

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Dr. Kevin N. Williams

SAC Chair: Lee Hawkins

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position        | Name                | Degree(s)/ Certification(s)   | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Assis Principal | Collette Richardson | Bachelors Degree from Clark- Atlanta University, and Masters in Elementary Education from Nova Southeastern University with certification in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University | 8                            | 13                             | 12 11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade A A A A A<br>AYP N N Y N N<br>High Standards Rdg. 63 78 74 74 67<br>High Standards Math 74 91 83 86 75<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 72 73 74 81 69<br>Lrng Gains-Math 70 78 70 79 68<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 86 73 61 59 57<br>Gains-Math-25% 64 82 65 82 65 |
|                 |                     | Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education from   |                              |                                |   |

|           |                   |  |   |   |  |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Principal | Kevin N. Williams | Florida Memorial University, Masters in Urban Education (TESOL) from Florida International University, Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University | 3 | 7 | School 12 11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grade A A A A A<br>AYP N N Y N N<br>High Standards Rdg. 63 78 74 74 67<br>High Standards Math 74 91 83 86 75<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 72 73 74 81 69<br>Lrng Gains-Math 70 78 70 79 68<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 86 73 61 59 57<br>Gains-Math-25% 64 82 65 82 65 |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|---|--|

### 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      | Bernadette Russell | Psychology, Reading, Educational Leadership, K-12 Elementary Education; ESOL | 2                            | 4                                    | 12 11 10 09 08 07<br>School Grade A C C B B C<br>AYP N N N N N N<br>High Standards Rdg. 63 70 61 59 70 56<br>High Standards Math 74 73 66 66 68 59<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 72 66 59 65 73 56<br>Lrng Gains-Math 70 58 63 59 50 57<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 86 55 40 70 75 44<br>Gains-Math-25% 64 70 67 65 61 64 |

### 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. Outreach to select Universities for interns | Principal, Assistant Principal                | 6/13                      |   |
| 2 | Provide Mentoring                              | Principal, Assistant Principal, MINT Teachers | 6/13                      |   |
| 3 | Provide Coaching                               | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach | 6/13                      |   |

### 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   |
|  | Teacher is certified to teach in primary grades, needs ESOL Endorsement partnered with Ms. Fronda to assist her with curriculum planning for ESOL students. Teacher will continue taking ESOL professional development courses. |

one regular education staff  
One SPED instructor

Teacher is certified to teach in SPED, needs Elementary Education Certification or Reading Endorsement partnered with Ms. Marrero-Alemanly to assist him with curriculum planning. The teacher will partner with Ms. Ferguson for articulation with the general education population.

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 51                                  | 2.0%(1)                  | 25.5%(13)                                  | 47.1%(24)                                   | 23.5%(12)                                  | 51.0%(26)                           | 56.9%(29)                   | 11.8%(6)                    | 0.0%(0)                             | 35.3%(18)                |

## 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 |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| No data submitted |                 |                       |                              |

## 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 A

Norwood Elementary School provides services to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through extended learning opportunities after-school and in some cases during the summer. Furthermore, the district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Norwood also provides support services to students through the usage of a Reading Coach who identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and behavioral assessments and intervention approaches. The Reading Coach also identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessments and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; a Title I Championship Chess Team; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Norwood provides services and support to migrant students and parents. The District Migrant liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs and conducts a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities after-school and in some cases during summer school by the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

#### Title I, Part D

Miami-Dade County Public School receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with the District's Drop-out Prevention programs.

#### Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL

training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols

#### Title III

Title III funds are used at Norwood Elementary School to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and immigrant students by providing:

- parent outreach activities
- professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
- reading and supplementary instructional materials
- hardware and software for the development of language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL and immigrant students.

The above services will be provided should funds become available for the 2012-2013 school year and should the FLDOE approve the application.

#### Title X- Homeless

Norwood seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents and community agencies.

Project Upstart, Homeless Children & Youth Program partners with Norwood Elementary to:

- assist in the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students.
- provide a homeless sensitivity and awareness campaign

The Homeless Liaison provides training for Norwood's registrar on the procedures for enrolling homeless students and for the school counselors on the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act-ensuring homeless children and youth are not to be stigmatized or separated, segregated, or isolated on their status as homeless-and are provided with all entitlements.

The District Homeless Student Liaison continues to participate in community organization meetings and task forces as it relates to homeless children and youth.

#### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Norwood will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

#### Violence Prevention Programs

Norwood ventures to decrease the violence in the lives of students by offering a Bully Prevention Program, a Gun Safety Program, a Walk Safe Program, Faux Paw internet safety campaign, Drug Abuse Awareness Program, Virus Free Living, a program which ventures to eliminate behavioral "viruses" within the child and thereby increase their academic performance, and Child Abuse and Prevention activities. Furthermore, Norwood employs the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program to address violence, drug prevention and intervention services for students through curriculum implemented by classroom teachers, elementary counselors, and TRUST Specialists.

Finally, elementary counselors and TRUST Specialists focus on counseling students to solve problems related to drugs and alcohol, stress, suicide, isolation, family violence, and other crises.

#### Nutrition Programs

Norwood adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy. Additionally, Norwood provides nutrition education, as per state statute, through physical education classes. As well as, Michelee Puppets which ventures to educate students on healthy dietary decisions. The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

#### Housing Programs

N/A

#### Head Start

N/A

#### Adult Education

N/A

#### Career and Technical Education

N/A

#### Job Training

N/A

#### Other

##### Parental Involvement Program Description

Norwood will involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extend an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs and services.

Norwood will also increase parental engagement/involvement through developing (with on-going parental input) our Title I School-Parent Compact (for each student); our school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting (Open House); and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

Furthermore, Norwood will conduct informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

Finally, Norwood will complete the Title I Administration's Parental Involvement Monthly School Report (FM 6914 Rev. 06-08) and the Title I Parental Involvement Monthly Activity Report (FM 6913 03-07) and submit to Title I Administration by the fifth of each month. Additionally, the Miami Dade County Public School's Title I Parent/Family Survey, distributed to school by the Title I Administration will be completed by parents/families annually in May. The survey's results are to be used to assist with revising our Title I parental documents for the approaching school year.

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of Norwood's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns as they arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

At Norwood Elementary School, the MTSS/RtI team will be composed of the following members:

- Administrator(s)
- Teacher(s) and Coach(es)
- Grade group chairpersons
- Special education personnel
- School guidance counselor
- School psychologist
- School social worker
- Community stakeholders

MTSS/RtI is a general education initiative in which the levels of support are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. MTSS/RtI uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions.

The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.

The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavioral supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instructional and/or behavioral support.

The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual student's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting

school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

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 following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the MTSS/RTI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team will:

Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by reviewing universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the classroom and individual level, to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and moderate or 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.

When students have learned or already know, then instruction will proceed to the next topic.

Hold monthly team meetings.

Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

Walk through monitoring and classroom visitations will be used to evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.

Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team:

- Met with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) to help develop the SIP.
- The team gathered and analyzed data on the academic areas that needed to be addressed for the upcoming school year.

The team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention and provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

### 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.

Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:

- adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
- adjust the delivery of behavior management system
- adjust the allocation of school-based resources
- drive decisions regarding targeted professional development

Managed data will include:

Academic

- FAIR assessment through PMRN for Reading
- Interim assessments through Edusoft for Reading, Math, Science and Writing
- State/Local Reading, Writing, Math and Science assessments
- FCAT
- Student grades
- School specific assessments/Edusoft reports

Behavioral

- Student Case Management System
- Detentions
- Suspensions/expulsions
- Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
- Office referrals per day per month
- Team climate surveys
- Attendance

Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and will:

- training for all administrators in the MTSS/RTI problem solving, data analysis process; and
- training for school staff to understand basic MTSS/RTI principles and procedures

Describe plan to support MTSS/RTI.

The plan to support the MTSS/RTI process will include:

- professional development to support school staff to understand basic MTSS/RTI principles and procedures; and
- providing a network or ongoing support for MTSS/RTI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Dr. Kevin N. Williams, Principal  
Collette Richardson, Assistant Principal  
Bernadette Russell, Reading Coach  
Lee Hawkins, EESAC Chair  
LaVenia Mobley, UTD Steward  
Maria Marrero-Aleman, SPED Program Specialist  
Lourdes Castillo, SPED Chairperson  
Nicole Ferguson Morris, Intermediate Grade Chairperson  
Erica Driver, Primary Grade Chairperson  
Angela Mitchell, Guidance Counselor  
Mi Yung Chung, School Psychologist

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

The following steps will be considered by the school's Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The LLT will:

The following steps will be considered by the school's Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The LLT will:

Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by reviewing universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the classroom and individual level, to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and moderate or 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.

When students have learned or already know, then instruction will proceed to the next topic.

Hold monthly team meetings.

Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

Walk through monitoring and classroom visitations will be used to evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.

Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

To increase implementation of the Common Core Standards in Reading, Language Arts, History and Science in grades

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

### \*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.

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences, in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. The Title I Program further provides assistance for preschool transition through the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program. HIPPY provides in-home training for parents to become more involved in the educational process of their three- and four-year old children.

Additionally, prior to transitioning into kindergarten, some local area pre-schools visit Norwood Elementary School to orient their students with the lay-out of the building and familiarize them with the school. Furthermore, an orientation meeting is held for pre-kindergarten parents and students where kindergarten standards and expectations are reviewed and distributed. As students register for kindergarten the office provides the parents with a "Summer Learning" calendar of activities to promote student learning during the summer as well as a reading log, a requirement of the school, this aids in transitioning students from pre-school to elementary school.

### \*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.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 27% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level 3 student proficiency by 6% percentage points to 33%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 27% - (55 students)   | 33%- (67 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  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more exposure to understand author's perspective, text structure and organizational patterns. | 1a.1.<br>Using grade-level text appropriate texts students will be able to summarize the story, article, or passage and identify the author's perspective and organizational technique utilized to express his/her idea or story. | 1a.1.<br>Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | 1a.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 1a.1<br>Formative:<br>Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. 2012 |

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: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 15% of student s scored at or above Level 4. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to achieve a performance level that is 5% higher. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 15% - (5 students)   | 20%- (7 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    |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
|  | 1b.1.<br>Students require multiple | 1b.1.<br>Using read alouds, | 1b.1.<br>Reading Coach,                       | 1b.1.<br>Monitoring on-going                        | 1b.1<br>Formative: |

|   |  |   |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions. | auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals and or symbols to facilitate reading comprehension and multiple exposures to the text | Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. 2012 |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|

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: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 33% of students achieved proficiency level 4 or 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3% percentage points to 36%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 33% - 67 students   | 36% - 73 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   |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 2a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more exposure to understand author's perspective, text structure and organizational patterns. | 2a.1 Using grade-level complex texts students will be able to summarize the story, article, or passage and identify the author's perspective and organizational technique utilized to express his/her idea or story as well as distinguish between the topic and the theme of a collection of stories, articles, or passages. | 2a.1. Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | 2a.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 2a.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. 2012 |

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: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 61% of student s scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to achieve a performance level that is 3% higher. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 61% -- 20 students  | 64% -- 21 students   |

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 | 2b.1. Students require multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions. | Using read alouds, auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals to facilitate reading comprehension and allow for multiple exposures to the text in order to increase students reading comprehension skills. | 2b.1. Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | 2b.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 2b.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FAA Reading 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:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br>Reading Goal #3a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 75% of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains to 80%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 75% - 96 students   | 83% - 103 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  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 3a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more exposure and practice with Main ideas, stated and implied, and relevant details | 3a.1. Using grade-level appropriate texts students will be able to summarize the story, article, or passage | 3a.1. Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | 3a.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 3a.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br>Reading Goal #3b: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 51% of student s made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 61% of students will make learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 51% - 10 students  | 61% - 12 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  |
| 1   | 3b.1. Students require multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions. | 3b.1. Continuous review/practice when learning reading concepts with the usage of visual choices as a means for demonstrating comprehension of text as it is presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). | 3b.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team | 3b.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. . | 3b.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FAA Reading 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 86% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 91% of these students will make learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 86% - 28 students   | 91% -30 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   |
| 1   | 4a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more practice and exposure to understanding main ideas, stated and implied, and relevant details. | 4a.1. Using the student's grade-level equivalency in reading as a starting point teachers will then scaffold students to grade level appropriate text in order to have students summarize the stories, articles, or passages, and using differentiation of instruction, small groups, and various teaching methods. | 4a.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team | 4a.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 4a.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading 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 |

|  |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
|  | 71% | 73% | 76% | 79% | 81% |  |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: |                                     |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|   |                                     |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring                      | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | 5B.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more exposure to understand author's perspective, text structure and organizational patterns. | 5B.1. Using the student's grade-level equivalency in reading as a starting point teachers will then scaffold students to grade level appropriate text in order to have students summarize the stories, articles, or passages, and using differentiation of instruction, small groups, and various teaching methods | 5B.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team | 5B.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 5B.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment |

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

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: |                                     |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|   |                                     |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

|  |   |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br>Reading Goal #5D: |   | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 62% of students with disabilities met adequate yearly progress. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students with disabilities to meet adequate yearly by 1 percentage points to 63%. |  |   |   |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |  |   |   |
| 62%-7 students   |   | 63%-8students   |  |   |   |
| 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  | 5D.1. Students require multiple reads of a selection prior to responding to comprehension questions | 5D.1. Using read alouds, auditory tapes and text readers that provide print with visuals to facilitate reading comprehension and allow for multiple exposures to the text in order to increase students reading comprehension skills  | 5D.1. Administrative Team, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team | 5D.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. . | 5D.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FAA Reading Assessment . |

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

|   |  |   |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br>Reading Goal #5E: |  | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test indicated that 63% of economically disadvantaged students achieved level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged student achieving level 3 or higher by 5 percentage points to 68%.        |   |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |   |  |  |
| 63%-115 students  |  | 68%-124 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  |
| 1   | 5E.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application. Students need more practice and exposure to understanding main ideas, stated and implied, and relevant details. | 5E.1 Using the student's grade-level equivalency in reading as a starting point teachers will then scaffold students to grade level appropriate text in order to have students summarize the stories, articles, or passages, and using differentiation of instruction, small groups, and various teaching methods | 5E.1 Administrative Team, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team | 5E.1 Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. . | 5E.1 Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. |

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 |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Access Points<br>Grade Level<br>Professional Learning Communities | SPED K-5<br>General Ed.<br>Grades K-5 | Program Specialist<br>Reading Coach | SPED Teachers<br>Grades K-5<br>General Ed<br>Teachers Grades K-5   | August 16, 2012 with monthly follow up meetings<br>September 10, 2012 with weekly follow up meetings | Classroom walk-throughs, Lesson Plans, and observations | Principal<br>Assistant Principal              |
| Professional Learning Communities                                 | Ed. Grades K-5                        | Reading Coach                       | General Ed<br>Teachers Grades K-5                                  | September 10, 2012 with weekly follow up meetings  | Classroom walk-throughs, Lesson Plans, and observations | Principal<br>Assistant Principal              |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| FL Ready Reading                      | Supplemental materials   | Title 1        | \$750.00                |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$750.00      |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                         |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| 2 Computers (lab)                     | Hardware                 | 6010           | \$1,000.00              |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$1,000.00    |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                         |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Common Core (Reading, Math, Writing)  | Professional development | N/A            | \$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: \$1,750.00 |

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>CELLA Goal # 1:  | The result of the 2011-2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 40% of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking Our goal for the 2012-2013 school |

year is to increase the percentage of proficiency by 5%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

43% -- 10 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  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Assessment Test for students who scored proficient in Listening/Speaking requires additional exposure and practice on retelling using CRISS strategies | 1.1.<br>Utilize the language experience approach to have students produce language in response to first hand, multi-sensorial experiences. Other listening approaches include:<br>Modeling<br>Teacher-led groups<br>Total physical response<br><br>Use simple direct language<br>Speaking approaches will include:<br>Brainstorming<br>Cooperative Learning<br>Panel Discussions<br>Repetition<br>Role-Play<br>Think Aloud | 1.1.<br>Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and LLT | 1.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 1.1.<br>Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment Test |

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:

The result of the 2011-2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 12.5% of students were proficient in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is 14% of students will demonstrate proficiency in Reading as evidenced by the CELLA Assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

13% -3 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   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 2.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Assessment Test for students who scored proficient in Listening/Speaking requires additional exposure and practice on retelling using CRISS strategies. | 2.1.<br>Using students grade level texts to activate prior knowledge, make predictions, picture walk, KWL, task cards, read alouds, scaffolding, cooperative learning, differentiation of instruction, small groups, choral reading, context clues, and | 2.1.<br>Reading Coach, Teachers, Administrative team and LLT | 2.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, SPED Program Specialist, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of | 2.1.<br>Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment Test. |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | focus on key vocabulary to improve reading comprehension. | strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions |
|--|---|--|

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br>CELLA Goal #3: | The result of the 2011-2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 8% of students were proficient in Writing. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is 9% of students will demonstrate proficiency in Writing as evidenced by the CELLA Assessment. |
|--|---|

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

8% - 2 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   |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the CELLA Assessment Test for students who scored proficient in Writing indicates that additional practice is required with sentence structuring, syntax, and grammar. | Using the student's grade-level equivalency in reading as a starting point teachers will then employ the use of graphic organizers, process writing, illustrating and labeling, spelling strategies, journals, modeling, and grammar, to develop students writing skills | Reading Coach, Administrative Team, and Literacy Leadership Team | Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, SPED Program Specialist, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment Test. |

**CELLA Budget:**

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                      |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| FL Ready Reading                      | Supplemental materials   | Title 1        | \$750.00             |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$750.00   |
| Technology                            |                          |                |                      |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| 2 Computers (lab)                     | Hardware                 | 6010           | \$1,000.00           |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| Professional Development              |                          |                |                      |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount     |
| No Data                               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00               |
|                                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00     |
| Other                                 |                          |                |                      |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$1,750.00 |

*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: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicated that 34% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the level 3 student proficiency by 5% percentage points to 39%. |
|--|---|

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

|                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 34% - 70 students | 39% - 79 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  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 1a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two-dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes | 1a.1.<br>Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures. | 1a.1.<br>Administrative Team, LLT             | 1a.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 1a.1.<br>Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal # 1b: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 55% of student s scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to achieve a performance level that is 3% higher |
|--|---|

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

|                 |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| 27%- 9 students | 32% -11 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                  |
|--|--|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
|  | 1b.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 | 1b.1.<br>Provide students with multiple opportunities to | 1b.1.<br>Administrative Team, LLT, and        | 1b.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and  | 1b.1.<br>Formative: Student work |

|   |   |  |               |  |  |
|---|---|--|---------------|--|--|
| 1 | administration of the FAA Mathematics Test was Geometry, Number Sense, and Algebraic Thinking. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding algebraic expressions, fraction recognition, measurements, and perimeter. | learn concepts using manipulatives visuals, repetition, picture cards, number lines and assistive technology as a means to demonstrate mathematical literacy and demonstrate that literacy by making visual choices as they are presented with answer choices as they are in the Florida Alternate Assessment. | MTSS/RTI team | district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, SPED MTSS/RTI team and Literacy Leadership Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment |
|---|---|--|---------------|--|--|

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicated that 37% of students achieved and proficiency levels 4 and 5. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students at levels 4 and 5 by 3 percentage points to 40%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 37% - 76 students   | 40% - 81 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   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two-dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes | 2.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures. | 2.1. Administrative Team, LLT                 | 2.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 55% of student s scored at or above Level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to achieve a performance level that is 3% higher. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 55% - 18 students   | 58% - 19 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  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2b.1. Students will expand exposure of geometric concepts by participating in independent studies, peer teaching, and ongoing monitoring | 2b.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points. Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency, and tools for measurement. Use guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems. Students must have continuous repetition when learning math concepts and must be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment | 2b.1. Administrative Team, LLT, and MTSS/RTI team | 2b.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, SPED Program Specialist, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 2b.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicated that 70% of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains to 75%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 70% - 90 students   | 75% - 96 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  |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 3.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two-dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes. | 3.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, journals, accountable talks, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures. | 3.1. Administrative Team, LLT                 | 3.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 3.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

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

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 71% of student s made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 76% of students will make learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 71% - 14 students   | 76% - 16 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  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Students will expand exposure of geometric concepts, number sense, and algebraic thinking by receiving additional exposure in virtual manipulatives, small groups, and instructional differentiation | Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points. Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency, and tools for measurement. Use guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems. Students must have continuous repetition when learning math concepts and must be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment. | Administrative Team, LLT, and MTSS/RTI team   | Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, MTSS/RTI Team, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions | Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment |

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br>Mathematics Goal #4: | Based upon the results of the Florida Alternate Assessment for 2011-2012, 64% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is that 69% of these students will make learning gains. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 64%- 19 students  | 69%-21 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  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | 4.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two- | 4.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, journals, accountable talks, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these | 4.1. Administrative Team, LLT                 | 4.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional | 4.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
| dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes | activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures using programs such as SuccessMaker, Riverdeep, ThinkCentral, and Gizmo. | decisions. |
|---|---|------------|

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>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 |
|  | 84  | 86        | 87        | 89        | 90        |           |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | Black: 75%- 143 students<br>Hispanic: 65%-8 students                                     |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| White: NA<br>Black: 75%- 143<br>Hispanic: 65%-8<br>Asian: NA<br>AmericanNA Indian: NA   | White: NA<br>Black: 82%- 157<br>Hispanic: 73%-9<br>Asian: NA<br>AmericanNA<br>Indian: NA |

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 | 5B.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two-dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes | 5B.1. Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, journals, accountable talks, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures | 5B.1. Administrative Team, LLT                | 5B.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 5B.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: |                                     |   |   |                 |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |   |   |                 |
|   |                                     |   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement   |                                     |   |   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                            | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted   |                                     |   |   |                 |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: |  | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicated that 69% of students with disabilities achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the amount of students with disabilities achieving proficiency by 1 percentage points to 70%.   |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |   |  |  |
| 69%-8 Students   |  | 70%-8 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  |
| 1  | 5D.1. Students will expand exposure of geometric concepts, number sense, and algebraic thinking by receiving additional exposure in virtual manipulatives, small groups, and instructional differentiation | 5D.1. Train teacher to effectively implement Access Points. Review for long term learning math concepts such as rote counting, fact fluency, and tools for measurement. Use guided discussion to engage students in real life math problems. Students must have continuous repetition when learning math concepts and must be provided with visual choices as presented in the Florida Alternate Assessment | 5D.1. Administrative Team, LLT, and MTSS/RTI team | 5D.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, MTSS/RTI Team, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions | 5D.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment |

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



|  |   |
|--|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal E: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicated that 73% of economically disadvantaged students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the amount of economically disadvantaged students achieving proficiency by 7 percentage points to 80%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| 73%- 133 Students  | 80%- 146 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   |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | 5E.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Geometry and Measurement. Students require additional practice and exposure to understanding perimeter, area, volume, two-dimensional shapes, congruency and symmetry in geometric shapes | 5E.1.<br>Utilize grade-level appropriate activities that promote the use, virtual manipulatives, small groups, differentiation, journals, accountable talks, geometric knowledge and spatial reasoning to develop foundations for understanding perimeter, area, volume, and surface area; these activities should include the selection of appropriate units, strategies, and tools to solve problems involving these measures | 5E.1.<br>Administrative Team, and LLT         | 5E.1<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, MTSS/RTI Team, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions | 5E.1.<br>Formative:<br>Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments.<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus            | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring            | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Access Points                                 | SPED K-5            | Program Specialist               | SPED Teachers Grades K-5  | August 16, 2012 and then monthly   | Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans and Observations | Assistant Principal, Principal                |
| Grade Level Professional Learning Communities | K-5                 | Grade Level Chairpersons         | General Education Teachers K-5                                    | September 17, 2012 and then after each major assessment                        | Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans and Observations | Assistant Principal, Principal                |

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.   |   | Based upon the results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0, 34% of students scored a level 3. Our goal is for 38% of students to score level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0  |  |  |  |
| Science Goal #1a:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |  |  |  |
| 34%- 25 students   |   | 38%- 28 students.   |  |  |  |
| <b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>   |   |   |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring          | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |
| 1  | 1a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Physical Science. Students need additional exposure and understanding of matter, forces of motion, changes in matter and energy. | 1a.1. Utilize instruction that includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion. Use Gizmo to elucidate and demonstrate concepts visually to enhance understanding. | 1a.1. Administrative team and Literacy Leadership Team | 1a.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. Meet monthly to review strategies and monitor effectiveness | 1a.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 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:                                       |          |   |   |                 |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:                      |          | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:           |   |                 |
|   |          |   |   |                 |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |          |   |   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier                                     | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted                                       |          |   |   |                 |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a:  | Based upon the results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0, 11% of students scored a level 4 or 5. Our goal is for 13% of students to score level 3 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 11%- 8 students  | 13%-9 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  |
| 1   | 2.1<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was Next Generation Standard Reporting Category 3, Physical Science. Students need additional exposure and understanding of matter, forces of motion, changes in matter and energy. | 2.1.<br>Utilize instruction that includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion. Use Gizmo to elucidate and demonstrate concepts visually to enhance understanding. | 2.1.<br>Administrative team and Literacy Leadership Team | 2.1.<br>Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. Meet monthly to review strategies and monitor effectiveness | 2.1.<br>Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 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: |                                     |
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b:  |                                     |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|  |                                     |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring                   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Access Points                      | SPED K-5            | Program Specialist               | SPED Teachers Grades K-5   | August 16, 2012 and then monthly   | Classroom Walk-Throughs, Observations, Lesson Plans | Assistant Principal, Principal                |
| Nature of Science Workshop         | K-5                 | Science Leader                   | Teachers Grades K-5  | September 16, 2012 and then after each major assessment                        | Classroom Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans, Observations | Assistant Principal, Principal                |

Science Budget:

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

# 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: | Based upon the results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing, 83% of students scored a level 3. Our goal is for 85% of students to score level 3 or above on the 2012-2013 FCAT Writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 83% - 53 students   | 85% - 54 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  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1a.1. Students need more exposure with sentence variety, an understanding of proper conventions, and sufficient background knowledge in regards to many life experiences which inhibits their ability to write with graphic detail and conventionally correct. | 1a.1. Provide instruction on subject/verb agreement, proper spelling of frequently misspelled words, punctuation and the different type of sentences available to them for usage. Then use revising/editing charts and conferencing with teachers for correcting their conventions, using sentence variety. Finally, offer a variety of extracurricular activities, virtual field trips, sharing or telling personal stories or memories out loud, maintain a writer's notebook, use graphic organizers, including timelines and storyboards and additional exposure with transitional words or phrases. | 1a.1. Reading Coach, Administrative Team and LLT | 1a.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Literacy Leadership Team and Reading Coach will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions. | 1a.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | Based upon the results of the 2011-2012 FAA Writing, 54% of students scored a level 4 or above. Our goal is for 59% of students to score level 3 or above on the 2012-2013 FCAT Writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 54% - 7 students   | 59% - 8 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  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1b.1. Students need continuous repetition/practice when learning writing concepts. | 1b.1. Use picture cards to create sentences and paragraphs on topics as well as assistive technology for students that are unable to physically write and/or allow students to dictate written responses so as to allow for them to more clearly communicate their ideas. | 1b.1. Reading Coach, MTSS/RTI, Administrative Team and LLT | 1b.1. Monitoring on-going classroom, school and district provided assessments. The Principal, Assistant Principal, MTSS/RTI, and Literacy Team will collaboratively determine the effectiveness of strategies. They will meet monthly to review progress and use data to make instructional decisions | 1b.1. Formative: Student work samples from classroom, school-wide and district-wide assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Access Points                      | SPED K-5            | Program Specialist               | SPED Teachers Grades K-5   | August 16, 2012 and then monthly   | Classroom Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans, Observations | Assistant Principal, Principal                |
| FCAT Writing 2.0 Training          | K-5                 | Reading Coach                    | Teachers Grades K-5  | September 10, 2012 and then after each major assessment                        | Classroom Walk-Throughs, Lesson Plans, Observations | Assistant Principal, Principal                |

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 |

## 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>Attendance Goal # 1:   |   | The attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 97.24% and our goal is to reduce the number of excessive absences by 5% in the 2012-2013 school year.  |   |  |                           |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate:   |   | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:   |   |  |                           |
| 97.24% (511)  |   | 97.24% (511)   |   |  |                           |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  |   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  |   |  |                           |
| 102   |   | 97   |   |  |                           |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)   |   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)   |   |  |                           |
| 57  |   | 54   |   |  |                           |
| 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. Illnesses such as the seasonal flu and colds have in conjunction with public awareness of the need to prevent spreading an illness have resulted in increased absenteeism. Students will receive additional instruction in hygiene techniques, preventive care and healthy choices | 1.1. Maintain a clean environment throughout the school. Teach and emulate prevention strategies, such as hand washing, sneeze in your sleeve, appropriate attire for weather conditions and healthy lifestyle choices | 1.1. Administrative Team                      | 1.1. Administrators will monitor the school's weekly COGNOS Report, physical environment to assure a clean, sanitary, and welcoming environment and conduct classroom walk throughs to assure that health education and prevention strategies are taught and implemented throughout the school | 1.1. Attendance bulletins |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Attendance                         | PK-5                | Assistant Principal              | Teachers and Parents  | August 16, 2012 and September 10, 2012   | Faculty and PTA Meetings          | Counselor, Assistant Principal                |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                              |                |                         |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Incentives                            | Incentive- G.A.M.E. T-shirts | PTA            | \$2,425.00              |
|                                       |                              |                | Subtotal: \$2,425.00    |
| Technology                            |                              |                |                         |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| No Data                               | No Data                      | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|                                       |                              |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
| Professional Development              |                              |                |                         |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| No Data                               | No Data                      | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|                                       |                              |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
| Other                                 |                              |                |                         |
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| No Data                               | No Data                      | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|                                       |                              |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|                                       |                              |                | Grand Total: \$2,425.00 |

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>Suspension Goal # 1:   | For the 2011-2012 school year there were 6 out-of-school suspensions and our objective is to reduce the number to 5. |
| 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  |
| 6   | 5  |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 6   | 5  |

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. Given the low number of suspensions at Norwood Elementary School, less than 2% of the total school population, continual reduction of that number of suspension is a challenge. | 1.1. Continue to implement in-house procedures to remediate discipline problems before they escalate into larger problems. Implementation of the teacher network program, student counseling, and peer mediation should continue. | 1.1. Assistant Principal, Principal           | 1.1. Monitor Student Case Management Referrals monthly. | 1.1. End of year suspension rate report. |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Student Code of Conduct            | PK-5th              | Principal                        | School-wide  | August 16, 2012  | Classroom walk-through to monitor teachers' implementation and instruction on the code of conduct as well as monitoring of SCMs and the Spot Success Program. | Principal                                     |

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of 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:   |   | Our goal for this year is to increase parental involvement by 1 percentage point at school site events by offering them at a variety of times in order to accommodate the various schedules of parents.      |   |  |                 |
| *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:   |   |  |                 |
| 62% (307)   |   | 63% (312)  |   |  |                 |
| 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   | Due to the demands on parents schedules, they are unavailable to attend school functions at the designated times. | Offer school programs at a variety of times during the day so as to allow more parents to become involved.   | Administrators                                | Monitor sign-in sheets to determine the number of parents attending school site events.  | Sign-in sheets  |
| 2   | Parents are inaccessible by phone and do not come to the school site.   | Utilize a Community Involvement Specialist to serve as the school's liaison to contact hard to reach parents in order to facilitate student achievement and parental involvement in school based activities. | Administrators                                | Monitor sign-in sheets and the community involvement specialists log to determine the number of parents being contacted and attracted to school site events. | 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           |
| 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           |
|                                       |                          |                | <b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b> |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |   |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1. STEM<br>STEM Goal #1:  |  | Increased attention to the area of science is needed as during the 2011-12 school year only fourth and fifth graders participated in the Science Fair. This year it is the goal to enable all students to participate in the Science Fair some projects will be class projects whereas others will be individual projects based on the readiness of the 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  |
| 1   | 1.1. Students lack knowledge on the Nature of Science in grades levels other than fifth grade. | 1.1. Provide in-class monthly scientific investigations utilizing the Nature of Science protocols to increase   | 1.1. Assistant Principal, Principal           | 1.1. Student work samples                           | 1.1. Percentage of students who successfully complete a Science Fair |

|  |  |  |                                      |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|
|  | students' knowledge and achievement in the area of Science |  | project for the 2012-13 school year. |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring                   | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Nature of Science                  | K-4                 | Science Leader                   | K-4 Teachers   | August 22, 2012 and monthly through February2013                               | Classroom Walk-Throughs, Observations, Lesson Plans | Assistant Principal, Principal                |

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                                      |                              |                |                         |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Goal                                  | Strategy                             | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Reading                               | FL Ready Reading                     | Supplemental materials       | Title 1        | \$750.00                |
| CELLA                                 | FL Ready Reading                     | Supplemental materials       | Title 1        | \$750.00                |
| Attendance                            | Incentives                           | Incentive- G.A.M.E. T-shirts | PTA            | \$2,425.00              |
|                                       |                                      |                              |                | Subtotal: \$3,925.00    |
| Technology                            |                                      |                              |                |                         |
| Goal                                  | Strategy                             | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Reading                               | 2 Computers (lab)                    | Hardware                     | 6010           | \$1,000.00              |
| CELLA                                 | 2 Computers (lab)                    | Hardware                     | 6010           | \$1,000.00              |
|                                       |                                      |                              |                | Subtotal: \$2,000.00    |
| Professional Development              |                                      |                              |                |                         |
| Goal                                  | Strategy                             | Description of Resources     | Funding Source | Available Amount        |
| Reading                               | Common Core (Reading, Math, Writing) | Professional development     | N/A            | \$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: \$5,925.00 |

## 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 (Uploaded on 10/17/2012)

## 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     |
|---|------------|
| To purchase computers for the computer lab. | \$2,400.00 |

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

Health and Fitness Fair  
Science With A Twists(S.W.A.T.)  
Science Camp

# 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<br>NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL<br>2010-2011 |           |           |         |         |                     |   |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)              | 78%       | 91%       | 87%     | 60%     | 316                 | 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%       | 78%       |         |         | 151                 | 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?                 | 73% (YES) | 82% (YES) |         |         | 155                 | 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   |           |           |         |         | 622                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 99%   |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*  |           |           |         |         | A                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

| Dade School District<br>NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL<br>2009-2010 |           |           |         |         |                     |   |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
|  | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned |   |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)              | 74%       | 83%       | 87%     | 45%     | 289                 | 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                            | 74%       | 70%       |         |         | 144                 | 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?                 | 61% (YES) | 65% (YES) |         |         | 126                 | 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   |           |           |         |         | 559                 |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%  |           |           |         |         |                     | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*  |           |           |         |         | A                   | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |