

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Mr. Steven E. Dragon

SAC Chair: Mrs. Paula Ippolito

Superintendent: Mrs. Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/9/2012

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) |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Principal | Steven E. Dragon | M.S. in Ed. Leadership Nova Southeastern University; BS in Elementary Ed. Bridgewater State University, MA. Certifications: Elementary Ed. 1-6; School Principal K-12 | 3 | 18 | Consistently maintains A school grade from 2004 - 2012; FCAT Reading proficiency 2011-2012 83% FCAT Math proficiency 2011-2012 75% FCAT Writing proficiency 2011-2012 98% FCAT Science proficiency 2011-2012 67% Reading learning gains 2011-2012 82% Math learning gains 2011-2012 81% Making learning gains in reading lowest quartile 2011-2012 82% Making learning gains in math lowest quartile 2011-2012 52% |
| Assis Principal | N/A | | | | |

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 | | | | |

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 | Use of Teacher Evaluation System (TES) Provide ongoing professional development | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | May 2013 | |
| 2 | District support for teachers in need of assistance | Steven E. Dragon, Principal District support staff | As Needed | |
| 3 | We recently hired three new instructional staff members. All three are highly effective teachers as documented by their evaluations and references. Two of the three have worked with this administration in a former school. They were selected by a team representative of the open positions. | Steven E. Dragon, Principal | September 2012 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
| Two (2) | These two instructional staff are out-of-field ESOL and are working to obtain that endorsement. |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 51 | 2.0%(1) | 11.8%(6) | 41.2%(21) | 47.1%(24) | 92.2%(47) | 0.0%(0) | 7.8%(4) | 9.8%(5) | 74.5%(38) |

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

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Steven E. Dragon
Susan Nations
Stephanie Chillemi-Rivera
Karan Manchester
Julie Odenweller
Larry Beck
Kathy Pedicini

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 team meets regularly each Tuesday to discuss individual students and their progress to the grade level curriculum. This multi-disciplinary team is responsible for aligning the needs of the students to the interventions and instruction. Members of the RtI team meet regularly with grade level teams to discuss student progress.

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 RtI team is used to help identify those specific students who need assistance and are in student groups identified on the SIP that are in need of improvement. The RtI problem-solving process is used to correctly identify the students, examine the instruction they are receiving and adjust/provide instruction and interventions as necessary to promote student growth. The frequent evaluation of student progress by the RtI team helps ensure that identified students are making progress and that areas of need are being met.

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.

The data used to identify students is multi-metric. We utilize student FCAT data for reading and math, FAIR data for reading, FCAT and LEARN data for science, district benchmark assessments for math, FCAT and regular writing prompt results for writing and ongoing progress monitoring data for reading and math. The data management system used to summarize this data is a progress monitoring spreadsheet that we have created that tracks these results. In addition, we use the district's AS400 data system to track our behavior results.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The staff has been trained on RtI using multiple methods. To begin each team was given an individual training session on the role of our RtI team and staff. The entire staff was also given an RtI overview at a staff meeting. Our curriculum leaders were given training and resources to use with their teams when planning and implementing tiered interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS team remains available to participate in team collaborative meetings and ongoing information is given to curriculum leaders during weekly meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Steven E. Dragon, Principal
Susan Nations, TOSA

Missy Windom, K
Amy Pedler, 1
Heather Dacheille, 2
Cherie Dennis, 3
Taunya Fogleman, 4
Katie Casanas, 5
Barbara Shontz, Specials
Stephanie Chillemi-Rivera, ESE

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

The team meets regularly to discuss literacy initiatives. Grade level representatives meet with team members to introduce and implement literacy initiatives in the classroom.

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

Schoolwide Reading Partner Program
Identify remedial students and target small group instruction
Reading Counts Incentives
Teacher-made schoolwide reading video
Principal luncheons with book talks

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.

N/A

*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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Level 3 - 25%(88) Level 3,4,5 - 83%(290) | Level 3 - 29% Level 3,4,5 - 85% |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b: | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 58%(202) Level 3,4,5 - 83%(290) | Level 4,5 - 60% Level 3,4,5 - 85% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 78%(167) | 80% |

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|---------|-----|
| 77%(46) | 81% |
|---------|-----|

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark 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%. | Reading Goal # | | | | | |
| | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 84 | 86 | 87 | 89 | 90 | |

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your school's percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Percent of students at proficiency: White 87%(247) Hispanic 62%(13) Asian 80%(11) | Percent of students at proficiency: White 87% Met AMO target Hispanic 73% Asian N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark 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:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 35% | 58% |
|-----|-----|

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |
| 3 | Lack of additional support for ELL students | Utilize the ESOL Liaison (new position in 2012-13) to provide instruction for ESOL students | JoAnn Doane, ESOL Liaison | Review of FAIR assessment and state/district assessments each trimester | State and district 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:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

| | |
|-----|-----|
| 41% | 67% |
|-----|-----|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation | Steven E. Dragon, Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson | District benchmark assessments |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | instruction | of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Susan Nations, TOSA | plans, district benchmark 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: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 71% | 78% |

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Schoolwide implementation of the Reading Comprehension Rubric provided to all teachers in the Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet | K-5 | Susan Nations, TOSA | All instructional staff K-5 | 2012-13 during Weekly PLCs | Classroom walkthroughs, FAIR assessments, data collected by teachers using the Reading Comprehension Rubric | School Administration |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| N/A | | | \$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 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: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal # 1a:</p> | <p>By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| <p>Level 3 - 27%(92)</p> <p>Level 3,4,5 - 74%(257)</p> | <p>Level 3 - 29%</p> <p>Level 3,4,5 - 76%</p> |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal # 1b:</p> | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #2a:</p> | <p>By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <p>Level 4,5 - 48% (165) Level 3,4,5 - 74% (257)</p> | <p>Level 4,5 - 50% Level 3,4,5 - 76%</p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012- 13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #2b:</p> | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| <p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p> | <p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p> |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| 77% (164) | 79% |
|-----------|-----|

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

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

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

| | |
|----------|-----|
| 58% (32) | 62% |
|----------|-----|

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark 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 # | | | | | |
| | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <p>The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is</p> </div> | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 84 | 85 | 87 | 88 | 90 | |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Subgroups and their level of proficiency: Asian 84%(11) White 79%(221) Hispanic 47% | Subgroups and their level of proficiency: Asian N/A White 87% Hispanic 65% |

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark 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:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016- 1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 39% | 65% |

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |
| 3 | Lack of additional support for ELL students | Utilize the ESOL Liaison (new position in 2012-13) to provide instruction for ESOL students | JoAnn Doane, ESOL Liaison | Review of FAIR assessment and state/district assessments each trimester | State and district 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:

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 44% | 67% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation | Steven E. Dragon, Principal | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson | District benchmark assessments |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | instruction | of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Susan Nations, TOSA | plans, district benchmark 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 56% | 76% |

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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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: | | | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| Level 3 - 38%(44) Level 3,4,5 - 68%(79) | | | Level 3 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 72% | | |
| 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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Implementation of the new science series at grades K-2 | Professional development opportunities provided by the school using Title II funds | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA District Science Coordinator | Classroom walkthroughs, administrator reviews of lesson plans, collaborative planning checklist | Program assessments |

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Science Goal #1b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Level 4,5 - 30%(35) Level 3,4,5 - 68%(79) | Level 4,5 - 34% Level 3,4,5 - 72% |

| 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 | Limited funds for outside professional development | To implement schoolwide use of The Planning for Instruction 2012-13 Booklet provided to all teachers | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Review state and district benchmark data, completeness of lesson plans and CPT discussions | State and district assessments, subject area tests, TES observations and evaluations |
| 2 | Teacher comfort level of differentiation of instruction | Conscientiously plan and implement differentiation of instruction to address the multiple learning styles/modalities of each student | Steven E. Dragon, Principal Susan Nations, TOSA | Classroom walkthroughs, documentation in lesson plans, district benchmark assessments | District benchmark assessments |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| in science. | | | | |
| Science Goal #2b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Science professional development using the new Fusion series provided to all K-2 teachers | K-2 teachers | Susan Nations, TOSA | All instructional staff K-2 | Sept. - May 2012-13 | Classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning checklists, documentation in lesson plans | School administration |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Provide professional development in Fusion Science to all K-2 teachers | Use of Title II Professional Development Dollars | Title II Funds | \$2,272.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,272.00 |
| 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: \$2,272.00 |

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: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 98%(109) | 98% | | | | |
| 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 | High current scores | Ongoing collaboration in teams for writing instruction | Classroom Teachers Susan Nations, TOSA | Writing scores and student performance | Writing assessments |

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

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 63%(70) | 67% | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | High current scores | To maintain high scores through regular assessments and collaborative conversations during PLCs. | 4th Grade Teachers Administration | Writing scores and student performance | Writing assessments |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------|

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 | | | | | | |

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | <p>90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease .</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p> | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | | |
| 95.7% (737/770) | 97.7% | | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | |
| 222 | 207 | | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | |
| 46 | 31 | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student travel | Encourage travel during school holidays only | Registrar and Administrative Team | Attendance monitoring | CrossPointe attendance reports |

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

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

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

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: | By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Student behavior | Continued implementation and refinement of the schoolwide PBS | PBS Team | Monitoring and evaluation of student behavior | Suspension rate |

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | Southside Elementary School has one of the highest levels of parent involvement in the district's elementary schools. No goal is needed at this time.s |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| More than 90% of parents were involved in school activities. | Maintain high levels of parent involvement. |

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 | Economy | Provide low cost parental and student activities | PTO President Steven Dragon, Principal | Monitoring attendance at school-related events | Actual number attending |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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 | N/A | | | \$0.00 |
| Science | Provide professional development in Fusion Science to all K-2 teachers | Use of Title II Professional Development Dollars | Title II Funds | \$2,272.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,272.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| 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: \$2,272.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| To provide schoolwide educational opportunities which enhance academic achievement and build community within the school. (Florida Studio Theatre) | \$7,202.61 |

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

Approve the allocation of the SAC budget dollars for Florida Studio Theater
Review of SIP and student achievement data
Review/discussion flexible supplement allocation
Discussion about legislative issues effecting the funding of education
Review/revision of school policies and procedures
Discussion about ongoing issues with student drop-off and pick-up
Review and discussion of Climate Survey results
Review and discussion of the staffing model for our school
Presentation of ongoing partnerships with community organizations

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Sarasota School District SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 92% | 94% | 97% | 80% | 363 | 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 | 77% | 78% | | | 155 | 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? | 67% (YES) | 67% (YES) | | | 134 | 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 | | | | | 652 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Sarasota School District SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 92% | 93% | 97% | 76% | 358 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 66% | 71% | | | 137 | 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? | 60% (YES) | 72% (YES) | | | 132 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 627 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |