FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MARION CHARTER SCHOOL

District Name: Marion

Principal: Gina Evers

SAC Chair: Gina Evers

Superintendent: Jim Yancey

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/21/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					In 2012, our school received a B. We increased our grade from 2011 by 2 grades, the only school in our district that improved by 2 grades. Math, an area of focus for us in 2012, showed exceptional growth, especially for our lowest 25%. The percentage of students showing growth in math in our lowest quartile increased from 53% showing growth in 2011 to 88% showing growth in 2012. Gains were also shown in reading for all groups. In 2012, our school earned 512 points, up almost 100 points from our 2011 score of 413 points. In 2011, our school received a D and did not make AYP. Although our 3rd graders scored very well, our 4th and 5th grades did poorly. In 2010, our school received a B for our school grade and did not make AYP. In 2009, our school received a grade of A, up from a C in the 2008 year, and we made AYP. The percent of students who are on level 3 or above in reading has fluctuated. In 2009, 71% were at level 3 or above, in 2010, 80% were at level 3 or

Principal	Gina Evers	M.Ed in Elementary Education, Administration	12	12	above, and in 2011, 64% were at level 3 or above. In 2012, 55% were at level 3 or above. The percent of students who are on level 3 or above in math has also fluctuated. In 2009, 69% were at level 3 or above, in 2010, 60% were at level 3 or above, in 2011, 67% were at level 3 or above and in 2012, we also had 67% at level 3 or above. The percent of students who are on level in writing had significantly decreased over time, but is improving. In 2009, 84% were at level, in 2010, 68% were on level, in 2011 38% were at level and in 2012, 54% were at level. Science has fluctuated. In 2009, 49% of our students were on grade level, in 2010, 60% were on grade level, in 2011, 35% were on grade level and in 2012, 30% were at grade level. Learning gains in reading increased this year. In 2009, 69% of our students made learning gains in reading. In 2010, 69% made learning gains in reading, in 2011, 54% of our students made learning gains in reading and in 2012, 65% made learning gains. In math, 80% of our students made learning gains in math in 2009. In 2010, 56% made learning gains in math, in 2011, 52% made learning gains in math and in 2012, 88% made learning gains. For students in the lowest quartile in reading, 69% made learning gains in 2009, 73% made learning gains in 2010, 50% did in 2011 and 65% did so in 2012. For math, 80% of our lowest quartile made learning gain in math in 2009. In 2010, 53% made learning gains in math, in 2011, 53% made learning gains in math and in 2012, 88% made learning gains.
Principal					We do not have any other administrator.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A, we do not have any instructional coaches.

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	In years when we need to recruit new teachers, we use Teacher to Teacher to advertise positions as well as advertising locally. We did so this year to replace our 1st grade teacher.	Gina Evers	May 2012	
2	We pay our teachers the same rate for years of experience and degree that the district does. In addition, we provide full health coverage and are part of the Florida Retirement System. Our teachers do not lose anything working for us.	Gina Evers	ongoing	
3	We provide our teachers with a $200 classroom budget, a full time ESE consultant, guidance counselor, and teacher assistants at every grade level. Our goal is to provide as much support and resources as possible.	Gina Evers	ongoing	
4	Teachers are empowered and encouraged to develop school improvement ideas and additional curriculum components which, if approved, are fully funded.	Gina Evers	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
We did not have any instructional staff or paraprofessionals that are out of field or teachers who received less than an effective rating.	If we did have any teachers or paraprofessionals who were teaching out of field, not highly qualified, or rated as needing improvement, we would assist them in finding the appropriate training needed to become highly qualified/effective/in field. Strategies would include peer mentoring, assignment to district level courses, an individual study plan developed with school administration, and/or online courses selected to remediate the areas of difficulty.

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
11	0.0%(0)	36.4%(4)	45.5%(5)	18.2%(2)	27.3%(3)	100.0%(11)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	81.8%(9)

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
Melinda Dube	Heidi Kucharek	Melinda is the other 1st grade teacher, is Clin Ed trained and an excellent teacher.	Before school began, Melinda went go over our school curriculum and structure. They worked together to create a framework for 1st grade. Additional activities included cumulative folder review; RTI introduction; introduction to our online gradebook program and website; weekly lesson plan review; data analysis; report card creation; our remediation programs; using intervention programs; and school assistance team format.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Our Title 1 funds provide 2 teacher paraprofessionals to work with our students in reading.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Currently we do not have any migrant students. If migrant students do enroll, we will utilize the services provided by the district to assist the student. These services include school supplies and a migrant liaison who works with families to provide referrals to services available to them.

Title I, Part D

We do not currently have any students who are funded by Title 1, Part D . If students enroll, we will utilize the services provided by the district.

Title II

The Marion County School District provides a variety of staff development activities that our staff can access, including training in new curriculums, using technology and serving students with special needs.

Title III

The Marion County School district provides services to support ELL students. We will utilize the district services including bi-lingual paraprofessionals, ELL materials, and family support.

Title X- Homeless

Currently we do not have any homeless students. If homeless students enroll, we will utilize the services provided by the district for these students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Our SAI funds are used to fund teacher salaries and an ESE consultant due to our large ESE numbers (approximately 36% of our student population).

Violence Prevention Programs

We use a school wide Positive Discipline program that incorporates daily morning meetings, character education vocabulary and modeling and guidance classes on bullying and positive peer relationships.

Nutrition Programs

Our students participate in the district lunch program. They are eligible for free and reduced price breakfasts and lunches the same as all district students.

Housing Programs

Not applicable

Head Start

Not applicable

Adult Education

Not applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not applicable

Job Training

Not applicable

Other

Not applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> . Our MTSS/RTI team consists of the principal- Gina Evers, the ESE consultant- Kelly Kaminski, and the guidance counselor- Valerie Wells. This team is joined by the student's teacher and ESE and district behavioral specialists, as needed.

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 team meets during pre-school to prepare student folders from the prior year and review incoming cumulative folders to flag students who may need additional support. Teachers receive folders showing last year's interventions and performance data for their students who were in the RTI process. Our ESE consultant meets with classroom teachers during the first 2 weeks of school to review the folders. During the first 2 weeks of school, students may be identified as needing additional support based on last year's end of year data or beginning of the year assessment testing. After the initial 2 week review, the MTSS/RTI team is called to review the students who are struggling and initial interventions are created and implemented. Teachers begin graphing data (1 data point per week) in the areas of concern. This data will be evaluated at least three times per year during child study team meetings of the MTSS/RTI team. The team members perform the following roles/functions- Gina Evers- responsible for providing resources, instructional support, training to implement student interventions. Kelly Kaminski is responsible for assisting teachers in writing the MTSS/RTI plan and identifying appropriate goals. Valerie Wells is responsible for providing support for behavioral interventions and student motivation activities. The MTSS/RTI team shares data with the School Leadership Team to identify areas of concern ie professional development, instructional strategies, and behavioral concerns.

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/RTI leadership team provides data to the our School Advisory Council, which, as a charter school, is our Board of Directors, in regular Board meetings. These meetings are open to the public and parents are encouraged to provide input on our School Improvement Plan. Data from the MTSS/RTI process is used to guide budget decisions on materials and staff professional development.

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.

> Our data is gathered from district Benchmark assessments, Focus Calendar assessments, classroom assessments, FCAT and Stanford 10 testing results, FAIR assessments, individual psychological/achievement testing and behavioral checklists/observations. Some data (Benchmarks, Focus Calendar Assessments and FCAT data) are stored in the district management system. Other data is maintained in our electronic web based gradebook (GradeQuick).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> On August 14, 2012, all instructional staff members were inserviced on changes to the MTSS/RTI process. Our ESE consultant will then meet monthly with all classroom teachers to support their data collection for students who are in the MTSS/RTI process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> Our ESE consultant, Kelly Kaminski, will meet with the school psychologist on a monthly basis and review all students in the MTSS process. She will meet with individual teachers on a monthly basis to evaluate data collection and interventions. Administration will review the data and discuss needed support, ie materials, training, interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The following staff members are on School Based Literacy Leadership Team- Gina Evers- Director, Michelle Axson- 4th teacher, Nancy Selph- 5th grade teacher, Valerie Wells- guidance counselor and Kelly Kaminski- ESE consultant.

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

The school based LLT meets on at least a quarterly basis. Meeting dates and times are posted in the annual staff calendar. Agendas are created at the end of each meeting to identify topics of discussion and tasks for group members before the next meeting. Each team member works on data collectively and then takes the data and works on separate projects, ie one team member might focus on intervention programs, one on motivation ideas. Team members confer with our other teachers to gather information and share team projects/initiatives.

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

This year we will work on the following initiatives-
1. Implementing and extending our intervention camps after school
2. Assisting teachers on graphing MTSS/RTI data and analyzing intervention data
3. Continuing to develop our motivation initiatives
4. Strengthening student competence in non-fiction reading strategies.
5. Focused assistance to 4th and 5th grade to improve FCAT performance.
6. Transitioning to Common Core Standards for the 2012-13 school year in K-2nd.
7. Improving student performance in science and writing

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.

Families with pre-school children are provided materials to help their child transition to the elementary school level. Our guidance counselor is available to parents to answer questions and meet with them to help their child make a smooth transition to school. Over the summer before they enroll in kindergarten, informational literature is mailed to all incoming kindergarten students.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2012-13, our school goal is to see an increase of 10% or higher in the percentage of students in grades 3-5 who achieve a Level 3 or above on their FCAT reading test as compared to the 2011-12 year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-12 school year, 55% (43) of our students were at or above grade level in reading on the FCAT reading test.	In 2012-13, we expect 60%(44) of our students to be at or above grade level in reading on the FCAT reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Almost 70% (112) of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Many students lack a wide variety of reading material at home.	Teachers will provide more intensive instruction in non-fiction reading, an area of particular need from our examination of the data. Non-fiction libraries have been purchased for all classrooms and additional teacher materials have also been provided.	Gina Evers	The Director, Gina Evers, will monitor reading data pre/mid and post year to determine effectiveness of new non-fiction reading materials.	FAIR, district Benchmarks, FCAT, school selected pre/post tests.
2	Students are not using online remediation programs as effectively as possible.	School will hold a parent workshop on using online intervention programs. Incentive program will be implemented to increase student participation.	Gina Evers	Student data results from FCAT Explorer and other online intervention programs will be assessed and monitored during the school year.	FCAT Explorer data, online intervention program reports

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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
	Not applicable. We do	Not applicable. We do	Not applicable. We	Not applicable. We do	Not applicable. We

| 1 | not have any students who are alternatively assessed. | not have any students who are alternatively assessed. | do not have any students who are alternatively assessed. | not have any students who are alternatively assessed. | do not have any students who are alternatively assessed. |

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:	In the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to increase the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT reading by at least 10% from the 2011-12 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, 29% (23 students) scored at a Level 4 or 5.	In the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to have 32% (23 students) score at a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT reading test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>With the focus on students who are not on grade level, we have not focused as much time on those who are above level.</td><td>Our Gifted teacher will be working with the above level students to appropriately challenge them to increase their achievement. She will also meet monthly with all teachers to review instructional strategies for students scoring at or above Level 4.</td><td>Kelly Kaminski</td><td>Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark testing will be evaluated for growth during the year.</td><td>Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark tests.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Providing sufficient enrichment activities for high achieving students.</td><td>All teachers have been inserviced at the start of the school year with suggestions for enrichment activities. Teachers will be including enrichment strategies in all lesson plans on a weekly basis for all students.</td><td>Gina Evers</td><td>Director will check lesson plans.</td><td>Benchmark testing, weekly classroom data points.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

				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	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains on FCAT reading by at least 10% from the 2011-12 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-12, 65% (51 students) made learning gains in reading as measured by the 2011-12 FCAT reading test.	In 2012-13, we expect 72% (53 students) will make learning gains in reading as measured by the 2012-13 FCAT reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With a population of students with high percentages of students in ESE programs and with RTI interventions, students need additional time to increase student achievement.	Tutoring will be provided 2 days a week after school to provide extra support in reading and math for students in Levels 1-2.	Gina Evers	Analysis of Focus Calendar Assessments and Benchmark tests for growth during the year.	Benchmark Assessments, Focus Calendar Assessments.
2	With 33% of our students being ESE students, many are performing below grade level but meeting their IEP goals. The IEP goals do not always indicate an expected grade level performance in reading, so even if they increase achievement, they are unable to move up in FCAT levels.	Our ESE consultant will continue to work with all teachers to insure students are meeting their IEP goals and developing effective strategies to move towards grade level proficiency. She will monitor ESE student achievement and meet at least monthly with teachers to help them modify instructional strategies. Students in need of improvement will also be provided corrective reading instruction.	Gina Evers	Weekly sharing of data on students in Levels 1 and 2 to determine effectiveness of strategies.	Benchmark assessments, weekly data points.
3					

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:

Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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:	In the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile showing learning gains in reading by at least 10%, as measured by performance on the FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, 50% (11 students) in the lowest academic quartile made learning gains as measured by the FCAT reading test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 55% (13 students) in the lowest academic quartile to make learning gains in reading as measured by the FCAT test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With a population of students with high percentages of students in ESE programs and with RTI interventions, students need additional time to increase student achievement.	Tutoring for students in Levels 1-2 will be provided after school two days a week in both reading and math.	Gina Evers	Analysis of Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark assessments during the year.	Focus Calendar Assessments, Benchmark assessments
2	Many students come to us in the upper elementary grades when they have not met with success at other schools. They often have gaps in reading skills.	To help all students in the lowest quartile, including our new students, we will identify those students in the first 3 weeks of school and create individual plans that will be implemented during their center time and intensive remediation teacher group time to address their gaps and build motivation. Students in this group will be tracked and have an adult mentor who will provide encouragement and praise for academic	Gina Evers, adult mentors.	Students will be tracked for on task behavior and effort during center and remediation time. Performance on intervention tools-Successmaker, Corrective Reading, etc. will be tracked. We expect to see continued growth and an increase in comprehension during the year.	Benchmark data, Behavioral charts, Weekly data points, Successmaker data.

		effort.			
3	Students in the lowest quartile need additional time spent to catch up and master grade level skills.	Students in the lowest quartile will have additional time to work on computer based intervention programs. Time will be provided after school during free tutoring and during the day during intervention time.	Gina Evers	Performance on intervention tools- Successmaker, Corrective Reading, etc. will be tracked. We expect to see continued growth and an increase in comprehension during the year.	Successmaker data, data from online intervention programs.

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 #
	At Marion Charter School, our goal for reading is that we will have a 10% or greater improvement each year in the number of students who test as proficient in reading on the FCAT.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	55%	60%	66%	73%	80%	

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:	Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to see at least a 10% improvement in the percentage of white students who score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 61% (27 students) of our white students score at a Level 3 or beyond on the FCAT reading test. This was the only subgroup that we had with enough students to count.	Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is that 67% (27 students) or more of our white students will score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.
2	Our current percentage of ESE students is 33% (32 students in 3rd-5th grades). These high numbers present a challenge in achieving on grade level proficiency of almost 80% when 33% are served in ESE programs.	We will work to insure all students, including white students, are provided with timely review and remediation, that intervention programs are started early in the year and monitored throughout the year.	Gina Evers	We will be looking at performance on Benchmark assessments, weekly data points and intervention programs such as Successmaker to determine if students are making adequate academic growth to get them to Level 3.	Benchmark assessments, weekly data points, intervention program data.
3					

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:	We only have one ESOL student in our school for the 2012-13 school year in grades 3-5. Our goal is that she, and any other ESOL students that might enroll, will score at a Level 3 or above on the 2012-13 FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
We did not have enough ESOL students enrolled to make a subgroup in the 2011-12 school year.	We only have one ESOL student in our school for the 2012-13 school year in grades 3-5. Our goal is that she, and any other ESOL students that might enroll, will score at a Level 3 or above on the 2012-13 FCAT reading test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.</td><td>N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.</td><td>N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.</td><td>N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.</td><td>N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>We only have 1 student in ESOL in our school.</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to see a 10% increase in the percentage of SWD who score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we did not have enough students with disabilities tested to count as a subgroup. However, by our own data, we had 38% (9 students) of our SWD who scored at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to see a 10% increase in the percentage of SWD who score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Students with disabilities require additional time and varied approaches to achieve academic success.</td><td>To provide students with additional time and support, staff members will provide tutoring time before, during and after school. Classroom teachers will monitor tutors. Kelly Kaminski will review tutoring plans and materials and provide assistance on curriculum selection for tutoring.</td><td>Kelly Kaminski</td><td>Kelly will monitor the progress of all SWD and report to the School Leadership Team on their progress.</td><td>Focus calendar assessments and District Benchmark test.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>We often get students join us in 3rd-5th grade who have not had success in other school settings.</td><td>To help students feel connected to our school, we implement a Positive Behavior system that includes daily morning meetings and peer mentoring. As needed, students are also assigned an adult mentor to provide additional support.</td><td>Valerie Wells, our guidance counselor</td><td>Reduction or elimination of behaviors that negatively impact learning.</td><td>Behavior charts</td></tr>
</table>

3	SWD require additional services to achieve academic success.	Our ESE consultant works directly with students and teachers to provide individualized programs and instructional strategies to best fit the needs of the students. She meets at least monthly with teachers to discuss all SWD and their progress.	Kelly Kaminski, our ESE coordinator	Teachers and our ESE coordinator will monitor the students mastery of NGSSS on Benchmark tests and classroom assessments.	Benchmark tests, classroom assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	For the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to see an increase of at least 10% in the number of economically disadvantaged students who score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 49% (25 students) of our economically disadvantaged students who achieved a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test. This compares closely with the overall percentage of students who achieved a Level 3 or higher on the 2011-12 FCAT reading test- 55%.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 55% (23) of our economically disadvantaged students to score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading test.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Economically disadvantaged students often lack resources at home to support academic growth.	Economically disadvantaged students will have additional time to work on online intervention programs after school and take home packets of resources.	Gina Evers	Evaluation of growth on Focus Calendar Assessments and district Benchmark testing during the year.	Focus Calendar Assessments, District Benchmark tests and Successmaker software assessments.
2	Limited access to computers in the home to allow students to access learning resources online.	All 3rd-5th grade classrooms have been provided with a complete LCD presentation station to allow teachers to fully access and share internet based resources and information with students. These stations can also allow teachers to present information in a wider variety of formats.	Gina Evers	Comparison of student performance and interest from last year to this year in classes with the newer technology.	Student surveys, teacher observation.
3	Additional time for intervention/remediation.	Teachers will provide daily periods for immediate, intensive intervention to allow students to receive timely support in areas they are struggling with.	Gina Evers	Monitoring scores on classroom assessments and Benchmark assessments.	Lesson plans, classroom assessments, Benchmark assessments, Successmaker data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-2nd grade	Gina Evers	K-2nd grade teachers	Pre-school and on early release dates in 2012-13	Administration will review reading performance in K-2nd and effectiveness of reading block as it is aligned to the Common Core standards.	Gina Evers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Whole and small group instruction	Treasures workbooks	FTE	$1,000.00
		Subtotal:	$1,000.00
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
Develop competence in Common Core standards	Teacher resource books	Title 1	$300.00
		Subtotal:	$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$1,300.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	For the 2012-13 school year, our goal is for 25% (2) of our CELLA tested students to test as proficient in listening and speaking.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
In the 2012 school year, we had 22% (2) of our CELLA tested students showing proficient in listening and speaking.	

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	None, all of our students tested as proficient or high intermediate.	We will continue to provide an extended reading block and small group teacher led centers to help ELL students achieve proficiency in listening and speaking.	Gina Evers	CELLA testing for 2013	CELLA test

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	In the 2013 school year, we will have 13% (1) of our ELL students score as proficient on the reading portion of the CELLA test.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
In the 2012 year, we had 11% (1) of our ELL students score as proficient on the reading portion of the CELLA test.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With just 9 ELL students, we do not have enough students to have an ESOL para. We only have one person on campus who speaks Spanish and she is a 3rd grade aide. 8 of the 9 students are younger than 3rd grade.	We will adjust our aide schedule to allow for her to work with the students, as needed, to build reading comprehension.	Gina Evers	CELLA testing scores for 2013	CELLA test

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	For the 2013 school year, our goal is for 25% (2) of our ELL students to score as proficient in writing on the 2013 CELLA test.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
For the 2012 school year, we had 22% (2) of our ELL students score as proficient in writing on the CELLA test.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With just 9 ELL students, we do not have enough students to have an ESOL para. We only have one person on campus who speaks Spanish and she	We will adjust our aide schedule to allow for her to work with the students, as needed, to build reading comprehension.	Gina Evers	CELLA testing	CELLA test

is a 3rd grade aide. 8 of the 9 students are younger than 3rd grade.				

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In the 2012-13 school year, 74% (55 students) will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test. Our goal is for our Level 3 students to improve their skills and maintain their on grade level performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 67% (52 students) of our students achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 74% (55 students) of our students to achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With a high percentage of ESE students,approximately 35% (56), additional time and support to master skills is needed.	Title 1 paraprofessionals will assist the teacher with small groups and individual tutoring directed by the classroom teacher. After school tutoring is provided 2 days a week by our 5th grade teacher.	Gina Evers	Analysis of Focus Calendar Assessments and Benchmark tests for growth during the year.	Benchmark Assessments, Focus Calendar Assessments.
2	Our students need a stronger foundation of science knowledge in K-3rd grades and more effective instruction throughout the grade levels.	Teachers will be provided with additional materials, technology and resources to support science instruction. All teachers will attend 3 half day science inservices during the 2012-13 school year. They will be observed by our science consultant and be required to complete a year long best practices project.	Gina Evers	Students will be assessed pre/post on grade appropriate science knowledge. Students would be expected to show a year's growth- an increase of at least 50% in their score.	Science pre/post test

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

		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	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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:	In the 2012-13 school year, we will increase the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT mathematics test by at least 10% from the 2011-12 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 32%(25 students) of our students who scored at a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT mathematics test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to have 35% (26 students) of our students score at a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT mathematics test.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With the focus on students who are not on grade level, we have not focused as much time on those who are above level.	Our Gifted teacher will be working with the above level students to appropriately challenge them to increase their achievement. She will also meet monthly with all teachers to review instructional strategies for students scoring at or above Level 4.	Kelly Kaminski	Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark testing will be evaluated for growth during the year.	Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark tests.
2	With a large percentage of our students in ESE programs, providing additional time for our advanced students in math has been challenging.	Math is blocked in 3rd and 4th/5th so teachers can group students to allow for advanced/enrichment instructional strategies during their 90 minute math block time.	Gina Evers	Increase in the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 or 5.	FCAT math test

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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

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

1	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In the 2012-13 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains in math will continue to be 88% or greater on the FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 88% (69 students) of our students show a year of progress on the FCAT mathematics test.	In the 2012-13 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains in math will continue to be 88% or greater on the FCAT mathematics test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>With a population of students with high percentages of students in ESE programs and with RTI interventions, students need additional time to increase student achievement.</td><td>Tutoring will be provided 2 days a week after school to provide extra support in reading and math for students in Levels 1-2.</td><td>Gina Evers</td><td>Analysis of Focus Calendar Assessments and Benchmark tests for growth during the year.</td><td>Benchmark Assessments, Focus Calendar Assessments.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.</td><td>Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.</td><td>Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.</td><td>Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.</td><td>Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.</td></tr>
</table>

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

	4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In the 2012-13 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains in math will continue to be 88% or greater on the FCAT mathematics test.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 88% (69 students) of the students in the lowest academic quartile show a year's growth on the FCAT mathematics test.	In the 2012-13 school year, the percentage of students making learning gains in math will continue to be 88% or greater on the FCAT mathematics test.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	With a population of students with high percentages of students in ESE programs and with RTI interventions, students need additional time to increase student achievement.	Tutoring for students in Levels 1-2 will be provided after school two days a week in both reading and math.	Gina Evers	Analysis of Focus calendar assessments and Benchmark assessments during the year.	Focus Calendar Assessments, Benchmark assessments
2	Students in the lower quartile require additional instructional time and varied methods to improve their academic skills.	Selected teachers will hold Math Camp after school 2 days per week starting in September. Selected students in the lowest quartile will be invited to attend. The sessions will take place directly after school and last for 30 minutes. Snack and free extended day care will be provided.	Gina Evers	Comparison of student scores on FCAT, Benchmark assessments and other classroom assessments from last year/beginning of this year.	FCAT tests, Benchmark assessments, and classroom assessments.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # At Marion Charter School, our goal for math is that we will have a 10% or greater improvement each year in the number of students who test as proficient in reading on the FCAT. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	74%	81%	89%	98%	

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:	For the 2012-13 school year our goal is for at least 82% (34 students) of our white students to achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test. We do not have any other subgroups with enough students to be counted.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 75% (33 students) of our white students score at a Level 3 or beyond on the FCAT mathematics test. This was the only subgroup that we had with enough students to count.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 82% (34 students) of our white students to achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.	N/A- we do not have any subgroup, other than white students, with enough numbers to constitute a countable group.
2					
3	None, our white students are achieving at a high level.	None, our white students are achieving at a high level.	Gina Evers	None, our white students are achieving at a high level.	None, our white students are achieving at a high level.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	We only have 1 student in the ELL program in our school in grades 3-5. Our goal is for her, and any other ELL students who enroll, to achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test in the 2012-13 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
We did not have enough students in the ELL subgroup to generate a score.	We only have 1 student in the ELL program in our school in grades 3-5. Our goal is for her, and any other ELL students who enroll, to achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test in 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	N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.	N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.	N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.	N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.	N/A- We only have 1 ELL student in 3rd-5th grades.
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In the 2012-13 school year, we currently do not have enough students with disabilities to count as a subgroup. However, we will be using strategies, listed below, to help the students we do have achieve their highest possible score on the FCAT math test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we did not have enough students with disabilities tested to count as a subgroup.	In the 2012-13 school year, we currently do not have enough students with disabilities to count as a subgroup. However, we will be using strategies, listed below, to help the students we do have achieve their highest possible score on the FCAT math test.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

1	Students with disabilities require additional time and varied approaches to achieve academic success.	To provide students with additional time and support, staff members will provide tutoring time before, during and after school. Classroom teachers will monitor tutors. Kelly Kaminski will review tutoring plans and materials and provide assistance on curriculum selection for tutoring.	Kelly Kaminski	Kelly will monitor the progress of all SWD and report to the School Leadership Team on their progress.	Focus calendar assessments and District Benchmark test.
2					

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:	For the 2012-13 school year, our goal is to see an increase of at least 10% in the number of economically disadvantaged students who score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 63% (32 students) who are economically disadvantaged score a Level 3 or above on the FCAT mathematics test	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 69% (30) of our economically disadvantaged students to score at a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT mathematics test.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Economically disadvantaged students often lack resources at home to support academic growth.	Economically disadvantaged students will have additional time to work on online intervention programs after school and take home packets of resources.	Gina Evers	Evaluation of growth on Focus Calendar Assessments and district Benchmark testing during the year.	Focus Calendar Assessments, District Benchmark tests and Successmaker software assessments.
2	Access to online intervention programs at home	Selected teachers will be holding an after school Math Camp starting in September. Students will access online tutorial programs and intervention activities. Free extended day care will be provided to assist parents.	Gina Evers	Increase in FCAT scores, Benchmark scores and the scores on classroom assessments.	FCAT mathematics test, Benchmark data and Successmaker data.

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In the 2012-13 school year, our school will show an increase of at least 10% in the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 or above on FCAT science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 30% (7 students) of our students score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT science test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to see 33% (7 students) score at a Level 3 or above on the FCAT science test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Our students need a stronger foundation of science knowledge in K-3rd grades and more effective instruction throughout the grade levels.	Teachers will be provided with additional materials, technology and resources to support science instruction. All teachers will attend 3 half day science inservices during the	Gina Evers	Students will be assessed pre/post on grade appropriate science knowledge. Students would be expected to show a year's growth- an increase of at least 50% in their score.	Science pre/post test

		2012-13 school year. They will be observed by our science consultant and be required to complete a year long best practices project.			
2	Student motivation	Teachers in 3rd-5th grade have been provided with resources to support nature journaling and scientific study. They will be expected to engage the children in motivating activities that increase their interest in and skills with science.	Gina Evers	Increase of at least 10% in the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT science test.	FCAT science test.

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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:	In the 2012-13 school year, our school will show an increase of at least 10% in the percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 9% (2 students) of our students score at a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT science test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect at least 11% (2 students) of our students to score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT science test.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	With the focus on	Our Gifted teacher will	Kelly Kaminski	Focus calendar	Focus calendar

				assessments and Benchmark testing will be evaluated for growth during the year.	assessments and Benchmark tests.
1	students who are not on grade level, we have not focused as much time on those who are above level.	be working with the above level students to appropriately challenge them to increase their achievement. She will also meet monthly with all teachers to review instructional strategies for students scoring at or above Level 4.			
2	School wide effectiveness in teaching science.	This year all teachers will be inserviced 3 times on effective, motivating instructional strategies in science that support the NGSSS. Teachers were supplied with materials to support more rigorous and motivating instruction. Teachers are expected to incorporate many of the strategies shared. Teachers will be expected to create a "best practices" grade level collection of effective instructional strategies.	Gina Evers	Increase in the percent of students scoring a 4 or 5 on FCAT science	FCAT science test

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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
Effective Science instruction	K-5th, whole school	Dr. Diana Wehrell-Grabowski	all classroom teachers	9-19-12, 10-3-12, 2-6-13	MIP project, FCAT science scores	Gina Evers

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
3 teacher inservice sessions	Science consultant Dr. Diana Wehrell-Grabowski	Title 1	$3,555.00
			Subtotal: $3,555.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,555.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In the 2012-13 school year, our school will show an increase of at least 10% in the percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 38% (9 students) of our students score proficient on the FCAT Writes test.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 42% (8 students) of our students to be proficient on FCAT Writes.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The effectiveness of instructional strategies for teaching writing.	All classroom teachers in grades K-5th will use a common writing curriculum- "Writers	Gina Evers	Increase in the percentage of students scoring proficient on FCAT Writes.	FCAT Writes

		Workshop" to instruct students in writing.		

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:	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.	Not applicable. We do not have any students who are alternatively assessed.

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
Integrating the Writer's Workshop into your curriculum	K-5th	Gina Evers	K-5th grade	Independent study project. We will meet 4 times per year to assess.	Individual meetings with teachers.	Gina Evers

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implement a school-wide writing curriculum	Writer's Workshop	Title 1, FTE	$1,620.00
			Subtotal: $1,620.00
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
Independent book study	Implementing Writer's Workshop	Title 1, FTE	$441.00

			Subtotal: $441.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,061.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to maintain or improve, if possible, our student attendance rate for those students who are absent 10 days or more (excessively absent) in the 2012-13 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
In the 2011-12 school year, our attendance rate was 95.62 %	We expect our attendance rate to be 95% or higher during the 2012-13 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 59 out of 168 students (35%) who were absent 10 or more days. This is a reduction of 4% from the 2010-11 school year.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to maintain or decrease our percentage of students who are absent from school for 10 or more days to no more than 35% of our student population.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 49 students out of 168 (29%) who were excessively tardy. This is an increase of 7% from the 2010-11 school year.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to reduce our percentage of students who are excessively tardy to school for 10 or more days to no more than 20% of our student population.

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	As a charter school, we pull from all over the district and most of our children are driven to school. Parent problems often cause students to be both late or absent.	At the end of the 2011-12 school year, we sent home letters letting parents of excessively absent/tardy children know that we would be monitoring absences and tardiness on a 20 day basis during the 2012-13 school year, just as we did during 2011-12. Each 20 days we will send out letters to families where students have dropped below a 90% attendance rate. We will follow up with phone calls, parent conferences and recognition for on time	Guidance Clerk	Our school guidance clerk will monitor attendance every 20 days. We expect to see a decrease of at least 10% in the percentage of students who are excessively tardy to school and to maintain or improve our absentee rate of 95.62%.	SMS data

	attendance. Letters will continue to be mailed out every 20 days.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to reduce our in school and out of school suspensions by 25%. Our goal is also to reduce the number of students suspended by 25% in the 2012-13 school year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

In the 2011-12 school year, we had 20 in school suspensions.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to have no more than 15 in school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 10 students who received in school suspension.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to have no more than 7 students who receive in school suspensions.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 19 out of school suspensions.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to have no more than 15 out of school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 11 students who received out of school suspensions.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect to have no more than 8 students receive out of school suspensions.

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 join our school in the upper grades who have had discipline problems and find our atmosphere to be different from many public school settings.	We will strive to help new students feel connected to our school community through participation in our morning meetings and guidance classes. Small group sessions, peer buddies and adult mentors are also assigned, as appropriate.	Valerie Wells, our guidance counselor	Few or no discipline reports for new students	School discipline action count
2	We have a new guidance counselor for the 2012-13 school year.	Ms. Wells will attend deans' meetings and other training to help her learn how to effectively deal with student discipline.	Gina Evers	At least a 25% reduction of in and out of school suspensions.	Discipline record from SMS.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In the 2012-13 school year, our goal is for 80% of our parents to participate in at least 1 activity other than the required 3 parent conferences.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
In the 2011-12 school year, we had 95% of our parents attend the required parent conferences and 65% who attended at least one other event.	In the 2012-13 school year, we expect 100% of our parents to attend all 3 parent conferences and 80% to attend at least one other parent event.

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	Some of our families are acting as guardians for children in challenging situations.	Making helpful connections with the guardians and encouraging them to be actively involved. Strategies include making initial phone calls to invite guardians out to meet with the teacher and counselor	Valerie Wells	Measuring the percent of guardians who attend the meetings.	Parent survey

		and following up with suggestions and materials to support the family.			
2		Working parents who have difficulty getting to school	Marion Charter School uses Edline and GradeQuick as our parent connection tools. Parents can access their child's grades, assignments and support materials through the parent website. Parents are given an access code that they can activate to allow them access to grades and class information. Additionally, all forms from school , including field trip permission forms, class and school newsletters, calendars, etc are all found at our website. It is a one stop place for all information about the school.	Gina Evers	At least a 10% increase in the percentage of parents who log on and are active on our school gradebook.	Edline user data base which shows how many parents are active on website.
3					
4		Parents are not sure how to help their children who are struggling in school.	Marion Charter School will hold 3 parent events during the first 9 weeks focusing on ways parents can help their children succeed in school. Topics are- Getting a Good Start; Preparing for FCAT Success-3rd-5th; and K-2nd Grade, Helping your Child Succeed.	Gina Evers	At least 75% of the parents who attend the events will rank them as helpful.	Parent surveys

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parents need a way to monitor their child's progress throughout the year.	Edline parent portal	FTE, Title 1	$2,400.00
			Subtotal: $2,400.00
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: $2,400.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in 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	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.

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
N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.	N/A We are not doing any STEM activities in the 2012-13 school year.

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Whole and small group instruction	Treasures workbooks	FTE	$1,000.00
Writing	Implement a school-wide writing curriculum	Writer's Workshop	Title 1, FTE	$1,620.00
				Subtotal: $2,620.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement	Parents need a way to monitor their child's progress throughout the year.	Edline parent portal	FTE, Title 1	$2,400.00
				Subtotal: $2,400.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Develop competence in Common Core standards	Teacher resource books	Title 1	$300.00
Science	3 teacher inservice sessions	Science consultant Dr. Diana Wehrell-Grabowski	Title 1	$3,555.00
Writing	Independent book study	Implementing Writer's Workshop	Title 1, FTE	$441.00
				Subtotal: $4,296.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $9,316.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/14/2012)

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.

   No. Disagree with the above statement.

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

By law, the School Advisory Council of a charter school is the Board of Directors.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
N/A	$0.00

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

The Board monitors the academic performance and budget of the school.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Marion School District MARION CHARTER SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	67%	38%	35%	204	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	54%	52%			106	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	53% (YES)			103	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					413	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Marion School District MARION CHARTER SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	80%	60%	68%	60%	268	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	69%	56%			125	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	73% (YES)	53% (YES)			126	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					519	
Percent Tested = 97%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested