

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LIGHTHOUSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Leslie F. Bolte

SAC Chair: Lori Brimanson

Superintendent: E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 11/6/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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 of Lighthouse Elementary 2011-2012: Grade A Reading Mastery: 88% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 71% of the lowest 25% made learning gains Math Mastery: 85% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the FCAT 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains 2010-2011: Grade A Reading Mastery 95%: 76% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading: 80% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of progress in reading: Math Mastery 95%: 71% of the students making a year's worth of progress in Math: 77% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of growth: Writing mastery was 92% and 91% mastery in Science. AYP was met in reading in all subgroups but was not met in Math in the subgroup SWD. Principal of Grove Park 2008-09: Grade B Reading Mastery 59%: 72% of students

Principal	Leslie F. Bolte	BA Elementary Education from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill/ Masters of Science Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University Principal Certification State of Florida/ESOL Endorsement	3	7	making a year's worth of progress in reading: 73% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of progress in reading: Math Mastery 62%: 72% of the students making a year's worth of progress in Math: 71% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of growth: Writing mastery was 85% and 26% mastery in Science. AYP was met in reading in all subgroups except the subgroups of SWD and Black. AYP was not met in Math by any subgroup except the subgroup of ELL. Principal of Grove Park 2007-2008 school grade B Reading Mastery 55%: 70% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading: 69% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of progress in reading: Math Mastery 59%: 72% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading: 73% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of progress in reading: Math Mastery 62%: 72% of the students making a year's worth of progress in Math: 71% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of growth: Writing mastery was 85% and 26% mastery in Science. AYP was met in reading in all subgroups except the subgroups of SWD and Black. AYP was not met in Math by any subgroup except the subgroup of ELL. Principal of Grove Park 2007-2008 school grade B Reading Mastery 55%: 70% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading: 69% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of progress in reading: Math Mastery 59%: 69% of the students making a year's worth of progress in math: 67% of the lowest 25% making a year's worth of growth: Writing mastery was 93% and 27% mastery in Science. AYP was met in reading in all subgroups except the subgroups of SWD and ELL. AYP was met in Math by all subgroups except SWD.
Assis Principal	Janet Anderson	BS – Elementary Education, University of S. Mississippi; MS – Educational Leadership, University of S. Mississippi; Specialist Degree - TSOL, Nova University; ESOL Endorsement – State of Florida	4	8	AP of Lighthouse Elementary 2011: Grade A Reading Mastery: 78% scored level 3 or higher in reading 71% of lowest 25% made learning gains Math Mastery: 85% scored level 3 or higher 73% of the lowest 25% made learning gains  AP of Lighthouse Elementary from 2006 – 2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery Average: 95%, Math Mastery Average: 95%, Science Mastery Average: 91%, AYP Average: 76%  AP of Grove Park Elementary from 2002 – 2006: Grade C, Reading Mastery Average: 57%, Math Mastery Average: 51%, AYP Average: 91%

## 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)
NA	NA	NA			NA

## 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	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with administration.	Principal and Assistant Principal	ongoing	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	3. Soliciting referrals from current employees.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
There were 0 teachers teaching out of field and 0 teachers received a less than effective rating.	All staff are highly effective.

### 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
54	0.0%(0)	9.3%(5)	44.4%(24)	46.3%(25)	38.9%(21)	100.0%(54)	7.4%(4)	5.6%(3)	72.2%(39)

### 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
NA	NA	NA	NA

## 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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

District-wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as Appreciation of Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

Required instruction listed in FL Statute 1003.42 (2) as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Resource Teacher: Develops, identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring,

data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction Teacher: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills

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 once a week to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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 Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

#### MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), District Reading Assessment, Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), Absences, Retentions, and Office Discipline Referrals

Midyear: Winter Diagnostic Test, District Reading Assessments Assessments, Progress Monitoring and Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)

End of year: District Reading Assessment, Spring Diagnostic Test, and SRI

Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

##### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Leslie Bolte - Principal  
Janet Anderson - Assistant

Darlene Staley- Literacy Team Leader  
Cathy Lemoine-Kindergarten Representative  
Karen Swanson-Kindergarten Representative  
Chris Capute-First Grade Representative  
Patti Reagan- First Grade Representative  
Allison Simmons - SAI teacher  
Tammy Trivison- SAI teacher  
Saralyn Brabban-Media Specialist  
Jonni Temple-Second Grade Representative  
Jennifer Klug-Second Grade Representative

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

Team meets monthly to discuss current data, curriculum needs, district and school initiatives and school-wide literacy concerns.

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

Identifying quality professional development to support the School Improvement Plan  
Establishing programs and guidelines to increase the number of books children read  
Parent training on content appropriate high level books  
Parent training on how to assist struggling readers at home

## 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.

## \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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



## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	12% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the FY 12 FCAT There will be at least a 3% decrease in students scoring level 1 and level 2 during FY 13
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (182) of Beacon Cove students scored level 3 on FCAT 2.0 in reading during FY 12.	Less than 10% of Beacon Cove students will score a level 1 or a level 2 in reading during FY 13.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time to analyze data and plan for instruction	Through LTMs monitor students' progress through district Literacy Assessment Fountas & Pinnell	Classroom teacher and Administration	Monitor EDW reports through LTM minutes	SSS Diagnostic tests winter and Spring and District Literacy Assessments, LTM minutes and walkthroughs
2	Teacher familiarity with appropriate intervention methods.	Students reading below grade level according to pupil progression will be placed on a PMP and receive 30 additional minutes of iii. Teachers will collaborate through data chats to monitor progress and set learning goals and discuss appropriate strategies.	School-base team members, administration, data processor	Bi-weekly progress monitoring, K-4 Literacy Assessment	Bi-weekly progress monitoring, K-4 Literacy Assessment
3	Access a variety of leveled, high interest texts	Teachers will engage students in a variety of genre in the classroom and encourage additional reading outside the classroom for pleasure and information. Students will become "book critics" appearing on the morning news to recommend books for reading.	Classroom teachers and Administration	Teachers will monitor the genre variety read by students in and outside the classroom through lesson plans and reading logs	Reading Logs, Reading Response Logs

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:	There will be a 3% increase in the number of students that score a level 4 and above in reading during FY13
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (619) of Beacon Cove Students scored level 4 or above on the FCAT 2.0 in reading during FY12.	71% of Beacon Cove students will score a level 4 or above in FY13.

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	Motivation of students to extend their learning to the next level	All teachers will provide differentiated instruction to engage all students and enhance learning.	Administration and classroom teachers	classroom walk-throughs	SSS Diagnostics, SRI, K-4 Literacy Assessment
2	Student use of critical thinking skills in reading	Teachers will refer to and utilize the Marzano higher order thinking questioning techniques in reading	Classroom teachers, administration	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs	SRI, District Literacy Assessments, SSS Diagnostics
3	Student lack of motivation to read	Teachers will use a variety of genre and conferencing to create an interest and love of reading	Classroom teachers, Administration	Classroom walk-throughs	Reading Response Journals, Reading Logs
4	Lack of classroom library books	Teachers will utilize the school resource room to increase the number of texts available to students in the classroom.	Classroom teachers	Lesson plans and walk-throughs	K-4 Literacy 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:	There will be an increase of 3% in the number of students that make learning gains during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (439) of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12	81% of Beacon Cove Students will make learning gains in FY13.

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	Teachers regularly analyze data to plan for instruction	Teachers will regularly access and review the results of the K-4 Literacy Assessment Data and the Diagnostic test results from the Educational Data Warehouse (EDW).	Administration, grade chairs, SAI Teacher	Review results of a variety of diagnostic data.	EDW reports, Diagnostic results
2	Student performance at a variety of levels within the classroom.	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction that corresponds to each child's needs, abilities and interests.	Administration, classroom teachers	Classroom walk-through and lesson plans	SSS Diagnostics, K-4 Literacy Assessment

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:	There will be a 9% increase in the number of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains in reading during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12.	80% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students will make learning gains in reading during FY 13.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of time and resources for ensuring the students in the lowest 25% get additional instructional time	SAI teacher will provide support to the classroom teacher through either pullout or small-group instruction	SAI Teacher	SAI Teacher identifies and monitors students in the lowest 25%	K-4 Literacy Assessment
2	Scheduling SAI and iii without interrupting other academic classes	SAI teacher will provide support to classroom teachers by providing small group instruction to struggling readers outside the 90 minute reading block. An additional .5 reading teacher will assist in the instruction of the lowest 25% outside the reading block.	SAI Teacher, Reading Resource Teacher and administration	SAI teachers and reading resource teacher will identify and monitor identified students who are struggling readers.	Resource teacher progress monitoring data, EDW reports
3	Lack of classroom leveled books and time within the daily schedule	Teachers will utilize the resource room to provide Students with just right books during daily independent read time	Classroom teacher, administration	Plan book, conferencing notes	EDW Reports, K-4 Literacy Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal #				
		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	90	91	92	93	94	

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 following subgroups did not meet the 2012 reading targets; Asian, Black, White. The following subgroup did meet reeading target; Hispanic. All subgroups will meet the 2013 targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asian 11%, Black 40%, Hispanic 12%, White12%	By 2013,7% Asian, 17% Black, 13%hispanic, 8% White will not make satisfactory progress.

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Identifying the area of deficiency	Data chats through LTMs willhelp identify specific areas of deficiency in reading and identify specific strategies that will increase proficiency in that area	classroom teacher, SBT, SAI teacher, administration	data monitoring of the K-4 Literacy Assessment, Diagnostic data, mastery of standards	K-4 Literacy Assessment, Diagnostics

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
ELL 23%	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students' lack of the English language	Teachers will use ESOL strategies to help students learn and understand the English language	ELL contact, classroom teacher, administration	observation, walk-throughs, CELLA results, Plan books	CELLA, Mastery of standards, K-4 Literacy Assessment

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 following subgroup did not meet 2012 reading target: SWD. All subgroups will meet 2012 targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% of SWD	By 2013 22% of SWD will not make satisfactory progress.

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	Gaps in teaching strategies	Teachers will attend professional development involving differentiated instruction	ESE Coordinator, administration	Observations, monitoring of data	K-4 Literacy Assessment

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 following subgroup did not meet the 2012 reading targets: Economically disadvantaged. By 2013 all subgroups will meet the target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% of Economically Disadvantaged Students	By 2013, 14% of Economically Disadvantaged will not make satisfactory progress.

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	Additional support in learning	Tutorial extending the instructional day	Administration	Pre-test, post-test and progress monitoring	Post-test

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
Daily 5 and Cafe PD and book study	K-2	District and in-house teachers	Open to entire school	District Planned training LTMs identifies PD days	Observations and walk-throughs, lesson plans, assessments	Administration
Common Core Standards	K and 1	District and in-house trainers	K and first grade teachers	LTMs	Observations, plan books, grade books	Administration
LLI implementation training	SAI, reading resource select k-2 teachers	District and in-house trainers	SAI, reading resource select k-2 teachers	Select training dates	Observations, lesson plans	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

71% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12.	For iii and SAI reached based progress monitoring purchase of LLI Reading Intervention	Administrative	\$3,202.20
			Subtotal: \$3,202.20
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
71% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12.	Nooks were purchased to use in the classrooms to enhance the reading curriculum and motivate students to read	PTO	\$3,750.00
			Subtotal: \$3,750.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
12% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the FY 12 FCAT There will be at least a 3% decrease in students scoring level 1 and level 2 during FY 13	A variety of genre of leveled readers for teacher/student use	internal accounts	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$8,952.20</b>

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:		65% of Lighthouse ELL Students will show proficiency in Oral Language skills in FY13.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
50% (7) of the Lighthouse ELL Students were proficient in Oral language in FY12.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time to implement and plan for instruction	Teacher will work with these students each day for 30 minutes outside the reading block to strengthen oral language skills.	teacher, administration	Lesson Plans, walk-throughs	CELLA, K-4 Literacy Assessment

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:	5% of Lighthouse ELL Students will be proficient in reading in FY13.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

1%(1) Lighthouse ELL Student was proficient in reading during FY12.

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	Addition time and personnel to instruct student above the 90 minute reading block.	Arrange schedule so that the District ELL support person is assigned to the school for an hour each day to provide small group instruction to the ELL students.	Administration, classroom teacher	Lesson plans, walk-throughs	K-4 Literacy Assessment, CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

3% of the Lighthouse ELL students will be proficient in writing in FY!# >

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

1% (1) of the Lighthouse ELL Students was proficient in writing during FY12.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time and personnel to analyze data and provide additional instruction beyond classroom instruction.	District ELL support teacher will be assigned to school each day and will provide support in writing to ELL students.	Administration, classroom teacher	Lesson plans, walk-throughs	Palm Beach Writes, CELLA

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
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of CELLA Goals*



# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	There will be a 5% decrease in the number of level 1 and level 2 students during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (209) of Beacon Cove Student scored an achievement level 3 in mathematics during FY12.	Less than 10% of Beacon Cove Students will score level 1 or Level 2 in mathematics in FY13.

## 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	Providing multisensory instruction that incorporates latest technology and software to instruct students in math	Continue the use of current math software and explore new software	Math Contact, Administration	Review software diagnostic reports by classroom teacher	software printout to show proficiency
2	Gaps in curriculum due to new math series	Cross grade level meetings and discussions to identify gaps and plan instruction	Classroom Teachers	LTM discussions, Cross grade level meeting notes, Diagnostic, walkthroughs	Diagnostics-Winter and Spring, classroom administered assessments
3	Students performing on a variety of levels within the classroom	Plan differentiated instruction accessing all modalities of learning within the mathematics blocks	Administration, Classroom Teachers	Graded-level teams will review results of common assessment data to determine progress toward benchmark and successful teaching strategies used.	Increased achievement between assessments.
4	Scheduling additional math assistance without interrupting other academic classes	Children will attend an after-school math tutorial for 60 hours provided for through a community school grant.	tutorial sponsor, tutorial teacher, administrator	progress monitoring of skills, observations	Winter Diagnostics, Spring Diagnostics, pre and post tutorial test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	There will be a 5% increase in the number of students that score level 4. Or above in mathematics during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (568) of Beacon Cove Students scored at or above level 4 in mathematics during FY12.	67% of Beacon Cove Students will score level 4 or above during FY13.

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	Moving students to succeed at their highest proficiency levels.	Teachers will provide differentiated and hands-on instruction that matches the child's abilities and interests.	Classroom teachers, administration	Classroom walk-through and lesson plans	Classroom walk-through log and classroom assessments.
2	Teachers modeling and utilizing higher order questioning in math instruction.	Teachers will utilize higher order thinking questions and techniques during math instruction.	Classroom teacher, administration	Lesson plans will be reviewed, classroom walk-throughs	Classroom walk-through log and focused walk-throughs to determine frequency of higher order questions.
3	Lack of student motivation in math	Utilize hands-on math manipulatives and games during instruction	Classroom teacher	Classroom assessments, Observations	Diagnostic testing and end of chapter 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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	There will be a 3% increase in the number of students that make learning gains in mathematics during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (426) of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in mathematics during FY12.	80% of students at Beacon Cove will make learning gains during FY13.

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	New Math Standards	Provide professional Development and support on new Core Standards in K and first grade	Classroom teachers and administration	Walk throughs, plan books.	Assessments of the Common Core Standards
2	Math series is written to the old standards	Publisher has provided on-line support with Oncore a supplement that fills in gaps between the series and the new standards. Teachers will utilize the supplement for instruction.	classroom teacher, administration	Plan books, walkthroughs, observations	Assessments of mastery of the standards

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:	There will be a 9% increase in the number of students in the lowest 25% that make learning gains during FY13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in mathematics during FY12.	82% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students will make learning gains in mathematics in FY13.

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	Monitoring the lowest 25%	Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile	Classroom Teacher, Administrator	Review Diagnostic data for Winter and Spring, monitor Math series and teacher-made assessments	Diagnostics Winter and Spring, Math series and teacher-made assessments
2	The consistent use of manipulatives and a variety of concept presentations to struggling math students.	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts in the classroom	teacher, administration	Walkthroughs, lesson plans, observations	Progress of students on assessments and mastery of the standards

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	88	89	90	91	92	

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 following subgroups did not meet 2012 math targets: Asian, White. the following subgroups met the math targets; Hispanic, Black. All subgroups will meet the 2013 targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Asians 7%, Black 30%, Hispanic 17%, White 15%	By 2013, 2% Asian, 25% Black, 15% Hispanic, 10% White will not make satisfactory progress.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Time to monitor the progress of individual subgroups.	LTM's scheduled regularly to monitor all subgroups in all areas	Teachers, LTM minutes	Review of minutes	review of subgroup data
---	---	---	-----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	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
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The following subgroup did not meet 2012 targets; SWD. All subgroups will meet the 2013 targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% SWD	By 2013, 255 of SWD will not make satisfactory progress.

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	Scheduling additional math assistance without interrupting other academic classes	Children will an after-school math tutorial for 60 hours after school.	Tutorial sponsor, Tutorial teacher, administration	Progress monitoring skills check, observations	Spring Diagnostics

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The following subgroup did not meet the 2012 math target; Economically Disadvantaged. All subgroups will meet targets by 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

25% of Economically Disadvantaged		by 2013, 18% of Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress.			
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	gaps in skills	Teachers will attend professional development on differentiated instruction strategies	Team Leaders, Professional Development Contact	Walk-throughs, observations	Diagnostics, Progress monitoring

*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
Math Common Core Standards	Kindergarten and First grade	District provides	Selected kindergarten and first grade teaches	When designated District facilitated trainings are indicated	Observation, walk-throughs , lesson plans	Administration
Math manipulatives and Work Stations	Kindergarten through grade 2	In-house facilitator	Kindergarten through grade 2 teachers	December	Observations, walk-throughs, lesson plans	Administration

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
Less than 10% of Beacon Cove Students will score level 1 or Level 2 in mathematics in FY13.	Mobi View Tablets	PTO	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$15,000.00
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
			<b>Grand Total: \$15,000.00</b>

*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:			There will be a 5% decrease in the percentage of students that score in level 1 or level 2 in science during FY13.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
35% (106) of Beacon Cove Students scored at achievement level 3 in science during FY12.			90% of 5th grade students will score level 3 or higher on FCAT science during FY13.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's understanding of abstract concepts	Utilize Hands-On laboratory experiments and virtual labs at least once per unit and provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities	Classroom Teacher,	Observations used and documentation in lesson plans Review and analysis of Pre/Post activity results in journal or KWL	Test results, experiment/activity analysis
2	Students understanding of abstract concepts	Utilize D E Streaming within classroom	Classroom Teacher	Walk-throughs, observations and plan books	Increase in student assessment data
3	Inadequate minutes of instruction	Integration of science throughout the curriculum/consultant presentations	Classroom teacher	Walk-throughs, observations and plan books	student response logs and teacher reflection

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:		There will be an increase of 5% in the number of 5th Grade students that score at or above level 4 in science during FY13.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
50% (153) of Beacon Cove 5th Grade Students scored at or above Achievement level 4 in science during FY12.		55% of Beacon Cove 5th Grade Studnets will score at or above achievement level 4 in Science during FY13.			
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	Teachers' in depth knowledge of higher level science concepts	Teachers will receive training in the content area of Science to increase their content knowledge	PD contact, administration	walk throughs, lesson plans	increases in student assessment data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
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
lack of time to create and develop activities and	Grades Kindergarten through 2nd	District Trainers	Kindergarten through grade 2 teachers	December/January	Walk-throughs, observations	Administration, PDD Team



Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
90% of 5th grade students will score level 3 or higher on FCAT science during FY13.	Materials such as science boards, manipulatives, paper etc. to make hands-on activities that can be taken and implemented into the classroom	School Budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

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:		There will be an increase of 2% in the percent of Beacon Cove 4th Grade Students that score at achievement level 3.0 or higher in FY13.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
93% (304) of Beacon Cove 4th Grade Students scored at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing during FY12.		95% of Beacon Cove 4th Grade students will score at achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing during FY13.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Writing support to assist teachers in the implementation of Writers' Workshop	Utilize Learning Village to assist in implementation and provide release time for teacher to observe peers at different stages of implementation.	classroom Teacher, Administration	Review of writing samples, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	Student writing folders, Palm Beach Writes

2	Lack of knowledge of effective use of rubrics/scales to provide student feedback	Provide PD on development on creating and scoring rubrics. Participate in group scoring and rubric development.	Writing Team, grade level teams, administration	Comparisons of essays that are group scored	Student writing folders, Palm Beach Writes
---	--	---	---	---	--

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% (1) student will score above level 4 in writing for FY12

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
In-school training of grade 1 and 2 teachers in Writers Workshop	Grades 1 and 2	Marcia Badesse (District trainer)	Grades 1 and 2	bi-monthly	observations, instructional review, plans, curriculum mapping	Administration
Writers Workshop Cohort	Grades K-2	District Trainers	one teacher per grade k, 1 and 2	5 times per year at a select site	teachers attending will come back to present topic of training to the staff.	Administration, PDD Team

Writing Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of Writing Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:		During FY13 the percent of attendance will increase from 80% to 87%. The current number of students with excessive tardies is 175. During FY13 school that number of excessive tardies will decrease by 50%.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
80% (674) of 872 students at Lighthouse Elementary are in attendance		The expected attendance rate will increase by 7% during FY13 to 87%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
20% (174) students at Lighthouse Elementary have excessive absences		87 students will have excessive absences at Lighthouse Elementary during FY13			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
81 students at Lighthouse Elementary have excessive tardies		45 students will have excessive tardies at Lighthouse Elementary during FY13			
<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents are unaware of the academic impact of loss of face-to-face academic instruction.	Print monthly a graph of the number of absences and tardies and indicate the hours lost in face-to-face instruction time.	Attendance Clerk, administration and SAC	Monthly graphs and data shown	Graphs, attendance and tardy information

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension	
Suspension Goal # 1:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement				
Parent Involvement Goal #1:				
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
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						

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
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

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	71% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12.	For iii and SAI reached based progress monitoring purchase of LLI Reading Intervention	Administrative	\$3,202.20
				Subtotal: \$3,202.20
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	71% of the lowest 25% of Beacon Cove Students made learning gains in reading during FY12.	Nooks were purchased to use in the classrooms to enhance the reading curriculum and motivate students to read	PTO	\$3,750.00
Mathematics	Less than 10% of Beacon Cove Students will score level 1 or Level 2 in mathematics in FY13.	Mobi View Tablets	PTO	\$15,000.00
				Subtotal: \$18,750.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	90% of 5th grade students will score level 3 or higher on FCAT science during FY13.	Materials such as science boards, manipulatives, paper etc. to make hands-on activities that can be taken and implemented into the classroom	School Budget	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$500.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	12% of students scored a level 1 or 2 on the FY 12 FCAT There will be at least a 3% decrease in students scoring level 1 and level 2 during FY 13	A variety of genre of leveled readers for teacher/student use	internal accounts	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$2,000.00
				Grand Total: \$24,452.20

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds (with SAC approval) will be used to pay for teacher registrations for conferences and for substitutes for assessment of students.	\$4,000.00

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

The SAC will monthly monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and ammend the plan if needed based on the data presented.

## 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  
No Data Found  
No Data Found