# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: PINEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Leon

Principal: Dr. Marilyn Jackson-Rahming

SAC Chair: Kevin L. Johnson

Superintendent: Jackie Pons

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/27/2012

## 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2011-2012 Grade B<br>FCAT READ: 46<br>FCAT MATH: 58<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 43<br><br>2010-2011 Grade C, AYP 85%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 75<br>FCAT WRITING: 64<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 25<br><br>2009-2010 Grade A, AYP 87%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 83<br>FCAT WRITING: 74<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 45 |
| | | Ph.D. Administration/ Leadership | | | 2008-2009: Grade B, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 79 |

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Marilyn Jackson-Rahming | M.A. in Administration and Supervision, Nova Southeastern University<br><br>Masters in Music, Florida State University<br><br>BS-Music Education, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University<br><br>Certifications-School Principal (All Levels) Music (K-12) | 16 | 23 | FCAT WRITING: 81<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 36<br><br>2007-2008: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 69<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 67<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 47<br><br>2006-2007: Grade C, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 24<br><br>2005-2006: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 70<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 74<br><br>2004-2005: Grade B, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 60<br>FCAT MATH: 55<br>FCAT WRITING: 73<br><br>2003-2004: Grade A, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 69<br>FCAT MATH: 57<br>FCAT WRITING: 84<br><br>2002-2003: Grade B<br>FCAT READ: 58<br>FCAT MATH: 59<br>FCAT WRITING: 82<br><br>2001-2002: Grade C<br>FCAT READ: 50<br>FCAT MATH 58<br>FCAT WRITING: 77<br>2000-2001: Grade A<br>1999-2000: Grade C<br>1998-1999: Grade C |
| Assis Principal | Lanell McCaskill | MS-Education Leadership MS-Education BS-Business Education Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University<br><br>Certifications-Business Education, (grades 6 - 12)<br><br>Educational Leadership, (all Levels)<br><br>Vocational Office Education, (vocational) | 7 | 9 | 2011-2012 Grade B<br>FCAT READ: 46<br>FCAT MATH: 58<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 43<br><br>2010-2011 Grade C, AYP 85%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 75<br>FCAT WRITING: 64<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 25<br><br>2009-2010 Grade A, AYP 87%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 83<br>FCAT WRITING: 74<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 45<br><br>2008-2009: Grade B, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 79<br>FCAT WRITING: 81<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 36<br><br>2007-2008: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 69<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 67<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 47<br><br>2006-2007: Grade C, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 24<br><br>2005-2006: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 70<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 74 |

## 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 | Barbara Mitchell | Master-Education<br><br>BS-Elementary Education Florida State University<br><br>Certifications-Early Childhood Education<br><br>Elementary Education Gifted, Endorsement Reading, (K - 12) | 12 | 12 | 2011-2012 Grade B<br>FCAT READ: 46<br>FCAT MATH: 58<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 43<br><br>2010-2011 Grade C, AYP 85%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 75<br>FCAT WRITING: 64<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 25<br><br>2009-2010 Grade A, AYP 87%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 83<br>FCAT WRITING: 74<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 45<br><br>2008-2009: Grade B, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 68<br>FCAT MATH: 79<br>FCAT WRITING: 81<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 36<br><br>2007-2008: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 69<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 67<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 47<br><br>2006-2007: Grade C, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 61<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 72<br>FCAT SCIENCE: 24<br><br>2005-2006: Grade A, AYP 97%<br>FCAT READ: 70<br>FCAT MATH: 68<br>FCAT WRITING: 74<br><br>2004-2005: Grade B, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 60<br>FCAT MATH: 55<br>FCAT WRITING: 73<br><br>2003-2004: Grade A, AYP 100%<br>FCAT READ: 69<br>FCAT MATH: 57<br>FCAT WRITING: 84<br><br>2002-2003: Grade B<br>FCAT READ: 58<br>FCAT MATH: 59<br>FCAT WRITING: 82<br><br>2001-2002: Grade C<br>FCAT READ: 50<br>FCAT MATH 58<br>FCAT WRITING: 77 |

## 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. No Teacher Left Behind Meeting | Principal | Monthly 5/2013 | |
| 2 | 2. Mentor Teachers | Principal/ Mentoring Teacher | 4/2013 | |
| 3 | 3. Buddy Teachers | Principal/ Team Leaders | 5/2013 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| No data submitted | |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36 | 2.8%(1) | 47.2%(17) | 27.8%(10) | 22.2%(8) | 50.0%(18) | 100.0%(36) | 2.8%(1) | 2.8%(1) | 25.0%(9) |

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jennifer Hirst | Sennio Taylor | Mentor's Experience and willingness to support new faculty members | Mentor Meetings Monthly; Observations |

# 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

Services are provided to ensure that all students requiring additional remediation are assisted through our 21st Century Learning Center (the ACE Academy) or our Summer Academies. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III to make staff development opportunities available to all administration, faculty and staff.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

We have a migrant liaison that works cooperatively with our ESOL Teacher to support students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other partnered programs to solidify that all student need are being met.

Title I, Part D

Funding is coordinated and channeled via the district for Drop Out Prevention initiatives.

Title II

The district receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students

and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Funds at Pineview Elementary School are used to purchase SuccessMaker licenses and provide professional development for SuccessMaker.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for instructional materials.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Title I provides a resource teacher to support Title I students in non-Title I schools.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI fund are coordinated with Title I funds

ARRA funds will be used to provide an early intervention First Grade Summer Reading Academy school for Level 1 readers for 2012-2013.

21st Century After School grant funds will be used to expand supplemental services after school and during the summer to support Level 1 Level 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

We coordinate efforts with our feeder daycare centers to offer services to the children and parents as it relates to school readiness.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

## 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.

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 (Resource) Teachers: 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.

Instructional Coach(es) Math/Science:
Develops leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district contacts to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with the 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.

Reading Coach: Provides 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, Tier2, and Tier3 intervention plans.

Program Specialist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates implementation of intervention plans. Provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities.
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 evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

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

Student Service Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social issues.

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 Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers and in our students.

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 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 systematic 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), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR),

SuccessMaker (CCC), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN,FCAT Simulation, SuccessMaker (CCC)
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR),
End of the Year: FCAT, SuccessMaker (CCC), FAIR

Data Days: Friday

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. Two Professional Development sessions entitle: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem Solving/RtI" and "RtI challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision Making, and Supporting and Evaluating Intervention" will take place in mid-August and in October.

The RtI team will also evaluate the need for additional PD experiences during their meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

┌─ School-Based Literacy Leadership Team ─────────────────────────────────

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

Principal
General Education Teachers
Exceptional Student Education (Resource) Teachers
ELL Teacher
Reading Coach
Program Specialist
Technology Specialist
Media Specialist

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

The purpose of the Reading Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees should serve on this team which should meet at least once a month. Under the guidance of the principal and the reading coach, the team will meet at least once a month to focus on literacy initiatives, programs, data, and literacy concerns throughout the school.

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

The Reading Leadership Team will:
• Engage in regular, ongoing, literacy professional development
• Participate in Professional Learning Communities and Study Groups
• Use data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesign instruction and resources to meet the student's instructional and intervention needs
• Implement the Comprehensive Core Reading Programs or Comprehensive Intensive
Reading Programs and scientifically based reading instruction and strategies with fidelity
• Participate in ongoing literacy dialogues with peers.
• Create and share activities designed to promote literacy.
• Support and participate in classroom research
• Support and participate in classroom demonstrations and modeling of research-based reading strategies.
• Mentor other teachers and present staff development.
• Reflect on practice to improve instruction

## 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.

Pineview is involved with on-going collaborative projects with our early childhood, head start and daycare programs. We extend opportunities for visits by pre-school students to orientate them with the "big school" experience. We also offer an annual orientation session for parents and the community to learn more about our kindergarten program and how school readiness is important in the initial success of all students.

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

## *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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | In grades 3-5, 42% of participating students will score a Level 3 on FCAT Reading as reported by the State School Accountability Report. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 38% (64) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading. | In grades 3-5, 42% (92) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions | Based on the Benchmark Assessments, interventions and tutoring will be provided for those who are performing below grade level. | Principal, Teacher and Curriculum Coach | Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, are to reflect differentiated instruction, Curriculum Folder. | Electronics Folders, Pearson (SM5), Data Director Assessments and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Differentiating instruction to continue to enhance learning experiences for our higher performing readers, while meeting the needs of our below grade level and struggling readers. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on student performance. | Principal and Reading Coach | Review SRA Folder data on a weekly basis. Team Sharing of all prescribes reading assessments. | Electronic SRA Folder. FAIR, FCAT, Data Director Asessments Pearson (SM4) and FCAT Explorer |
| 3 | Student exposure to on grade level vocabulary. | Teacher will provide explicit vocabulary instruction. | Principal and Reading Coach | Vocabulary Folder | Vocabulary Assessments, FAIR, FCAT |
| 4 | Time Constraints | Teachers will recieve initial training on AR programs and reporting capabilities. | Team Leaders, Reading Coach & Media Specialist | Monitor AR Reports Weekly | AR Reports |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1b: | Increase the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 buy 1% on the FAA Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| None of our identified student(s) were proficient in reading at Levels 4,5,and 6 as reported by their performance on the FAA Reading. | The percentage of identified students (3) proficient in reading at Levels 4,5, and 6 will increase by at least 1% as reported by their performance on the FAA Reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiating instruction to continue to enhance learning experiences for our higher performing readers, while meeting the needs of our below grade level and struggling readers. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on student performance. | Principal and Reading Coach | Review SRA Folder data on a weekly basis. Team Sharing of all prescribes reading assessments. | Electronic SRA Folder. FAIR, FCAT, Data Director Asessments Pearson (SM5) and FCAT Explorer |

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | In grades 3-5, 24% of participating students will score a Level 4 and 5 on FCAT Reading as reported by the State School Accountability Report. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 22% (41) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading. | In grades 3-5, 24% (48) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Differentiating instruction to continue to enhance learning experiences for our higher performing readers, while meeting the needs of our below grade level and struggling readers. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on student performance. | Principal and Reading Coach | Review SRA Folder data on a weekly basis. Team Sharing of all prescribes reading assessments. | Electronic SRA Folder. FAIR, FCAT, Pearson (SM5)and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Student exposure to above grade level vocabulary. | Teacher will provide explicit vocabulary instruction | Principal and Reading Coach | Vocabulary Folder | Vocabulary Assessments, FAIR, FCAT |
| 3 | Time Constraints | Teachers will recieve initial training on AR programs and reporting capabilities. | Team Leaders, Reading Coach & Media Specialist | Monitor AR Reports | Weekly AR Reports |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2b: | Maintain the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at Level 7 on the FAA Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 100% (1)of our identified students were proficient in reading at Level 7 as reported by their performance on the 2012 FAA Reading. | The percentage of identified students 100%(1) proficient in reading at Level 7 will be maintained as reported by 2013 FAA Reading. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | Differentiating instruction to continue to enhance learning experiences for our higher performing readers, while meeting the needs of our below grade level and struggling readers. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on student performance. | Principal and Reading Coach | Review SRA Folder data on a weekly basis. Team Sharing of all prescribes reading assessments. | Electronic SRA Folder. FAIR, FCAT, Data Director Asessments Pearson (SM5) and FCAT Explorer |

| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | In grades 3-5, increase the percent of students making learning gains by 3% learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 72% of students achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading. | In grades 3-5, 75% (149) of students achieved learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions. | Based on Benchmark assessments, interventions and tutoring will be provided for those who are performing below grade level. | Principal and Reading Coach | Classroom Observations, lesson, plans are to reflect differentiated instruction. SRA Folder | Benchmark Assessments, SRA Folder, Progress Monitoring Tools, Pearson (SM4)and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | | Student exposure to on grade level vocabulary. | Teacher will provide explicit vocabulary instruction. | Principal and Reading Coach | Vocabulary Folder | Vocabulary Assessments, FAIR, FCAT |
| 3 | | Time Constraints | Teachers will recieve initial training on AR programs and reporting capabilities. | Team Leaders, Reading Coach and Media Specialist | Monitor AR Reports | Weekly AR Reports |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | We have no identified students. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| We have no identified students. | We have no identified students. |
| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | In grades 3-5, increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 2% learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 72%(78) of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading. | In grades 3-5, 74% (147) of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Scheduling to provide small group instuction for students in need of interventions. | Based on Benchmark assessments, interventions and tutoring will be provided for those who are performing below grade level. | Principal and Reading Coach | Classroom Observations, lesson, plans are to reflect differentiated instruction. SRA Folder | Benchmark Assessments, SRA Folder, Progress Monitoring Tools, Lexia, Pearson (SM5), FAIR, FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Balancing Core curriculum exposure with the needed interventions. | Additional instructional support in the area of reading will provided to all students and a small group instruction with ii and iii utilizing university partnerships and FCRR. | Principal, Reading Coach, Resource Teachers and Program Specialist. | Classroom Observations, lesson, plans are to reflect differentiated instruction. SRA Folder | Benchmark Assessments, SRA Folder, Progress Monitoring Tools, Lexia, Pearson (SM5), FAIR, FCAT Explorer |
| 3 | Time Constraints | Teachers will recieve initial training on AR programs and reporting capabilities. | Team Leaders, Reading Coach and Media Specialist | Monitor AR Reports | Weekly AR Reports |

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 #<br>In six years the school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 64% | 67% | 70% | 73% | 76% | |

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. | Monitor all applicable student subgroups not making satifactory progress in Reading. Decrease the percentage of |
|---|---|

| | Reading Goal #5B: | | non proficient students in their identified subgroup by 3%. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| Black:56%; Hispanic 45% and Asian 45% not proficient by subgroup. | Black:53%; Hispanic 42% and Asian 42% |

| 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 | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions. | Additional instructional support in the area of reading will provided to all students and a small group instruction with ii and iii utilizing university partnerships and FCRR. | Principal, Reading Coach, and Resource Teachers | Classroom Observations, lesson, plans are to reflect differentiated instruction. SRA Folder | Benchmark Assessments, SRA Folder, Progress Monitoring Tools, Pearson (SM5), FAIR, FCAT Explorer |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | Deacrese by 3% English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory in Reading. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 60%(9) of our English Language Learners (ELL) did not make satisfactory in Reading. | 43%(6) of our English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory in Reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Time Constraints and differentiated instruction follow through in the classroom. | Services are provided based on the LEP plan as determined by the ELL instructor and Principal. | Administrators, ELL Teacher, and Classroom Teacher | Progress towardthe achievement ofthe LEP goals. | Pearson (SM5),CELLA and FCAT |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5D: | Decrease by 3% Students with Disabilities(SWD) not making satisfactory in Reading. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 88%(23) of our Students with Disabilities(SWD) did not make satisfactory in Reading. | 15% of our Students with Disabilities(SWD) will make satisfactory in Reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Full implementation of the core curriculum with effective differentiation and remediation. | Services are provided based on IEP requirements and as determined by the Intervention Team. | Administration, Resource Teacher, Homeroom Teacher and Referral Coordinator. | Progress toward IEP goals. | IEP and 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 subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | Increase the proficiency percentage of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Economically Disadvantaged ED: 54% (99) were not proficient in Reading as reported by 2012 FCAT 2.0. | Economically Disadvantaged ED: 60% will be proficient in Reading as reported by 2013 FCAT 2.0. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions. | Additional instructional support in the area of reading will be provided to all students and a small group instruction with ii and iii utilizing university partnerships and FCRR. | Principal, Reading Coach, and Resource Teachers | Classroom Observations, lesson, plans are to reflect differentiated instruction. SRA Folder | Benchmark Assessments, SRA Folder, Progress Monitoring Tools,Pearson (SM5),iObservation, FAIR and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Students being provided with the necessary tools to an effective learning experience on a daily basis. | Provide Tools (i.e. meals, snacks, schools supplies, mentors and tutors) learning materials to support students as needed. | Administrators,Guidance Counselor, Reading Coach,Classroom Teachers and Resource Teachers | Classroom observations and administrative-teacher Pit Stops. | AIM Web, Pearson (SM5), FCAT Explorer and Benchmark Assessments |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Re-Teaching after Benchmark Assessment/Differentiating Instruction | PreK-5 | Lead Teacher | All academic teachers | Quarterly | Lesson Plans; Data Evaluation; Classroom Observations | Administrators; Reading Coach |
| Setting Learning Goals and Monitoring Progress | PreK-5 | Team Leaders | All grade level teachers; ESE; Special Areas | Monthly | Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal and Formal Observations | Administrators; Peers |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Read-Aloud Strategies | PreK-2 | Reading Coach | All PreK-2 Teachers | Monthly | Lesson Plans; Classroom Obsevations | Administrators; Reading Coach |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Imagine It!/SRA | Core Curriculum | School Based Funds | $4,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $4,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| WriteScore | Instructional Technology Assessment Tool for Progress Monitoring | Title I | $3,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $3,500.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Setting Learning Goals and Monitoring Progress | Setting Learning Goals Handbook | Title II | $5,000.00 |
| Re-Teaching after Benchmark Assessment/Differentiating Instruction | AIMS Web training/Differentiated Instruction | TEC | $2,000.00 |
| Read-Aloud Strategies | Read-Aloud Kits/Training | School Based Funds | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $7,500.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $15,000.00 |

*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.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | The percentage of ELL students proficient in listening/speaking English will increase by 2% as evidenced by their performance on CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 37% (10) of ELL students were proficient in listening/speaking English as evidenced by their performance on 2012 CELLA. | |

| 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 |
| | Comprehension of | Utilize ESOL funding | Administration, | Student growth on | CELLA Outcomes |

| 1 | language proficiency, tests, instruction, materials and assessments are not provided in their home language educating parents on the accommodations provided to their children. | to assist in developing a stronger home-school connection as well as offering technological tools for addition instruction in the home. | ESOL Teacher and Classroom Teachers. | CELLA, Report Card Data. LEP Goal Proficiency and daily observations. | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | The percentage of ELL students proficient in reading English will increase by 2% as evidenced by their performance on CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 17%(4) of ELL students were proficient in reading English as evidenced by their performance on 2012 CELLA. | |

| 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 | Comprehension of language proficiency, tests, instruction, materials and assessments are not provided in their home language educationg parents on the accommodations provided to their children. | Utilize ESOL funding to assist in developing a stronger home-school connection as well as offering technological tools for addition instruction in the home. | Administration, ESOL Teacher and Classroom Teachers. | Student growth on CELLA, Report Card Data. LEP Goal Proficiency and daily observations. | CELLA Outcomes |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | The percentage of ELL students proficient in writing English will increase by 2% as evidenced by their performance on CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 3O% (8) of ELL students were proficient in writing English as evidenced by their performance on 2012 CELLA. | |

| 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 | Comprehension of language proficiency, tests, instruction, materials and assessments are not provided in their home language educating parents on the | Utilize ESOL funding to assist in developing a stronger home-school connection as well as offering technological tools for addition instruction in the home. | Administration, ESOL Teacher and Classroom Teachers. | Student growth on CELLA, Report Card Data. LEP Goal Proficiency and daily observations. | CELLA Outcomes |

| accommodations provided to their children. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| ELL Curriculum | Instructional Supplements for ELL Students | School Based | $3,600.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $3,600.00 |
| 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: $3,600.00 |

*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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | In grades 3-5, 33% of participating students will score a Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 Math as reported by the 2013 State School Accountability Report. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 30% (55) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0Math. | In grades 3-5, 33% (66) of students will achieve a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT2.0 Math. |

| 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 | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions | Based on the Benchmark Assessments, interventions and tutoring will be provided for those who are performing below grade level. | Principal, Teacher and Curriculum Coach | Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, are to reflect differentiated instruction, Curriculum Folder. | Electronics Folders, Pearson (SM5), Data Director Assessments and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Full implementation of a math series. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on data driven decisions. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Math Coach | Lesson Plans, Core Assessments and Instructional Technology Data, Student Portfolio, Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklists | Mini-assessments, Benchmark Assessments and FCAT Explorer, Pearson (SM5), Data Director Assessments, iObservation and Core Math Assessments. |
| 3 | Scheduling and exposure to higher order thinking skills. | All students will receive daily instruction Acaletics. | Principal and Teachers | Acaletics Folders Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Acaletics Progress Monitoring and Assessments |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | Maintain the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at Levels 4,5, and 6 on 2013 FAA Math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| l00% (1) of student(s )in grades 3-5 scoring at Levels 4,5, and 6 on 2012 FAA Math. | l00% (3) of student(s )in grades 3-5 scored at Levels 4,5, and 6 on 2013 FAA Math. |

| 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 |
| | Curriculum Pacing in | Teachers will develop and | Administration and | Classroom Observation & | iObservation, |

| 1 | accordance with the student IEP utilizing suplemental tools to meet student goals. | engage in tasks with a higher order complexity. | Referal Coordinator. | Classroom Walk-throughs (Formal and Informal) | Classroom Observation Feedback, and FAA Outcomes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | In grades 3-5, 38% of participating students will score a Level 4 and 5 on FCAT Math as reported by the State School Accountability Report. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 35% (60) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2011 FCAT Math. | In grades 3-5, 38% (83) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT Math. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Full implementation of a math series. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on data driven decisions. | Principal, Assistant Principal and Math Coach | Lesson Plans, Core Assessments and Instructional Technology Data, Student Portfolio, Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Mini-assessments, Benchmark Assessments and FCAT Explorer,Data Director Assessments, Pearson and Core Math 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: | Increase the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at Level 7 buy 1% on the 2013 FAA Math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| None of our identified student(s) were proficient in reading at Level 7 as reported by their performance on the 2012 FAA Reading. | The percentage of identified students (3) proficient in reading at Level 7 will increase by at least 1% as reported by their performance on the 2013 FAA Reading. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Curriculum Pacing in accordance with the student IEP utilizing supplemental tools to meet student goals. | Teachers will develop and engage in tasks with a higher order complexity. | Administration and Referal Coordinator. | Classroom Observation & Classroom Walk-throughs (Formal and Informal) | iObservation, Classroom Observation Feedback, and FAA Outcomes. |

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. | In grades 3-5, increase the percent of students making learning gains by 3% learning gains on the 2013 |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mathematics Goal #3a: | | administration of the FCAT Math. | | |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| In grades 3-5, 66% (71) of students achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math. | In grades 3-5, 69% (137) of students achieved learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math. |

### 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' implementation of the core math curriculum and pacing to meet student expectations and needs. | Teachers will analyze data and provide appropriate instruction and interventions based on data driven decisions. | Principal and Teachers | Lesson Plans, Core Assessments and Instructional Technology Data, Student Portfolio, Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Mini-assessments, Benchmark Assessments and FCAT Explorer, Pearson (SM5), Data Director Assessments, iObservation and Core Math Assessments. |
| 2 | Scheduling and exposure to higher order thinking skills. | All students will receive daily instruction Acaletics. | Principal and Teachers | Acaletics Folders Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Acaletics Progress Monitoring and Assessments |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b: | We have no identified students. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| We had no identified students. | We have no identified students. |

### 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: | In grades 3-5, increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 4% learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT 2 .0Math. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| In grades 3-5, 66% (71)of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math. | In grades 3-5, 70% (139) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math. |

| | 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 and time away from the core curricular instruction. Needing additional Resource Staff | Additional instructional support in the area of math will be provided to all students and a small groups. | Administration | Lesson Plans, Core Assessments and Instructional Technology Data, Student Portfolio, Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Mini-assessments, Benchmark Assessments and FCAT Explorer, Pearson (SM5), iObservation, Data Director Assessments and Core Math Assessments |
| 2 | Scheduling and exposure to higher order thinking skills. | All students will receive daily instruction Acaletics. | Principal and Teachers | Acaletics Folders Classroom Walk Through and Benchmark Checklist | Acaletics Progress Monitoring and Assessments |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Elementary School Mathematics Goal # <br><br> In six years the school will reduce the achievement gap in Math by 50%. <br><br> 5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 77 | 79 | 81 | 83 | 85 | |

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. <br><br> Mathematics Goal #5B: | Monitor subgroups by ethnicity not making satifactory progress in Math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black 43% (66) and Hispanic 35% (7) | Black 60% (119) and Hispanic 68% () students will be profient in 2013 Math. |

| | 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 | Needed Resource Staff and Scheduling | Provide additional instructional support in the area of math and math vocabulary will be provided to sudents. | Administration | Acaletics Folders, Lesson Plans, SM4 Prescription and Scheduling, Data Director Mini Assessments, Math Block II | Pearson (SM5), Data Director Reports, Acaletics Score Outcomes |

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. | Deacrese by 3% English Language Learners (ELL) not making |
|---|---|

| Mathematics Goal #5C: | satisfactory in Math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 40%(6) of our English Language Learners (ELL) did not make satisfactory in Math. | 60%(6) of our English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory in Math. |

| 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 Constraints and differentiated instruction follow through in the classroom. | Services are provided based on the LEP plan as determined by the Administrators, ELL Teacher, and Classroom Teacher. | ESOL Teacher and Principal. | Classroom Teacher Progress toward the achivement of the LEP goals. | Pearson (SM5),CELLA and FCAT |

| 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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | Decrease by 3% Students with Disabilities(SWD) not making satisfactory in Math. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77%(20) of our Students with Disabilities(SWD) did not make satisfactory in Math. | 26% of our Students with Disabilities(SWD) will make satisfactory in Math. |

| 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 | Full implementation of the core curriculum with effective differentiation and remediation. | Services are provided based on IEP requirements and as determined by the Intervention Team. | Administration, Resorece Teacher, Homeroom Teacher and Referral Coordinator. | Progress toward IEP goals. | IEP and 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 subgroup: |
|---|

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | Increase the proficiency percentage of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup by 10%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Economically Disadvantaged ED: 43% (78) were not proficient in Math as reported by 2012 FCAT 2.0. | Economically Disadvantaged ED: 60% (119) will be proficient in Math as reported by 2013 FCAT 2.0. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Scheduling small group instruction, Additional Resource Teachers needed, Scheduling adequate Collaboration and Planning | Resource and Core Curricular Teachers will have blocked planning sessions and Curricular Lead Teachers will provide core teachers with interventions based on student data analysis | Administration and Lead Math Teachers | Core Assessments, Acaletics, Math Block II, SM5, Data Director Assessments | Go Math Chapter Tests, Acaletics Reports, Data Director Reports and Pearson (SM5) Reports. |
| 2 | Students being provided with the necessary tools to an effective learning experience on a daily basis. | Provide Tools (i.e. meals, snacks, schools supplies, mentors and tutors) learning materials to support students as needed. | Administrators,Guidiance Counselor, Classroom Teachers and Resource Teachers | Classroom observations and administrative-teacher Pit Stops. | AIM Web, Pearson (SM5), FCAT Explorer and Benchmark Assessments |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Setting Learning Goals and Monitoring Progress | K-5/Math | Team Leaders | School-Wide Math | Monthly | Monthly Classroom Walkthroughs, Informal and Formal Observations | Administrators; Peers |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| GoMath! | Core Curriculum | School Based Funds Basic | $2,500.00 |
| Texas Math | Instructional Curriculum Supplement | School Based Funnds | $1,450.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $3,950.00 | |

| Technology | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Acaletics | Instructional Supplement | School Based Funds | $1,450.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $1,450.00 | |

| 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: $5,400.00 | |

# 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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | Increase the percent of students in grades 5 that score a Level 3 by 8% on 2012 FCAT Science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 32% (21) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2011 FCAT Science. | In grades 3-5, 40% (24) of students achieved a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Balancing Core Curriculum exposure with the needed interventions | Based on the Benchmark Assessments, interventions and tutoring will be provided for those who are performing below grade level. | Principal, Teacher and Curriculum Coach | Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, are to reflect differentiated instruction, Curriculum Folder. | Electronics Folders, Pearson (SM5), Data Director Assessments and FCAT Explorer |
| 2 | Lack of hands on Science Experiments Materials | Provide hands on real world science experience and engaging activities, implementation of core science series, use supplemental science materials to enhance science instruction. | Administration | The created lab schedule will be implemented and monitored by the Principal. Classroom Walk Through Gems, AIMS Units,STEM curriculum SRA Snapshots and Science Learning Community | Core Science Assessments, FCAT Explorer, iObservation and SPLC Agendas |
| 3 | Exposure to Science Vocabulary | Teacher will provide explicit science vocabulary instruction | Administration | Science Vocabulary Folders | Science Vocabulary Assessments |
| 4 | Instructional time to differentiate and extend learning. | Implementation of the STEMS Program | Administration | Mini Assessments and Progress Monitoring Assessments | FCAT 2.0, iObservation and Check Point Assessments |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1b: | We have no identified students. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| We had no identified students. | We have no identified students. |

| 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.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | Increase the percent of students in grades 5 that score a Level 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In grades 3-5, 10% (5) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science. | In grades 3-5, 13% (7) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of hands on Science Experiments Materials | Provide hands on real world science experience and engaging activities, implementation of core science series, use supplemental science materials to enhance science instruction. | Administration | The created lab schedule will be implemented and monitored by the Principal, Classroom Walk Throughs, Gems, AIMS Units,STEM curriculum, Data Director MiniAssessments, SRA Snapshots and Science Learning Community | Core Science assessments, FCAT Explorer,iObservation, SPLC Agendas, Data Director Reports |
| 2 | Lack of Exposure to Science Vocabulary. | Teacher will provide explicit science vocabulary instruction. | Administration | Science Vocabulary Folders | Science Vocabulary Assessments |
| 3 | Students lack higher order skills that enable them to look for errors in logic or reasoning. | Teacher will provide explicit science instruction targeting the development of the Higher oreder thinking skills to enhance the students ability to utilize deductive reasoning. | Administration and Lead Science Teacher | Mini Assessments | Check Point Assessments |
| 4 | Instructional time to differentiate and extend learning. | Implementation of the STEMS Program | Administration | Mini Assessments and Progress Monitoring Assessments | FCAT iObservation Check Point 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. | We have no identified students. |
|---|---|

| Science Goal #2b: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| We had no identified students. | We have no identified students. |

| 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 | | | | | | |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Scott Forseman | Core Curriculum | School Based Budget | $2,500.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $2,500.00 | |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| WriteScore | Instructional Technology Tool for Progress Monitoring | School Based Budget | $1,500.00 |
| | | Subtotal: $1,500.00 | |
| **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: $4,000.00 | |

# 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | Increase by 3% the percentage of students scoring Level 4 or above on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72% (41) of students scored Level 4 or above on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing. | 75% (58) of students scored Level 4 or above on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing. |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Training for new teachers, pacing to meet student needs. | Teachers will provide guided writing instruction using the writing process K-5. | Principal and Teachers | Weekly Writing Folder | Pineview WUR Report, LCS WUR Reports and FCAT |
| 2 | Transition into new writing expectations | Teachers will recieve the necessary PD Professional Development in order to effective provide quality instruction to students. | Administration | Observations, Lesson Plan Review and Peer Coaching | Writing PLC Minutes,PD Sign Logs ,iObservation, Pineview WUR, Write Score and LCS WUR Reports. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
| --- | --- |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | We have no identified students. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| We had no identified students. | We have no identified students. |

| | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning and Collaboration with the Writing Consultant | Grades 2-5/Writing | Rick Shelton | Teachers in Grades 2-5 | Quarterly | Writing Feedback Checklist | Administration |

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<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Increase the average daily attendance rate by 1%. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 94.8% was the daily average attendance rate. | 96% will be the daily average attendance rate. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |

| | 133 students had excessive absences. | 80 students or less will have excessive absences. |
|---|---|---|
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| | 146 students had excessive tardies. | 60 students or less will have excessive tardies. |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Parental Responsibility Home-School Connection | Parent Communication | Principal, IAT Team, Program Specialist | Weekly Attendance Data Analysis | Genesis and Pinpoint Reports |
| 2 | Teacher reporting truancy issues in a timely manner. | Teacher will receive attendance data ona weekly basis of students who need an attendance referral. | Administration, Registrar and Program Specialist | Weekly Teacher Emails and Genesis Data Analysis | Genesis and Pinpoint Reports |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Collegial Conversations/Book Study for PLC 49 Techniques- The Arts & Sciences of Teaching | PK-5 | Assistant Principal and Reading Coach | School-wide | Bi-Weekly | Attendance Reports | Principal |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent Contact Mail Outs and Quarterly Awards Program | Incentives and Postage | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 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: $1,000.00 |

*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<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | Decrease the out of school suspension rate by 20%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 655 | 524 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 655 | 524 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 105 | 84 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 105 | 84 |

| 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 | Consistency of expectations of appropriate behavior | Year 2 Implementation of Year 2 Tier 1 of Positive Behavior Support (PBS). | Administration, Teachers, , BMC, and PBS Team | Educators Handbook | Educators Handbook Reports |

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

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

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

---

Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parent Contact Mail Outs and Quarterly Awards Program | Incentives and Postage | School Based Budget | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $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: $500.00 |

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

# Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | |
| 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 |
| Parent Education and Outreach | Meeting Materials and Home Resources | Title I | $1,450.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,450.00 |
| 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: $1,450.00 |

*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:

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. STEM |||||
| STEM Goal #1: | Increase the percent of students in grades 5 that score a Level 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science.In grades 3-5, 13% (7) of students achieved a Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science. |||||

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of hands on Science Experiments Materials | Provide hands on real world science experience and engaging activities, implementation of core science series, use supplemental science materials to enhance science instruction. | Administration and STEMS Lead Teacher | The created lab schedule will be implemented and monitored by the Principal. Classroom Walk Through Gems, AIMS Units,STEM curriculum SRA Snapshots and Science Learning Community | Core Science Assessments, FCAT Explorer, iObservation and SPLC Agendas |

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 |
| Theory to Practice: Experiment Resources | Hands on experiment resources | School Based/STEM Project Grant | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $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 |

## 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 | Imagine It!/SRA | Core Curriculum | School Based Funds | $4,000.00 |
| CELLA | ELL Curriculum | Instructional Supplements for ELL Students | School Based | $3,600.00 |
| Mathematics | GoMath! | Core Curriculum | School Based Funds Basic | $2,500.00 |
| Mathematics | Texas Math | Instructional Curriculum Supplement | School Based Funnds | $1,450.00 |
| Science | Scott Forseman | Core Curriculum | School Based Budget | $2,500.00 |
| Attendance | Parent Contact Mail Outs and Quarterly Awards Program | Incentives and Postage | School Based Budget | $1,000.00 |
| Suspension | Parent Contact Mail Outs and Quarterly Awards Program | Incentives and Postage | School Based Budget | $500.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Parent Education and Outreach | Meeting Materials and Home Resources | Title I | $1,450.00 |
| STEM | Theory to Practice: Experiment Resources | Hands on experiment resources | School Based/STEM Project Grant | $500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $17,500.00 |

## Technology

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | WriteScore | Instructional Technology Assessment Tool for Progress Monitoring | Title I | $3,500.00 |
| Mathematics | Acaletics | Instructional Supplement | School Based Funds | $1,450.00 |
| Science | WriteScore | Instructional Technology Tool for Progress Monitoring | School Based Budget | $1,500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $6,450.00 |

## Professional Development

| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Reading | Setting Learning Goals and Monitoring Progress | Setting Learning Goals Handbook | Title II | $5,000.00 |
| Reading | Re-Teaching after Benchmark Assessment/Differentiating Instruction | AIMS Web training/Differentiated Instruction | TEC | $2,000.00 |
| Reading | Read-Aloud Strategies | Read-Aloud Kits/Training | School Based Funds | $500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $7,500.00 |

## 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: $31,450.00 |

# Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| ☐ Priority | ☐ Focus | ☐ Prevent | ☐ NA |
|-----------|---------|-----------|------|

Are you a reward school:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

 No. Disagree with the above statement.

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

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| WriteScore- Progress Monitoring | $1,000.00 |
| Reading Curriculum Enhancements | $1,000.00 |
| Science Experiment Materials | $500.00 |
| Attendance Recognition | $500.00 |

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

The purpose of the Pineview SAC is to assist in the preparation and implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) required in the accountability legislation.

First, SAC must develop or review the school's core values and beliefs. The School Board's mission, priorities and beliefs, purpose and philosophy should be used as guides. Second, a vision or mission is developed, consistent with those of the School Board. It is reviewed annually to ensure that it clearly reflects the direction in which the school is going to be moving. Third, a needs assessment is conducted. This assessment assists SAC in determining the gap between where the school is and where it wants to be. This is based upon data that is important for improving teaching and learning in the school. SAC must review the school's status in relation to the Florida School Accountability Reports. Finally, The School Advisory Council reviews, monitors and gives and listens to input and feedback as it relates to addressing all school goals and allowing instruction to be driven by relative data and ensuring that Pineview is a stellar educational facility for all stakeholders.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Leon School District**
**PINEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2010-2011**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 61% | 75% | 64% | 25% | 225 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 58% | 61% | | | 119 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>• Improve FCAT Levels<br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 54% (YES) | 49% (NO) | | | 103 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 447 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

**Leon School District**
**PINEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2009-2010**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 68% | 83% | 74% | 45% | 270 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 64% | 79% | | | 143 | 3 ways to make gains:<br>• Improve FCAT Levels<br>• Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5<br>• Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 53% (YES) | 78% (YES) | | | 131 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 544 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |