

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Carmen B. Fuentes

SAC Chair: Julie S. Lozano

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/16/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Carmen B. Fuentes	BS- Elem. Ed, Nova S. Eastern Univ.; MS-Computer Ed., Barry University; Specialists- Ed. Leadership Elem.Ed., Nova S. Eastern Univ. Certification: Elem. Ed, ESOL, Ed. Leadership and School Principal	5	10	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades A A A A High Standards 93 93 93 96 Math 96 94 95 98 Learning Gains-Rdg 68 78 78 74 Learning Gains-Math 73 67 67 64 Gains-R-25 67 78 78 83 Gains-M-25 74 70 67 64
		BS- Elem. Ed, Florida International University (FIU) MS- TESOL, FIU			'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades A A A C

Assis Principal	Eduardo Bovo	Modified Masters in Ed. Leadership, FIU Certification: Elem. Ed., ESOL K-12 Endorsed, Ed. Leadership	1	7	High Standards 83 91 90 49 Math 85 88 89 61 Learning Gains-Rdg 61 78 64 67 Learning Gains-Math 53 68 45 56 Gains-R-25 57 82 64 69 Gains-M-25 57 82 52 58
-----------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
N/A					

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. Calusa accepts interns and field experience students from four local universities to recruit highly qualified teachers.	Assistant Principal	May 6, 2013	
2	2. Calusa conducts lesson study groups to retain highly qualified teachers.	Leadership Team	May 6, 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
1.82% (1): out-of-field	Teacher was advised of ELL Endorsement courses offered in the District to provide ESOL endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
55	1.8%(1)	14.5%(8)	34.5%(19)	47.3%(26)	47.3%(26)	85.5%(47)	7.3%(4)	10.9%(6)	90.9%(50)

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
Ana Denton	Susan Carrillo	Expertise in content area.	Peer Observations, bi-weekly meetings, professional development.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- **Principal /Assistant Principal:** Provides a common mission for the use of data-driven instruction and planning. Also, ensures that the school-based leadership team is implementing MTSS /RtI effectively. In addition, supervises the implementation of MTSS /RtI documentation and interventions. Last, oversees that professional development is delivered to support RtI implementation and maintains communication with parents regarding school-based MTSS /RtI plans and activities.
- **Reading Facilitator:** Delivers information regarding the content standards and benchmarks, assists with the implementation and development of the school instructional focus calendars, assessments and interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Writing Facilitator:** Delivers information regarding the content standards and benchmarks, assists with the implementation and development of the school instructional focus calendars, assessments and interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Mathematics Facilitator:** Delivers information regarding the content standards and benchmarks, assists with the implementation and development of the school instructional focus calendars, assessments and interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Science Facilitator:** Delivers information regarding the content standards and benchmarks, assists with the implementation and development of the school instructional focus calendars, assessments and interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Social Studies Facilitator:** Provides up-to-date information regarding Social Studies curriculum, assists in gathering and analyzing data.
- **Primary Teacher Representative:** Provides up-to-date information regarding the curriculum, assists in gathering data, collaborates with the staff on the effective implementation of research-based interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Intermediate Teacher Representative:** Provides up-to-date information regarding the curriculum, assists in gathering data, collaborates with the staff on the effective implementation of research-based interventions. Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **School Psychologist:** Collects and analyzes data to develop student intervention plans. Meets with teachers and parents to provide information and support. Evaluates students for possible placement for either gifted or SWD programs. Reevaluates students for possible dismissal of previous placement programs.
- **Student Services Personnel (School Guidance Counselor):** Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students Analyzes data to determine students' progress and needs.
- **Speech and Language Pathologist:** Provides in-house individualized speech and language therapy to meet the needs of students on Individualized Educational Plans (IEP). Assesses students for possible placement and dismissal of services in the speech and language program.
- **Special Ed. Personnel:** Provides support for the general education teacher in order to implement individual instructional strategies to meet the unique needs of struggling students.

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?

1. To review progress-monitoring data at the grade and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks.
 2. Based on the above information, the team will identify students in need of enrichment and/or intervention and adjust the Instructional Focus Calendar as needed.
- The team will determine the professional development and resources needed to address student enrichment and/or intervention.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team meets with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC), principal and assistant principal to help develop the SIP. The team will disaggregate the data to determine school strengths and weaknesses and plan instruction for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals and strategies will be identified to serve as the framework with clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance, relationship) for the upcoming school year.

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.

Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) and school based monthly assessments
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FCAT Simulation Midyear, FAIR, school based monthly assessments, core subject area assessments, Interim Assessments.
End of year: FAIR, FCAT, SAT, school based monthly assessments
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis
The MTSS/RtI team will ensure teachers have access to data from the PMRN and FAIR in order to address any technology needs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

MTSS/ RtI team members will provide ongoing support for school staff to understand basic MTSS/ RtI principles, procedures, and implementation.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS/ RtI team members will provide ongoing support for school staff to implement basic MTSS/ RtI principles, procedures, and implementation.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is: Ms. Carmen Fuentes, Principal, Mr. Eduardo Bovo, Assistant Principal, Ms. Maria Montoya, Reading Facilitator, Ms. Madelyn Fadhel, Primary Liaison, Ms. Yania Dieppa, Social Studies Facilitator, Ms. Yvonne Gonzalez, Writing Facilitator, Ms. Julie Lozano, Intermediate Liaison and Ms. Nancy Bauerlein, School Counselor.

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

The Principal and Assistant Principal will continue to promote school-wide literacy across all the academic areas. They will hold monthly meetings with the LLT in order to ensure that all members have a unified focus of the school's literacy goals. The Reading Facilitator will provide her expertise in reading instruction and assessment, as well as up-to-date information and resources on new instructional trends and strategies professional development workshops provided by the District. The Reading Facilitator will assist the Media Specialist in promoting literacy school-wide by correlating Accelerated Reader (AR) with class-based student incentives for reading. The Primary and Intermediate Liaisons will provide literacy support to the classroom teachers through mentoring and coaching. The Writing Facilitator will be responsible for offering reading and writing cross-curricular activities and strategies to classroom teachers. Furthermore, the School Counselor will encourage literacy through prominent school-events, such as Red Ribbon Week.

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

One of the major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to identify our weakest benchmarks through ongoing data analysis and incorporate differentiated instruction in conjunction with the Instructional Focus Calendars in order to close the achievement gap with our lower performing students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

***Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition**

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

N/A

***Grades 6-12 Only**

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

***High Schools Only**

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 25% (106) of students achieved a Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 26% (111).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (106)	26% (111)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was reporting category 3, Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non-Fiction. Students lack the ability to identify literary elements in grade level text. When given single or multiple text structures, students demonstrated a weakness in their ability to compare and contrast elements, topics, settings, characters, or problems.	1.1 Students will use grade-level appropriate fiction and non-fiction texts that contain a variety of literary genres. Teachers will implement graphic organizers and open ended questioning that reflects item specifications for Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non-Fiction during whole group and small group instruction.	1.1 Leadership Team	1.1. Ongoing student progress monitoring through benchmark assessments each month and adjust instruction as needed.	1.1. Informal Assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.
2					

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 60% (256) of students achieved Levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Levels 4 and 5 student proficiency to 61% (260).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (256)	61% (260)

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	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was reporting category 3, Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non-Fiction. Students lack the ability to identify literary elements in grade level text. When given single or multiple text structures, students demonstrated a weakness in their ability to compare and contrast elements, topics, settings, characters, or problems.	2.1. Students will use enrichment activities that focus on a variety of literary genres, specifically fiction and non-fiction texts. Teachers will implement graphic organizers that align with specifications for Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non-Fiction during whole group instruction.	2.1. Administration	2.1. Ongoing student progress monitoring benchmark assessments each month and adjust instruction as needed	2.1. Informal Assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 85% (229) of students tested made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains to 90% (242).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (229)	90% (242)

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	3.1. Consistent exposure to higher order inference type questions which cannot be found directly within the text.	3.1. Utilize task cards to create questions while aligning to Common Core Curriculum Standards to reinforce the use of Bloom's Taxonomy.	3.1. Administration	3.1. Ongoing student progress monitoring through teacher observations, classroom and monthly benchmark assessments with an emphasis on the students' ability to apply Bloom's Taxonomy.	3.1. Informal assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Reading Test Was the student's lack of	Students will be exposed to different genres of reading texts. Teachers will implement additional technology resources to assist students' reading	Administration	Ongoing student progress monitoring through benchmark assessments each month, and adjust instruction as needed.	Informal Assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim

comprehension skills.	deficiencies.		Assessments, and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.
-----------------------	---------------	--	--

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 97% (37) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving learning gains to 97% (37).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
97% (37)	97% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Consistent exposure to higher order inference type questions which cannot be found directly within the text.	4.1. Utilize task cards to create questions while aligning to Common Core Curriculum Standards to reinforce the use of Bloom's Taxonomy.	4.1. Administration	4.1. Ongoing student progress monitoring through teacher observations, classroom and monthly benchmark assessments with an emphasis on the students' ability to apply Bloom's Taxonomy.	4.1. Informal assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Assessment.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.						
	Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	85	87	88	89	91		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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
Aligning NGSSS with CCCS (Calusa Crunches CCCS)	Reading	Literacy Team	Reading/Language Arts Teachers	September 4, 2012 ongoing	Classroom Observations	Administration

Reading Budget:

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

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:			Based on the 2012 CELLA data 52% (94) of students were proficient in Oral Skills.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
52% (94)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students lack English oral skills proficiency due to the limited vocabulary skills related to listening and speaking and also limited cultural background knowledge.	ELL students will be exposed to more real-world vocabulary.	Administration	CELLA Assessments and classroom teacher observations.	Informal assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, and CELLA Assessments.

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:			Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 39% (71) of students were proficient in Reading.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
39% (71)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students lack reading proficiency in English due to the limited amount of fluency.	Classroom teachers will expose ELL students to a variety of reading genres to assist their comprehension.	Administration	CELLA Assessments and classroom teacher observations.	Informal assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, and CELLA Assessments.

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

CELLA Goal #3:	Based on the 2012 CELLA data, 36% (66) of students were proficient in writing				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
36% (66)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students demonstrate partial proficiency in writing due to the limited knowledge of grammar structures and vocabulary.	Classroom teachers will provide ELL students more opportunities to practice use of grammar and vocabulary during differentiated instruction.	Administration	CELLA Assessments and classroom teacher observations	Informal assessments, Formative Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, and CELLA Assessments.

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicates that 27% (115) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 30% (128).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (115)	30% (128)

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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement. This deficiency is due to a limited variety of presentation strategies, with an emphasis on a lack of technology.	1.1. Develop skill-based differentiated lessons that help students to understand the geometric and measurement concepts.	1.1. Administration and Leadership Team	1.1. Review monthly benchmark assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	1.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and Informal Assessments Summative assessment. 2013 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 group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student will have ample opportunities to practice solving mathematical word problems.	Student will be exposed to different problem solving strategies.	Administration	Formal and Informal classroom assessments.	2013 Florida Alternative Assessment for math.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results for the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 57% (245) of students achieved a proficiency Level and 5. Our goal is to increase student proficiency to 59% (252).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (245)	59% (252)

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	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement. This deficiency is due to a limited variety of presentation strategies, with an emphasis on technology; not taking into account the various student learning styles	2.1. Utilize NGSSS in correlation with Common Core Curriculum Standards (CCCS) resources to present material in a variety of modalities through the use of technology. This strategy will be developed during vertical planning sessions and target students that are above proficiency.	2.1. Administration	2.1. Review monthly benchmark assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and Informal Assessments Summative assessment. 2013 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 group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student will have ample opportunities to practice solving mathematical word problems.	Student will be exposed to different problem solving strategies.	Administration	Formal and Informal classroom assessments and adjust instruction as needed	2013 Florida Alternative Assessment for math.

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 78% (210) of students tested made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our learning gains to 83% (223).
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (210)	83% (223)

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	3.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement. This deficiency is due to a limited variety of presentation strategies, with an emphasis on technology; not taking into account the various student learning styles.	3.1. Develop hands on activities that help students to understand geometric and measurement benchmarks, taking into account various learning styles.	3.1. Administration and Leadership Team	3.1. Review monthly benchmark assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	3.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and Informal Assessments Summative assessment. 2013 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 group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test 84% (34) of students tested made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our learning gains to 89% (36).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (34)	89% (36)

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	4.1. Our gains are affected by the range of performance within our lowest 25 % group. This makes it difficult to accurately address these students' individual needs. In addition, we lack technological resources.	4.1. Implement technology for teachers in grades three through five. Teachers will also incorporate GIZMO technology labs into their classroom instruction. Also, we will implement an after-school tutorial program utilizing Successmaker.	4.1. Administration and Leadership Team	4.1. Ensure that technology is consistently utilized as part of the Mathematics instructional block through classroom observations. Maintain a GIZMO lab schedule. In addition, monitor results and ongoing progress monitoring of Successmaker.	4.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments, District Interim Assessments, and Informal Assessments Summative assessment. 2013 FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	87	88	90	91	92	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Aligning NGSSS to CCCS	Mathematics	Leadership Team	Mathematics Teachers	Start September 2012 ongoing	Classroom Observations and Walk throughs	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 48% (57) of the students tested, achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The expected level of performance for 2013 is to increase proficiency to 49% (58).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (57)	49% (58)
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	1.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test was Physical Science. This is a result of inconsistent exposure to a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities in grades K-5.	1.1. Provide a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities for students to analyze, draw appropriate conclusions, and apply key instructional concepts.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Post Lab student reflections will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of inquiry-based learning through the use of the Scott Foresman Science Activity Book	1.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT, 35% (41) of students tested scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). The expected level of performance for 2013 is increase students' proficiency to 35% (42).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (41)	35% (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
	2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the	2.1. Enrich students by presenting higher order thinking skills (HOTS)	2.1. Administration	2.1. Lab sheets will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the	2.1. Formative: Monthly Interim Benchmark

1	FCAT Science Test was Physical Science. This is a result of inconsistent exposure to a variety of hands-on inquiry-based learning opportunities in grades K-5.	to assist them in the scientific process. Teachers will also incorporate GIZMO technology labs into their classroom instruction.		implementation of inquiry-based learning through the use of the Scott Foresman Science Activity Book.	Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Assessment.
2					

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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
Aligning NGSSS with CCCS	Science	Leadership Team	Science Teachers	Start September 2012 ongoing	Classroom Observations and Walk throughs	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.		The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 93% (147) students achieved Levels 3-6.			
Writing Goal #1a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level of students scoring at levels 3-6 to 94% (148).			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
93% (147)		94% (148)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, was the students' proper use of grammar and conventions in responding to a prompt.	Teachers will infuse mini-lessons on the proper use of grammar and conventions	Administration/ Literacy Team	Monthly Writing Prompts and Ongoing classroom writing assessments	Formative: District Baseline Data, Monthly Writing Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment. Formative: District Baseline Data, Monthly Writing Assessments, Summative: 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment.
2	There were limited resources available for instructional use on teaching grammar and conventions.	Plan to purchase instructional resources on the use of grammar and conventions.	Administration/ Literacy Team	Monthly Writing Prompts and Ongoing classroom writing assessments	Formative: District Baseline Data, Monthly Writing Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Curriculum: Reading/Writing	Language Arts	Leadership Team	Language Arts Teachers	November 6, 2012	Student Samples	Leadership Team

Writing Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The 2011- 2012 attendance goal was 96.92% (831). There were 152 students with excessive absences and 143 with excessive tardies. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase attendance to 97.42% by minimizing absences due to illnesses and truancy, and to create a climate in our school where parents, students, and faculty feel welcomed and appreciated. In addition, our goal for this year is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardiness (10 or more) by 5%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.92% (831)	97.42% (835)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
152	144
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
143	136

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	1.1 Truancy – decreased by only .05% from previous year.	1.1 Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of nonattendance to Attendance Review Committee (ARC) for possible intervention.	1.1 School Counselor	1.1 Weekly updates to Administration by the ARC and to entire faculty during faculty meetings.	1.1 Attendance Intervention logs and attendance rosters
2	Truancy – decreased by only .05% from previous year. Parents and students are unfamiliar with the MDCPS attendance policy.	1.2. Provide detailed attendance policy information and require signed parent acknowledgement.	1.2. Administration, School Counselor, and classroom teachers.	1.2. SCM attendance referral forms.	1.2. Parent Communication Log and attendance intervention reports.
	1.3. Truancy – decreased	1.3. Contact parent when	1.3. Administration,	1.3. SCM attendance	1.3. Parent

3	by only .05% from previous year. Parents and students are unfamiliar with the MDCPS attendance policy.	student accumulates excessive unexcused absences and/or tardies.	School Counselor, and classroom teachers	referral forms	Communication Log and attendance intervention reports
4	1.4 Illnesses – 7% (55) of students accumulated excessive (10 or more) excused absences.	1.4 Maintain a clean environment throughout the school. Teach and encourage healthy choices and prevention strategies.	1.4 Administration, classroom teachers, and cafeteria and custodial staff	1.4 Administrators will monitor school's environment and ascertain health education and health prevention strategies are implemented throughout the school	1.4 Attendance rosters

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
Truancy Prevention	PK - 5/ Attendance	Registrar and counselor	School-wide	August 16, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day November 6, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day February 2, 2013 – Teacher Planning Day	An Attendance Action Plan will be developed and shared during the PD. Administration will monitor the implementation of this program by teachers and staff.	Administration, Counselor and Registrar
School Climate	PK – 5/ Learning Environment	Counselor	School-wide	August 16, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day November 6, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day February 2, 2013 – Teacher Planning Day	A positive behavior/character education program will be developed and shared during the PD. Administration will monitor the implementation of this program by teachers and staff.	Administration and Counselor

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Truancy Prevention	Perfect Attendance Certificates	After School Care (0930)	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
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: \$100.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension		Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to maintain the total number of suspensions at zero (0).			
Suspension Goal # 1:					
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
0		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
0		0			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
1		1			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
1		1			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students are not consistently recognized for positive behavior.	1.1. Utilize the school-wide reading and positive behavior management system theme by rewarding compliance with the Student Code of Conduct through incentives.	1.1. Administration and School Counselor	1.1. Provide rewards and recognize positive behavior during school-wide Morning Announcements. Monitor COGNOS quarterly suspension reports	1.1. Raffle Results Log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct and COGNOS quarterly suspension

					reports.
2	1.2. Require signed parent acknowledgement of Student Code of Conduct behavioral expectations.	1.2. Administration, School Counselor, and classroom teachers	1.2. Administration, School Counselor, and classroom teachers	1.2. SCM discipline referral forms	1.2. Parent Communication Log and COGNOS quarterly suspension reports
3	1.3. Provide classroom opportunities to explain, discuss, and model behavioral expectations described in the Student Code of Conduct.	1.3. Administration, School Counselor, and classroom teachers.	1.3. Administration, School Counselor, and classroom teachers	1.3. SCM discipline referral forms	1.3. Classroom Guidance Log and COGNOS quarterly suspension 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
School Climate	PK – 5/ Learning Environment	Counselor	School-wide	August 16, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day November 6, 2012 – Teacher Planning Day February 2, 2013 – Teacher Planning Day	A positive behavior/character education program will be developed and shared during the PD. Administration will monitor the implementation of this program by teachers and staff.	Administration and Counselor
Student Code of Conduct	PK – 5/ Learning Environment	Administration	School-wide	August 2012 – June 2013	Utilize classroom, cafeteria, and building walk-throughs to monitor faculty and staff enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct.	Administration and Counselor

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		During the 2011 – 2012 school year, parent participation in school wide activities was 36%, as indicated by parent volunteer sign-in sheets. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase parent participation by 2%, from 36% to 38%.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
36% (345)		38% (365)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents inability to attend due to work schedules.	1.1. Provide multiple opportunities for parents to attend events during and after school hours. Provide online academic resources through the school website.	1.1. Administration PTA Board Members	1.1. Review sign in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school events.	1.1. Sign in Sheets

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM		Based on the total number of students enrolled in grades 3 – 5, 95% of the students will participate in a school wide Science Fair.			
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Overall teacher knowledge of the scientific process related to the science project in practice.	Science Fair Timeline was created to assist teachers on implementing steps to preparing a science fair project.	Administration Science Facilitator	Student work samples submitted throughout the timeline.	Participation Logs

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

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						

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 N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A			\$0.00
CELLA	N/A			\$0.00
Mathematics	N/A			\$0.00
Science	N/A			\$0.00
Writing	N/A			\$0.00
Attendance	Truancy Prevention	Perfect Attendance Certificates	After School Care (0930)	\$100.00
Suspension	N/A			\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A			\$0.00
STEM	N/A			\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$100.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds will be used to hire and interventionist that will support the school based intervention program for grades 3rd – 5th.	\$3,860.00

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

The SAC will assist, oversee and provide support in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan throughout the 2012-2013 school year.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	96%	95%	75%	359	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	69%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	76% (YES)			142	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					639	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District CALUSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	94%	94%	68%	349	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	73%	62%			135	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	71% (YES)			137	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					621	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested