FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ACADEMI R CHARTER SCHOOL WEST

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Tirso Alonso

SAC Chair: Chereen Coile

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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	Carolina A. Claro Ed.D.	Elementary Education Special Education School Psychology Leadership	2	3	2010-2011 AcadeMir Charter School West Grades K-1 Only; 2011-2012 School Grade A 2006-2010 Miami Dade County Public Schools, School Psychologist Region VI/V, serving Campbell Dr. Elem, Redondo Elem., Norma Bossard Elem., and School for Advanced Studies. 2004-2005 Heritage School, Head of School.
Assis Principal	Albert Mancebo	Elementary Education Gifted Endorsement ESOL Endorsement Educational Leadership	1	9	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade C B B C B AYP - N N N N High Standards Rdg. 55 67 67 62 60 High Standards Math 49 57 63 58 60 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 64 63 61 61 Lrng Gains-Math 65 61 62 64 70 Gains-Rdg-25 65 71 54 67 64 Gains-Math-25% 52 66 63 58 66

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Ana Valdes	BA Elementary Education M.S. Ed Leadership	1	1	FY10 Pinecrest North; School Grade A, made AYP FY08 Pinecrest South; School Grade A, made AYP

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	4. School has retained NAEP consultants to assist with the hiring and training of new teachers. New teachers will receive classroom support, coaching and guidance through certification process in order to meet all criteria for highly qualified status.	Principal, NAEP	Ongoing	
2	1. Advertising of new teaching positions for fully certified and qualified teachers	Principal	Ongoing	
3	2. Regular meetings of new teacher with Principal	Principal	Ongoing	
4	3. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	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
0	

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
35	14.3%(5)	85.7%(30)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	11.4%(4)	100.0%(35)	11.4%(4)	0.0%(0)	74.3%(26)

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

NAEP Consultants	Lauren Campos Jennifer Victoria Diana Maldonado		NAEP Consultants will meet with team leaders on a weekly basis to build capacity through a series of data progress monitoring and implementation of the FCIM

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.

> The RtI Leadership Team will consist of the Principal, Assistant Principal and grade level team leaders.

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 RtI Leadership Team will meet once a month to review the data that identifies students who need intervention, based on subjects they are struggling with in class. The Leadership Team will discuss ways in which such intervention can be implemented in the classroom and then communicate this plan to the teachers.

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 will review the School Improvement Plan on an on-going basis to make sure the SIP is actually being implemented. When the Leadership team meets, these items will be discussed. The team understands that RtI is closely tied to the Florida Continuous Improvement Model and Progress Monitoring along with the Federal IDEA requirements. RtI goals and policies will align with our instructional goals in each area.

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.

> FLKRS and FAIR will be used as the main data sources for students. Teacher-Generated Assessments and gradebooks, along with Pinnacle and PMRN will be used as data management systems to monitor data.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> RtI will be part of the pre-school professional development that all teachers attend. Additionally, the school has sent five teachers for RtI training last year and these teachers have been implementing RtI throughout the year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> Based upon the information from http://www.florida-rti.org/educatorResources/MTSS_Book_ImplComp_012612.pdf, but not limited to the following:
>
> 1. Effective, actively involved, and resolute leadership that frequently provides visible connections between a MTSS framework with district & school mission statements and organizational improvement efforts.
>
> 2. Alignment of policies and procedures across classroom, grade, building, district, and state levels.
>
> 3. Ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services.
>
> 4. Strong, positive, and ongoing collaborative partnerships with all stakeholders who provide education services or who otherwise would benefit from increases in student outcomes.
>
> 5. Comprehensive, efficient, and user-friendly data-systems for supporting decision-making at all levels from the individual student level up to the aggregate district level.
>
> 6. Sufficient availability of coaching supports to assist school team and staff problem-solving efforts.
>
> 7. Ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.

8. Communicating outcomes with stakeholders and celebrating success frequently.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The school-based LLT consists of Dr. Carolina Claro (Principal), Mr. Albert Mancebo (Assistant Principal), Ms. Azalia Fajardo (SPED Coordinator), Grade Level Chair Persons
Ms. Torres K, Ms. Williams 1st, Ms. Millares 2nd, Ms. Ms. Camilo 3rd, Ms. Naranjo 4th, and Ms. Garcia 5th.

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

LLT meets every two weeks to discuss progress of reading program and any problems and/or interventions needed. Team will analyze data for ongoing progress monitoring and intervention effectiveness.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year is to ensure that all students are making adequate progress in literacy and reading skills, as well as reviewing benchmark assessment.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 33%(50) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 35%(53).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33%(50)	35% (53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis Teachers will use available test-prep materials, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, Reading Coach, LLT an classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 35%(53) of students achieved levels 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 1 percentage points to 36%(55).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%(53)	36%(55)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis. Teachers will use available test-prep materials, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Teachers will also provide supplemental reading materials on/above grade level to ensure that classwork is challenging	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administartors, LLT an classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 78% (44) of students made learning gains Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 2 percentage points to 83%(47). .
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(44)	83%(47)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis. Teachers will use available test-prep materials, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Teachers will also provide supplemental reading materials on/above grade level to ensure that classwork is challenging.	Administration and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administrators, LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 78% (<30) of Lowest 25% students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 5 percentage points to 83%(<30).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(<30)	83%(<30)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test is Reading Category 2: Reading Application	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis. Teachers will use available test-prep materials, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category. Teachers will also provide supplemental reading materials on/above grade level to ensure that classwork is challenging	Administrators and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administrators, the LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category. Low 25% students not making progress as determined by evaluation tools will receive RtI.	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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 # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	58%	62%	66%	69%	73%	

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:	During the 2011-12 school year, 70% (101)of Hispanic students were proficient in reading. During the 2012-13 school year, the school will increase the percentage of proficient Hispanic student by three percentage points to 73%(105).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(101)	73%(105)

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	Based on the results of the FCAT Reading 2.0 Assessment for 2012 30% of Hispanic students are still not proficient in reading.	Teachers will use available test-prep materials, CRISS strategies, and classroom textbooks to teach and assess this reporting category.	Principal, AP, LLT	Following the FCIM model, administrators, the LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this reporting category. Low 25% students not making progress as determined by evaluation tools will receive RtI.	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013 FCAT Reading

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 results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessments indicate that 51% (19) of ELL students were proficient in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 5 percentage points to 56%(21).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51%(19)	56%(21)

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	During the 2012 school year 49% of ELL students were not proficient in reading.	Emphasize Reading Strategies of determining cause/effect, author's purpose, main idea, and text features using graphic organizers, one-sentence summaries, cause/effect charts on a daily basis.	Administrators and LLT	Following the FCIM model, administrators, the LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this subgroup.	Formative: District Baseline, Fall, winter Interim assessments, teacher-generated classroom assessments, reports from FCAT Explorer. Summative: 2013

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:	
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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	
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

Implementing Common Core Standards	2-5	Literacy Director	2-5 Reading and LA teachers	PD Days	Monitoring by LLT will occur year-long during PLCs	Principal and LLT
Lessons from Common Core FY12	K-1	Literacy Director	K-1 Reading and LA teachers	PD Days	Year-long monitoring by LLT during PLCs	Principal and LLT

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
All	Reading Plus Program	School Budget	$11,000.00
All	After School Tutoring Program	EESAC	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $12,500.00
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: $12,500.00

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:	During the 2011-12 school year, 30%(64) of ELL students were proficient in the Listening/Speaking sub test of the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:
30%(64)

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
	ELL students have a fear of speaking English	Students will be provided with the	Administration and ESOL	Teacher observation	Formative: Listening/Speaking

| | 1 | as a result of the accent that is part of the language learning process. | opportunity to work in small groups where risk taking in listening and speaking English is encouraged and expected. | coordinator. | | Mini Assessments

Summative: 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA |

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: | During the 2011-12 school year, 32%(67) of ELL students were proficient on the Reading sub test of the CELLA. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

32%(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	ELL students do not get sufficient opportunities to read in their home language.	Provide students with many opportunities to read a wide range of genres in their home language.	Administrators and ESOL coordinator	Following the FCIM model, administrators, the LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this area.	ormative: Interim Assessment of Reading Summative: 2013 Reading section of the 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: | During the 2011-12 school year 43%(89) of ELL students were proficient on the Writing Sub test of the CELLA. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

43%(89)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not given the opportunity to organize thoughts in a systematic way.	Provide students with graphic organizers that allow them to systematically organize their thoughts before writing in any language.	Principal and ESOL Coordinator	Following the FCIM model, administrators, the LLT and classroom teachers will review assessment data weekly to ensure progress in this area.	Formative: Writing Mid-year Assessment Summative: Writing section of the 2013 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
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 28%(42) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency by 4 percentage points to 30%(46).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%(42)	30%(46)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 1: Number: Operations and Problems Limited access to hands-on activities in order to break down multi-step problems.	Teachers will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and development of student understanding of mathematical concepts, through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice	Administration	Review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. . Review teacher lessons plans to ensure hands-on activities are being implemented in the classroom.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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:

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 34% (52) of students achieved a level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving a level of 4 or 5 by 2 percentage points to 35%(53).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (52)	35%(53)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement	Students will be given opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities to maintain or increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences with grade level appropriate activities and manipulatives to reinforce attributes of shapes, size and position, 3-dimensional geometric shapes, and transitive properties in the primary grades to prepare and support applications of two and three dimensional shapes in the intermediate grades.	Administration	Review ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of the skills taught.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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:	
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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 55% (31) of students made a learning gain. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 65%(37).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (31)	65%(37)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category of 1: Number: Operations and Problems	A school wide word problem strategy will be adopted and put into place for all students in 3rd-5th grade. Students will be taught specific steps in solving a word problem. (Underlining keywords, circling the numbers etc.)	Administration	Review classroom assignments and assessments that test word problems. Conduct grade level discussion to attain teacher feedback on effectiveness of strategy.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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 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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessments indicate that 55%(<30) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 10 percentage points to 65%(<30).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(<30)	65%(<30)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category of 1: Number: Operations and Problems	Provide students the opportunity to recall addition, subtraction, multiplication and division facts through a incentive program. Provide activities such as Ticket to get it" to practice addition, subtraction, multiplication and division on a daily basis.	Administration	Review formative bi-weekly assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics 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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #
	Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50% 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	57	61	65	69	73	

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:	During the 2011-12 school year, 61%(88) of Hispanic students made satifactory progress on the Math 2.0 FCAT. Our goal for this school year is to increase the percentage of Hispanic students making satifactory progress by 5 percentage points to 65%(94).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%(88)	65%(94)

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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement.	Teachers will provide contexts for mathematical exploration and development of student understanding of mathematical concepts, through the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities	Administration	Review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed. . Review teacher lessons plans to ensure hands-on activities are being	Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments. Summative: Results from the

		for practice.		implemented in the classroom	2013 FCAT Mathematics 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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Based on last years results, 47%(18) of ELL students made satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 FCAT. Our goal this school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress by 5 percentage points to 52%(21).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47%(19)	52%(21)

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was the Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement.</td><td>Students will be given opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities to maintain or increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences with grade level appropriate activities and manipulatives to reinforce attributes of shapes, size and position, 3-dimensional geometric shapes, and transitive properties in the primary grades to prepare and support applications of two and three dimensional shapes in the intermediate grades.</td><td>Administration</td><td>Review ongoing classroom assignments and assessments that target application of the skills taught.</td><td>Formative: Pre/Post Evaluative Class Assessments and Baseline Data Assessments.

Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	
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				

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
Interpreting Word Problems in Math	2-5	Mathematics Director	School-wide PD and grade-level PLCs	Pre-school PD; Monthly PLCs	Follow up in PLCs by grade-level with Math Director	Principal and Math Director

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
All	After School Tutoring	EESAC	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
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: $1,500.00

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:	Based on last year's results 29%(7) of students scored at a Level 3 on the 2012 Science FCAT. Our goal is to increase the percentage of Level 3 students by three percentage points to 32%(8).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(7)	32% (8)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test results show area of deficiency to be life science and physical science.	Monitor implementation of hands-on activities and scientific writing strategies to ensure students understand benchmark areas. Lab activities will be conducted weekly to reinforce benchmark areas as well.	Principal/AP	Baseline/Interim and classroom assessments will be used to determine students mastery of benchmarks	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
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:	During the 2011-12 school year 29%(7)of fifth grade students scored at or above a Level 4 on the FCAT Science Assessment. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students scoring at or above a Level 4 on the FCAT Science Assesment by one percentage point to 30%(7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(7)	30%(7)

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	Real werld hands on science activities for students with an apptitude for science are not sufficient.	Provide students with real world inquiry based problems to allow them to develop solutions based on the skills learned in science.	Principal, AP, NAEP Science Director	Monitor student projects.	Formative: Baseline, Interim Assessments, Teacher generated classroom assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
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
Hands-on Science	2-5	NAEP Science Director	Grades 2-5	Pre-Openning	Classroom Observations and observation of student work during PLCs	AP
Writing Lab Reports	2-5	NAEP Science Director	Grades 2-5	Pre-Openning	Follow-up monitoring during monthly PLCs	AP

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	During the 2011-12 school year 97%(59) scored at or above proficiency on the FCAT Writing Assessment. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to maintain our level of student proficiency at 97%(59).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

		97% (59)		
97% (59)				

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	Changes in FCAT Writes at State Level without proper communication may impact student scores.	Continue writing instruction as is and monitor changes in State policy regarding FCAT Writes.	Literacy Director	Effectiveness of writing instruction is determined by monthly writing prompts.	Formative: Classroom assessments and monthly writing prompts Summative: 2013 FCAT 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:	
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
PLC-Reading student Writing	3-5	Literacy Director	Language Arts Teachers 3-5	Monthly meetings	Literacy Director and teachers will meet monthly to discuss student work and effectiveness of instruction	AP

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal is to exceed the District's expected attendance rate of 96%. We will average 97.1% attendance during this school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.6%(579)	97.1%(582)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
121	115
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
102	097
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
	Unexcused absences are high among	Maintain a clean environment throughout	Administration	Administrators will monitor school's	Attendance rosters

| 1 | elementary students. | the school. Teach and emulate healthy choices and prevention strategies. | | environment and ascertain that health education and health prevention strategies are implemented throughout the school year. | |

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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	Our school goal is to maintain the suspension rate as low

Suspension Goal #1:	as we had it last year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
3	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	3

	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	Parents and students are unfamiliar with the School Code of Conduct and unaware of the reasons for child's suspensions.	Administration will make sure to contact parents of students who have been placed in indoor and outdoor suspension. Student Code of Conduct will be thoroughly explained to both parents and students	Administration	Monitor Parent contact log and parent sign-in sheet for evidences of communication with parents of students who have been suspended	Parent sign-in sheet/parent contact log

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2011-12 school year, 75% of parents attended at least one parent activity. Our goal is to increase that by two percentage points to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
75%	77%

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	Parents will be unable/unwilling to participate in required school activities due to work commitments and /or schedules.	1.1. Parent survey to determine family schedules and convenient times for participation. 1.2 Parents will be given incentives to participate in school activities.	Leadership Team	Sign-In Sheets Volunteer Hour Logs	Documentation proving parents' attendance

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:	Our goal is to increase the number of opportunities that our 5th grade students have to be involved in hands-on STEM activities.
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
	Master schedule is not	Develop master	Principal	Monitor master	Master Schedule

1	designed to give specific time for STEM hands-on activities.	schedule to provides specific times of STEM activities.		schedule implementation by teachers.	
2	Enrichment activities not involving STEM.	Develop after school enrichment clubs for STEM activities.	Principal	Monitor STEM club schedules and implementation.	Enrichment club logs

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	All	Reading Plus Program	School Budget	$11,000.00
Reading	All	After School Tutoring Program	EESAC	$1,500.00
Mathematics	All	After School Tutoring	EESAC	$1,500.00
				Subtotal: $14,000.00
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: $14,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment

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
Student motivation activities and tutoring.	$3,000.00
Student motivation activities.	$90.00

The EESAC is the primary responsible body within the school for the creation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. For this reason all meetings will have an agenda item discussing the SIP and the progress towards its goals. In addition the EESAC receives approximately $5 per FTE so the distribution of these funds will also be discussed by this committee.

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