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress in reading from 61% (49) to 65% (44). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 61% (49) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in reading. | In 2013, it is expected that 65% (44) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each testing standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | | | | |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | <p>1b. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.</p> | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes</p> |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>2b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks</p> |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>3b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks</p> |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>4b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations.</p> | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks</p> |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5D:</p> | <p>To increase the number and percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students making satisfactory progress in reading from 71% (34) to 74% (37).</p> |
| <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> |
| <p>In 2012, 71% (34) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students made satisfactory progress in reading.</p> | <p>In 2013, it is expected that 74% (37) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students will make satisfactory progress in reading.</p> |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>1. Rigor ~</p> <p>Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark.</p> | <p>1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/ benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/ benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 2 | <p>2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.</p> | <p>2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 3 | <p>3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p> | <p>3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences)</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes</p> |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | | | Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/ instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/ instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills (differentiated materials/ instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/ instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | To increase the number and percentage of Economically Disadvantaged (ED)students making satisfactory progress in reading from 69% (97) to 72% (96). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| In 2012, 69% (97) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students made satisfactory progress in reading. | | | In 2013, it is expected that 72% (96) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students will make satisfactory progress in reading. | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Cooperative structures and strategies - Kagan | K-5 | Leadership Team | school-wide | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, classroom observations, student interviews, CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Goals and contracts with students | K-5 | Leadership Team | school-wide | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, student interviews, CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Data chats - Leadership Team to Teacher (PLC - 2x a month) - Teacher to Student (1x quarterly) - Student to Parent (minimum formally 1x - informally quarterly) | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, student-led conference sign-in sheets, data binders | Leadership Team |
| Test Item Specifications | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, classroom observations, CTEM | Leadership Team |
| 1b. Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks | K-5 | Leadership Team | school-wide | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, classroom observations, CTEM, student interviews | Leadership Team |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | Leadership Team | school-wide | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, classroom observations, CTEM, data binders | Leadership Team |
| Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS), Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and Reading Coherence Model (RCM), - Comprehension Connections, Close Reading | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes, attendance rosters, classroom observations, CTEM | Leadership Team |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Purchase Brain Pop program for student use at school and home | Brain Pop Program | School funds | \$1,780.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,780.00 |
| 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 |
| Data binders | Binders used house item specifications, quarterly assessment data and common formative assessment data | school funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$2,280.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. | | By the end of the 2012-13 academic year, the percentage of ELL students proficient in Listening/Speaking will be 54% (40) as measured by spring CELLA scores. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| 49% (41) students are proficient in Listening/Speaking in grade K-5 at Sea Gate Elementary School. | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | 1.1. Students have insufficient background knowledge of US cultural norms and content specific vocabulary to fully understand oral language. | 1.1. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs. 1.2 TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations for | Language Arts and/or ELL teacher, ELL contact, Reading coach, Principal, Assistant Principal, INSS Teacher, Counselor | Classroom Walk Throughs from Administrators and coaches to observe: Teachers and coaches will provide students with opportunities to write short/long dialogues using key vocabulary learned and present orally using different settings and scenarios. Students will have oral dialogue presentations | Teacher created rubrics - keeping in mind various readability levels- and Spring CELLA assessment. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | <p>participation in oral language opportunities.</p> <p>1.3 Provide scaffolded support for ELL learners by inclusion in small group support for L 1 and 2 students as appropriate.</p> <p>1.4 Monitor progress a minimum of once every 2 weeks by monitoring student participation in collaborative activities and maintaining empirical as well as assessment data. Disaggregate data to determine additional supports that may be needed to improve oral language skills of identified ELL learners.</p> <p>1.5 Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.</p> | <p>and the teachers will use the rubrics created to determine students' effectiveness.</p> <p>Students can also evaluate other students on their presentations and the teacher may consider the students' evaluations as part of the overall evaluation process.</p> |
|---|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2: | By the end of the 2012-2013 academic year, the percentage of LY students proficient in Reading will be 32% (24) as measured by spring CELLA scores. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 29% (24) of students are proficient in Reading in grade K-5 at Sea Gate Elementary School. | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| | 2.1. ELL students experience delays in acquisition of reading skills due to limited vocabulary, limited experience to build background knowledge, limited English usage in the home and in many cases, illiteracy in the home. | <p>Through the implementation of common core standards, ELL students will be exposed to rigorous grade level expectations in the area of Reading to:</p> <p>Teachers will make sure that students:</p> <p>Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text; including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.</p> | <p>Language Arts and/or ELL teacher</p> <p>ELL contact</p> <p>Reading coach</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Assistant Principal</p> <p>INSS Teacher</p> <p>Counselor</p> | <p>Classroom Walk Throughs from administrators and coaches to observe:</p> <p>Teachers explaining prerequisite language applications: reading directions, idioms, sentence starters, essay formats, pattern drills, or completing a story map; check for understanding.</p> <p>Teaching specific reading comprehension skills for completing: task procedures, answering questions, word problems, understanding text & graphics.</p> | Teacher-made test, Fluency rubric spring CELLA assessment and /or FACT test results |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Identify key vocabulary words to connect meaning to comprehension.</p> <p>Use Reading for comprehension strategies such as: Guided reading, completing chapter pre-reading guides, reciprocal teaching, Directed Reading/ Thinking Activity (DRTA), anticipation and double entry journals.</p> <p>Use scaffolding strategies necessary for students to read for understanding and comprehension.</p> <p>Utilize paraphrasing and fluency activities to improve reading comprehension.</p> | <p>Reading coaches monitor teachers' implementation of opportunities for students to read aloud, to respond to comprehension questions and to talk about their responses writing short dialogues.</p> <p>Teachers utilize fluency rubrics to determine the effectiveness of strategy.</p> <p>Coaches monitor teachers' utilization of rubrics.</p> |
|---|---|--|

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3: | By the end of the 2012-13 academic year, the percentage of LY students proficient in writing will be 37% (27) as measured by the spring CELLA assessment. |
|--|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

34% (28) of LY students are proficient in Writing in K-5 at Sea Gate Elementary School.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 3.1. Students do not have opportunities for authentic conversations and evaluation of their own or others writing. | <p>3.1a As evidence of strategic and extended thinking in writing, TE will hold students accountable for producing an oral or written analysis of multiple genres of thematically connected texts a minimum of six times per year. Depending on students' writing skills, the process may be implemented through Read-Alouds.</p> <p>3.1b To develop strategic and extended thinking in regard to student writing, TE will provide opportunities for peer evaluation of students' writing based on the writing rubric. Students will be accountable for defending their thinking based on specific examples from the writing and their understanding of expectations for quality</p> | <p>Language Arts and/or ELL teacher ELL contact Reading coach Principal Assistant Principal INSS Teacher Counselor</p> | <p>Classroom walkthroughs to observe:</p> <p>Structure of multiple opportunities for peer-to-peer interactions to increase speaking, listening, reading comprehension & writing skills and</p> <p>Support language interactions with review/preview of language forms, use of graphic organizers or other types of modeling.</p> | Teacher created rubrics and spring CELLA assessment |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | writing, providing recommendations for improving the writing. | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1a. FCAT2.O: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: | To increase the number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 27% (119) achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. | In 2013, 27% (116) of students will be expected to achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/ benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/ benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4 | Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | observations and study of lesson plans. | rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Students will identify a goal for achieving a level 3 or 4 on the scale and write a contract for the work he/she will do to demonstrate successful mastery of the standard/benchmark. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Learners will be expected to demonstrate understanding of problems or algorithms by explaining the concept or producing and explaining a model drawing of the problem. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate , using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

| | |
|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: | To decrease the number and percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities reaching Levels 4 - 6 in mathematics from 42% (5) to 0% (0). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that | In 2013, it is expected that 0% (0) of students with |

| | |
|--|---|
| 42% (5) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4, 5 or 6 in mathematics proficiency. | significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 4, 5 or 6 in mathematics proficiency. |
|--|---|

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 | 1b.1. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 1b.1. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation. | 1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.1. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 1b.1. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 2 | 1b.2. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 1b.2. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 3 | 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving and interpreting information. | 1b.3. a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP goals into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction. | 1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | To increase the percentage and number of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics from 54% (235) to 59% (254). |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| In 2012, 54% (235) of students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics. | | | In 2013, 59% (254) of students will be expected to achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics. | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies (Kagan) that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Students will be | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | | expected to achieve a 4 on the scale by extending their learning. TE will work with high achieving students to identify specific work that will meet the requirements. | | | Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Learners will create a new problem using the same mathematics concept. High achieving learners will exchange the problems they've developed and will solve using a minimum of two strategies. Pairs of students will explain their work and thinking. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will teach students the process of model drawing to comprehend, represent, and solve word problems. Students will collaborate , using text to answer and reinforce teacher and student-posed questions and theories. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Math proficiency from 25% (3) to 28% (4). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 25% (3) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7, 8 or 9 in mathematics proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 28% (4) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 7, 8 or 9 in mathematics proficiency. |

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 | 2b.1. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 2b.1. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation. | 2b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.1. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 2b.1. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 2 | 2b.2. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 2b.2. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 2b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.2. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.2. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 3 | 2b.3 Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving, and interpreting information. | 2b.3 a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP goals into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction. | 2b.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.3 Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.3 Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

| | |
|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | To increase the percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics from 82% (215) to 84% (228). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 82% (215) of students made Learning Gains in mathematics. | In 2013, 84% (228) will be expected to make Learning Gains in mathematics. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |
| | Person or Process Used to |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Utilizing scale, ensure understanding of knowledge and actions necessary to demonstrate mastery of the standard/ benchmark. All students identify an achievement level on the scale and specific actions for achieving the level. During daily guided | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | practice, students will chart their progress toward the goal. Students' graphing their progress provides a check for understanding to inform instruction. | | | Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Maintain high expectations for all students to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified role within groups. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks |

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: | To increase the number or percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities making learning gains in mathematics from 20% (1) to 28% (3). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Mathematics Test indicate that 20% (1) of students with significant cognitive disabilities made learning gains in mathematics proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 28% (3) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 7, 8 or 9 in mathematics proficiency. |

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 | 3b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 3b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge | 3b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 3b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 3b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation. | | | |
| 2 | 3b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 3b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for math computation. | 3b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 3b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 3b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 3 | 3b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from math applications, problem solving and interpreting information. | 3b.3. a) Teachers will adapt and modify classroom work to be consistent with academic functioning as outlined in the IEP b) Teachers will differentiate materials and instruction, and will work in centers, small groups or individually to support improved math skills c) Teachers will incorporate IEP accommodations into lesson plans to support remediation, differentiation, and accommodations in daily math instruction. | 3b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 3b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 3b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

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: | To increase the percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics from 91% (52) to 93% (63). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 91% (52) of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. | In 2013, 92% (63) of students in Lowest 25% will be expected to make learning gains in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | <p>an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark.</p> | <p>rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark.</p> | <p>ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale.</p> | <p>Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 2 | <p>2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.</p> | <p>2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans</p> |
| 3 | <p>3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p> | <p>3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences)</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes</p> |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 5 | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>1b. During small group guided practice or data chat, TE will explain scale to students and assist in setting individual goals to demonstrate standard/benchmark success. Conduct monthly data chats with individual students. Each student will identify a level to achieve and identify the actions he/she must take to achieve the level. Students will chart their progress toward the goal, modifying goal as appropriate. Provide small group guided practice/scaffolded support daily or as needed, gathering assessment data a</p> | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | minimum of once every two weeks (OPM). | | | |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Through differentiated instruction and multi-tiered supports, TE will scaffold support for meeting high expectations. Teachers will utilize the intervention, practice, and extension activities from the Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide in grades 1-5. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Elementary School Mathematics Goal # | | | | |
| 5A : | | <input type="text"/> | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | To increase the number and percentage of students making satisfactory progress in mathematics from: White: 86% (253) Black: 60% (12) Hispanic: 74% (72) Asian: 75% (3) American Indian: 100% (10) to White: 87% (260) Black: 64% (11) Hispanic: 77% (69) Asian: 78% (7) American Indian: 100% (9) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on state FCAT data the current level of performance in mathematics is: White: 86% (253) Black: 60% (12) Hispanic: 74% (72) Asian: 75% (3) American Indian: 100% (10) | Based on state FCAT data the expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year in mathematics is: White: 87% (260) Black: 64% (11) Hispanic: 77% (69) Asian: 78% (7) American Indian: 100% (9) |
|---|---|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to risk factor, e.g., limited background knowledge, vocabulary, language acquisition) and develop an individualized plan specific to student's needs. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. TE will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, TE will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 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. | | To increase the number and percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5C: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| In 2012, 65% (52) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | In 2013, it is expected that 69% (47) of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>1. Rigor ~</p> <p>Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each testing standard/ benchmark.</p> | <p>1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/benchmark.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 2 | <p>2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.</p> | <p>2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 3 | <p>3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~</p> <p>Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs.</p> | <p>3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences)</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes</p> |
| 4 | <p>4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies</p> <p>Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension.</p> | <p>4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies.</p> | <p>Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher</p> | <p>Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans.</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats</p> |
| 5 | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>1b. TE will conference individually with students to determine needs relative to language acquisition and develop a language/vocabulary journal specific to student's needs.</p> | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>see 1. Rigor</p> | <p>Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Notebooks, Student Data Chats,</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | PLC Notes Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. TE will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | To increase the number and percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 72% (34) to 75% (38). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 72% (34) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. | In 2013, it is expected that 75% (38) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor – Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/ benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/ benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | | levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved mathematics skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/ differentiation/ accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved mathematics skills | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 6 | | (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/ differentiation/ accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | | | Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved mathematics skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/ differentiation/ accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. TE will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP accommodations, working in small group or individually with students to support improved mathematics skills (differentiated materials/instruction). Provide lesson plans in a central database (Angel) to increase ESE teacher remediation/ differentiation/ accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Student Notebooks |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | To increase the number and percentage of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 70% (98) to 73% (98). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 70% (98) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students made satisfactory progress in mathematics. | In 2013, it is expected that 73% (98) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor – Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | | mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Based on triangulation multiple data, teacher will differentiate instruction and intervention as appropriate | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations student interviews CTEM | Leadership Team |
| 1b. Teachers will use | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----------------------------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------|
| learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations student interviews data notebooks CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Professional Development in model drawings to comprehend, represent and solve word problems. | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Quarterly Pioneer Math Trainings offered for pioneer teachers in grade bands for K-1, 2-3, and 4-5. | K-5 | Leadership Team / District Level | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations CTEM | Leadership Team |

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.O: Students scoring at Achievement

| | |
|---|---|
| Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a: | To increase the number of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science from 28% (39) to 28% (39). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 28% (39) achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. | In 2013, 28% (39) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor – Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/ benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/ benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/ benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction – Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction – Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 4 | Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | of lesson plans. | Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Utilize 5E model of science instruction with fidelity, emphasizing hands-on opportunities, notebooking and vocabulary development. Display LG and scale to demonstrate high expectations for mastery of the standard/benchmark. In science notebooks, students will identify an achievement level (3 or 4) and the work they will do to demonstrate mastery. To ensure that students are making progress toward mastery, a minimum of weekly, require text-dependent written responses to questions from quadrants 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, 5E Lesson Plans, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Using the science 5E model, complete the exploration and explanation "Es" in small groups. In advance of this work, students must be taught the various roles and responsibilities of the particular structure being used. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, 5E Lesson Plans, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies(Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | interface with the content area reading. | | electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
|--|--|--|---|

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal # 1b: | To increase the number and percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities reaching Levels 4 - 6 in science from 25% (1) to 25% (1). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Science Test indicate that 25% (1) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4, 5 or 6 in science proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 25% (1) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4, 5 or 6 in science proficiency. |

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 | 1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 1b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data-Collected through Pre-test, Post-test Benchmark Assessments | 1b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 2 | 1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for scientific exploration. | 1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| | 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to | 1b.3. Provide scaffolded instruction with the use of pictures and | 1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, | 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests | 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 3 | gaining information from reading, and interpreting information. | text features to support comprehension in the areas of scientific inquiry, such as: asking questions, making predictions and communicating findings. | Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team | Monthly Benchmark Assessments | Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | To increase the number of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, 39% (55) achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science. | In 2013, 43% (61) will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/benchmark. | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies (Kagan) that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM |
| | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (Student-Led Conferences) | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 3 | not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | | ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | | Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 5 | see 1. Rigor | 1b. Students will be expected to set a goal for achieving a 4 on the scale and will identify the work they will do to demonstrate exemplary mastery of the standard/benchmark. Ex.: For text-dependent written responses, students must reference a minimum of 2 outside sources to either support or refute the student's conclusions. TE will provide scaffolded support in order to develop students' ability to successfully meet this expectation. | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Ask advanced learners to work in pairs to evaluate each other's work. Following oral evaluations, students will rate each other's logic and completion based on the scale for the learning goal. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. Teachers will utilize consistent reading scaffolds and strategies(Reading Coherence Model and/or Collaborative Comprehension Strategies) in their classrooms so students have a routine to interface with the content area reading. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase FAA Science proficiency by 8 percentage points to 83%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Science Test indicate that 75% (3) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 7 or above in science proficiency. | In 2013, it is expected that 83% (2) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 7 or above in science proficiency. |

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 | 2b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 2b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.1. UNIQUE: Monthly Benchmark Assessments UNIQUE: Checkpoints and Profile Comparisons CTEM |
| 2 | 2b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 2b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and | 2b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 2b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction and in the selection of appropriate tools for scientific exploration. | | | |
| 3 | 2b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information from reading, and interpreting information. | 2b.3. Provide scaffolded instruction with the use of pictures and text features to support comprehension in the areas of scientific inquiry, such as: asking questions, making predictions and communicating findings. | 2b.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 2b.3 Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 2b.3 Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 1b. Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations student interviews CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Professional Development in 5E model - Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate - emphasizing hands-on opportunities, notebooking and vocabulary development. | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations student notebooks CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Text-dependent written responses to questions from quadrants 3 or 4 of Webb's Depth of Knowledge | | | | Ongoing | PLC notes attendance | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|--------------|--|--|-----------------|
| (DOK) using outside resources to either support or refute the student's conclusions. Focus on applying scientific thinking and inquiry in performing these tasks. | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | rosters classroom observations student notebooks CTEM | Leadership Team |
|---|-----|-----------------|--------------|--|--|-----------------|

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | To increase the number and percentage of students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing from 88% (130) to 97% (149). | | |
| Writing Goal #1a: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| In 2012, 88% (130) of students achieved Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) and higher in writing. | | In 2013, it is expected that 97% (149) of students will achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) 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. Rigor ~ Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate tasks, opportunities for student discourse | 1a. Teachers will be supported by building coaches and district staff to utilize standards/benchmarks and Test Item Specifications to | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher | During classroom observations administrators will determine that learning goal (LG) is specific to the standard/benchmark, | Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each tested standard/benchmark. | determine the level of rigor required for mastery of the standard/benchmark. Teachers will identify the learning goal (LG) and scale to incorporate rigorous expectations that include tasks, opportunities for student discourse, and assessments that follow an appropriate level of rigor for each standard/benchmark. | Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | is posted and in student-friendly language and that the scale (0-4) is aligned to the LG and represents graduated levels for demonstrating mastery of the standard/benchmark. Administrators will interview 1-3 students to determine understanding of the LG and scale. | Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars, FCAT/Collier Writes, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 2a. Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers' use of cooperative structures/strategies will be monitored through CTEM. | Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars, FCAT/Collier Writes, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats |
| 3 | 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction ~ Instructional: Data-driven planning, instruction and communication have not become uniform practice across all classrooms. Consequently, instruction, interventions and enrichment are not driven by data and do not address individual student needs. | 3a. Professional Learning Communities will meet 2 times each month for the specific purpose of examining, interpreting, and analyzing data to inform planning and instructional decisions. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | School-level data chats: administrator to teacher or team (2x each month); teacher to student (a minimum of 1x quarterly); student to parent (elementary and AVID) (Student-Led Conferences) are held routinely. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars, FCAT/Collier Writes, PLC Notes |
| 4 | 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies Instructional: Content instruction often does not include specific strategies for accessing the text to build comprehension. | 4a. Content area teachers will routinely utilize Collaborative Comprehension Strategies (CCS) or Reciprocal Teaching (RT) and (as appropriate) the Reading Coherence Model (RCM) across all content, seeking to incorporate multiple texts, both fiction and non-fiction, to develop analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach INSS Teacher Media Center Specialist Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ELL Teacher | Teachers use of reading strategies across all content will be monitored during CTEM classroom observations and study of lesson plans. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, CTEM, Lesson Plans, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars, FCAT/Collier Writes, PLC Notes |
| | see 1. Rigor | 1b. To ensure rigorous expectations for student writing, a minimum of 50% of student writing will be content-based written responses to multiple texts and demonstrate thinking skills appropriate to levels 3 or 4 of Webb's DOK. 1c. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper | see 1. Rigor | see 1. Rigor | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Lesson Plans, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 5 | | capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence. 1d. To ensure rigorous expectations for student writing, Baseline, End of Quarter 1, End of Quarter 2, and EOY writing assessments will be administered with opportunity for and focus on revision based on teacher feedback. | | | samples/exemplars, FCAT/Collier Writes, PLC Notes |
| 6 | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 2b. Students will work with a partner to evaluate each other's prompt and text-dependent written responses based on the writing rubric. Following the evaluation, partners will discuss the evaluations and reach agreements as to how the writing could be improved/strengthened. 2c. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence. | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Lesson Plans, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars,FCAT/Collier Writes, PLC Notes |
| 7 | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | 3b. During PLCs, TE will triangulate data to determine appropriate opportunities for extension and acceleration to enrich/extend the level of student comprehension. | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | see 3. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Administrator's Observations, Student Interviews, Student-led Conferences, Student Data Chats, PLC Notes |
| 8 | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | 4b. In all content areas when assessing student responses, check for proper capitalization of the first word of the sentence, appropriate punctuation at the end of the sentence, and that the response is a complete sentence. | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | see 4. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating, Webb's Depth of Knowledge and C & I Non-negotiables electronic form, Observations, CTEM, Student Interviews, Student Notebooks, Student-led Conferences, Lesson Plans, Rubrics, Quarterly Writing Prompts, Writing Samples, Teacher scored writing samples/exemplars,FCAT/Collier Writes, PLC Notes |

| | |
|--|--|
| 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: | To increase the number of students with significant cognitive disabilities reaching Levels 4 or higher in writing proficiency from 50% (2) to 50% (5). |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| The results of the 2012 FAA Writing Test indicate that 50% (2) of students with significant cognitive disabilities received a level 4 or higher in writing proficiency. | | | In 2013, it is expected that 50% (5) of students with significant cognitive disabilities will receive a level 4 or higher in writing proficiency. | | |
| 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 | 1b.1. Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | 1b.1. Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of: a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | 1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.1. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.1. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
| 2 | 1b.2. Inconsistent use of Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) does not support students' effective modes of communication, or provide consistent, understandable or readable (discernible) responses. | 1b.2. Professional Learning Communities will focus professional learning activities on: a) Incorporating multiple modes of communication in IEP development b) Identifying a variety of communication tools/strategies for instructional presentation, student responses and engagement c) Planning for the use of communication in daily instruction. | 1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.2. Observations: the use of a variety of communication modalities is evident when incorporated into daily lessons and differentiated for group/individual student needs. | 1b.2. Assistive Technology Evaluation (AT) ULS: AT Decision Guide CTEM |
| 3 | 1b.3. Students lack practice in utilizing informational text as it applies to gaining information for a structured approach to support writing and representing/interpreting information. | 1b.3. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in the use of text features focused on: writing conventions of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coaches, PLC Teams, IEP Team Members | 1b.3. Progress Monitoring Data collected through Pre and Post-tests Monthly Benchmark Assessments | 1b.3. Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

(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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 1b. Teachers will use learning goals with accompanying scales (0-4) to identify levels of performance relative to the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks so students understand what is required to demonstrate successful mastery of the learning goal and its embedded standards/benchmarks | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters classroom observations student notebooks CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Training in synthesizing complex ideas from multiple genres of thematically connected texts, citing sources to substantiate established claims and introduce and refute counter arguments. | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters writing samples classroom observations student notebooks student interviews CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Professional Development Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) text dependent written responses with multiple texts; Capitalization, punctuation, complete sentences | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters writing samples classroom observations student notebooks student interviews CTEM | Leadership Team |
| Training on rubric and text dependent written response anchor papers | K-5 | Leadership Team | K-5 Teachers | Ongoing throughout the year during Early Dismissal, Staff training days and PLCs | PLC notes attendance rosters writing samples classroom observations student notebooks student interviews CTEM | Leadership Team |

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Attendance | | To decrease the number of students with excessive absences and tardies. | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| In 2011-12, the attendance rate was 97%. | | In 2012-13, it is expected that the attendance rate will be 99%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| In 2011-12, 18% (168) of students had excessive absences (10 or more). | | In 2012-13, it is expected that no more than 16% (127) of students will have excessive absences (10 or more). | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| In 2011-12, 12% (99) of students had excessive tardies (10 or more). | | In 2012-13, it is expected that no more than 10% (79) of students will have excessive tardies. | | | |
| 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 who are absent due to parent's misunderstanding of Attendance Laws / importance of daily attendance miss instructional time | Assistant Principal runs reports of excessive absences weekly. Assistant Principal, School Counselor and District's Attendance Office conduct conferences with parents and students to discuss solutions. Discuss the issue of attendance and absences during curriculum night, in newsletter articles, and through phone links. | Assistant Principal School Counselor District's Attendance Office | Weekly attendance reports | Weekly attendance data, Student Pass |
| | Students who are tardy due to parent's inability to habitually get them to school on time miss instructional time | Assistant Principal runs reports of excessive tardies weekly. Assistant Principal, School Counselor and District's Attendance | Assistant Principal School Counselor District's Attendance Office | Weekly attendance reports | Weekly attendance data, Student Pass |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | Office conduct conferences with parents and students to discuss solutions. Discuss the issue of attendance and tardies during curriculum night, in newsletter articles, and through phone links. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Student Pass | Attendance/Discipline program | CCPS | \$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: | To continue having 0 In-School Suspensions. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Sea Gate Elementary had 0 In-School Suspensions during the 2011-12 school year. | Sea Gate Elementary expects to have 0 In-School Suspensions during the 2012-13 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| Sea Gate Elementary had 0 Students Suspended In School during the 2011-12 school year. | Sea Gate Elementary expects to have 0 Students Suspended In School during the 2012-13 school year. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| Sea Gate Elementary had 0 Out of School Suspensions during the 2011-12 school year. | Sea Gate Elementary expects to have 0 Out of School Suspensions during the 2012-13 school year. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| Sea Gate Elementary had 0 Students Suspended Out of School during the 2011-12 school year. | Sea Gate Elementary expects to have 0 Students Suspended Out of School during the 2012-13 school year. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Student's lack of prior success with reward systems | Implement the Red Brick Pizza Program to reward positive behavior. This supports our Positive Behavior Support Program. | Assistant Principal | Behavior reports | Behavior reports, teacher and administrative observation |
| 2 | School-wide consistency is necessary | Positive Behavior Support Committee meets monthly to discuss strategies. | School Counselor | Behavior reports | Committee observations, survey |
| 3 | School-wide consistency is necessary | PBS school coach will attend monthly district PBS meetings and share information with school team. | School Counselor | Implementation of strategies | Observation |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| Student Pass | Attendance/Discipline program | CCPS | \$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 |
| Provide a line item amount for the PBS Committee to determine school needs throughout the year. | School budget line item--PBS | locational funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | For the 2012-2013 school year, our collaboration with families will increase from 90% (738) to 100% (787) by all students having a parent participate in student-led conferencing. | | | |
| <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| 90% (738) of students (K-5) had a parent/guardian participate in student-led conferencing. | | 100% (787) of students (K-5) will have a parent/guardian participate in student-led conferencing. | | | |
| 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' ability to understand their own progress | Train students and schedule time (Early Release Day) for student led conferencing in all grades (K-5). | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher Counselor | Participation rates student/parent interviews data notebooks | Student portfolios/data notebooks Sign-in sheets |
| 2 | Students' ability to understand their own progress | Teachers will participate in "data chats" with students to enhance knowledge of individual goals. | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher Counselor | Observation student interviews data notebooks | CTEM data notebooks |
| 3 | Overcome cultural and language barriers to help build a positive school connection with families and parents. | All communication will meet the needs of our parents, and interpreters will be provided for any meetings / events. | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher ELL Resource Hearing Impaired Interpreters Counselor | Observations discussions with parents | Call-out reports, meeting notes, school related communication |
| 4 | Involvement of families and parents in understanding the importance of data in the student learning process | Students will be able to communicate their progress to their families through student-led conferencing, data notebooks and quarterly reports. | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher Counselor | Participation rate Observations data notebooks | Sign-in sheets Student-led conference feedback forms data notebooks |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | Parents and families unable to attend school events. | Provide various opportunities to attend activities / meetings. | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher Counselor | Observations, Participation rate | Sign-in sheets |
| 6 | 1.1. A small number of our students have non-English speaking parents. They feel uncomfortable linguistically in the school setting. They also prefer printed materials in their native language sent home from the school. | 1.1a. Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. 1.1b. Provide translation in Spanish and Creole at all parent functions, meetings, and trainings. 1.1c. Utilize bilingual staff and students to assist parents in navigating around the school and for translations | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher, ELL Resource | Observations, discussions with parents | Call-out reports, meeting notes, school related communication |
| 7 | 1.2. A small number of our students are from families of "Economically Needy". Parents desire to attend school functions and activities but have difficulty attending day-time events due to child care, transportation, and employment-related issues. | 1.2a. Serve food at evening events. 1.2b. Plan teacher/parent conferences to meet all stakeholders' needs. 1.2c. Provide child-care services at parent training events. 1.2d. Promote community involvement to provide transportation to school functions. | Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teacher ELL Resource Counselor | Observations, discussions with parents | Call-out reports, meeting notes, school related communication |
| 8 | 1.3. A small number of the students' parents and/or extended family members are immigrants. They have expressed interest in expanding their knowledge of the federal, state, and the local school system procedures and policies. | 1.3a. Organize and conduct various parent training sessions. 1.3b. Present various training sessions for staff in regards to effective communication with immigrant families. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher, ELL Resource | Observations, discussions with parents | Call-out reports, meeting notes, school related communication |

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 |
|---|---------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| PLC groups will create process to implement Student-led Conferencing, Data Notebooking and Data Chats | K-5 | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Team Leaders | All Instructional Staff | Early release PLC meetings | Implementation of Student-led Conferencing, Data Notebooking, Data Chats | Leadership Team Team Leaders |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| Odyssey of the Mind http://odysseyofthemind.com | K-5 Teachers | Parent Volunteer | K-5 Teachers | TBD | TBD | Assistant Principal Reading Coach Counselor Classroom Teachers Parent Volunteer |
| Existing Programs - Organic Garden / worm bin / compost The Habitat | K-5 Teachers | Classroom Teachers | K-5 Teachers | throughout the year | classroom observations student interviews data notebooks | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Counselor Classroom Teachers |
| Invention Convention Participation http://www.ehow.com/list_6459433_invention-convention-ideas-kids.html or http://just-think-inc.com/ or http://www.eduplace.com/science/invention/overview.html | 4th Grade Teachers | 4th Grade Teachers | Principal Assistant Principal 4th Grade Teachers K-5 classrooms District personnel | Spring 2013 | classroom observations data notebooks | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Counselor Classroom Teachers |
| Projects already in existence ~ Conservancy Panther Posse CREW Corkscrew Swamp and Sanctuary Echo Farms. These are all accompanied by preparatory and follow-up lessons. | K-5 Teachers | Classroom Teachers | K-5 Teachers | throughout the year | classroom observations data notebooks student interviews | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Counselor Classroom Teachers |
| Enrichment with 10,000 Island Dolphin Research and Study Program | 4th and 5th Grade | Parent Volunteer Administration | 4th and 5th Grade Teachers and Students | October 2012 - December 2012 | student notebooks student interviews | Principal Assistant Principal |

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 |
| Enrichment with 10,000 Island Dolphin Research and Study Program | Skype camera materials | Internal Budget | \$300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$300.00 |

Additional Goal(s)

Community Partnerships Goal:

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1. Community Partnerships Goal Community Partnerships Goal #1: | | To nurture and engage an active community of families, organizations and volunteers who will work with the district to help all students succeed; Ensure that all schools have the needed level of community support to help all students succeed; Create partnerships that will work toward overcoming cultural, language and other barriers in this diverse community. | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | 2013 Expected level: | | | |
| Sea Gate currently has 540 active volunteers. | | 10% (54) of our volunteers will commit to helping other schools within the community. | | | |
| 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 | Willingness of volunteers to commit to attending other schools. | Principal / Assistant Principal will connect with same admin. from other schools to determine volunteer needs and make initial contact for volunteer. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Volunteer hours | Fast Pass System, Volunteer hours |

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

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

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

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 Community Partnerships Goal(s)

Quality Learning Experiences Goal:

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| <p>1. Quality Learning Experiences Goal</p> <p>Quality Learning Experiences Goal # 1:</p> | <p>To provide a safe, caring, rigorous learning environment, for a diverse student body, that offers multiple opportunities for success and supports student achievement and development.</p> <p>Create and maintain a safe, caring environment with minimal disruptions where all students have a sense of belonging, and are respected and accepted by teachers, peers and the community.</p> <p>Create and maintain a teacher guided instructional program focused on advancement through the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy and the interactive engagement of students with teachers, peers and resources.</p> <p>Ensure all students are immersed in data-driven, evidence-based curricular programs that provide diverse learning experiences and multiple opportunities to master the Florida educational standards.</p> | | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | 2013 Expected level: | | | | |
| Sea Gate earned 672 points and an "A" grade for the state of Florida. | Sea Gate will increase its total points earned by 5% (707 points) to maintain an "A" grade from the state of Florida. | | | | |
| <p>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p> | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Staff continues to be in the developing stages of fully implementing the strategies by Marzano in The Art and Science of Teaching. | Professional development time will be spent training staff in the strategies of highly effective instruction. | Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach | CTEM | CTEM |

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Quality Learning Experiences Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|------------------|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Purchase Brain Pop program for student use at school and home | Brain Pop Program | School funds | \$1,780.00 |
| Mathematics | FASTT Math Program | Computer-based program | District funds | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,780.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Attendance | Student Pass | Attendance/Discipline program | CCPS | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | Student Pass | Attendance/Discipline program | CCPS | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Data binders | Binders used house item specifications, quarterly assessment data and common formative assessment data | school funds | \$500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Suspension | Provide a line item amount for the PBS Committee to determine school needs throughout the year. | School budget line item--PBS | locational funds | \$500.00 |
| STEM | Enrichment with 10,000 Island Dolphin Research and Study Program | Skype camera materials | Internal Budget | \$300.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$800.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$3,080.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 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.

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|----------------------------|--------|

The intended use of funds is to be used for the after school FCAT Club.

\$682.24

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) serves in an advisory capacity to the school principal and assists in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. Professional development, materials, technology, staffing, student support services, and other matters of resource allocation are addressed by the SAC. The SAC assists in the preparation of the school's annual budget. Other areas of interest to our school community are addressed.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Collier School District SEA GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 93% | 91% | 90% | 76% | 350 | 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 | 81% | 68% | | | 149 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 73% (YES) | 73% (YES) | | | 146 | 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 | | | | | 645 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Collier School District SEA GATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 90% | 87% | 95% | 74% | 346 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 71% | 62% | | | 133 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 68% (YES) | 63% (YES) | | | 131 | 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 | | | | | 610 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |