FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: WOLF LAKE ELEMENTARY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Caroll Grimando

SAC Chair: Denise Alhemovich

Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Last Modified on: 1/24/2013

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Patricia Ius	BAE- English Education, University of Florida; Master of Science- Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida		20	Riverside Elementary 11-12- School Grade B Reading- 49% HS, 70% LG, 75% lowest 25% Math-45% HS, 69% LG, 68% lowest 25% Science- 38% HS Writing- 98% HS 10-11 School Grade C Reading 67% HS, 60% LG, 73% lowest 25% Math 59% HS,55% LG, 63% lowest 25% Science 37% HS Writing- 96% 09-10- School Grade B Reading- 71% HS, 61% LG, 75% lowest 25% Math- 63% HS, 61% lg 65% lowest 25% Science 47% HS Writing- 81%
					Wolf Lake Elementary 11-12- School Grade A Reading- 70% HS, 71% LG, 69% LG lowest 25% Math- 75% HS, 75% LG, 61% LG Lowest 25% Writing- 87% HS Science- 53% HS 10-11- School Grade A 97% of AYP criteria

| Principal | Caroll Grimando | M.S. in Educational Leadership B. S. in Elementary Education Certified in Education Leadership/ Elementary and Early Childhood Ed. | 6 | 19 | satisfied.
Reading- 88% HS, 71% LG, 70% LG lowest 25%
Math- 85% HS, 63% LG, 53% LG Lowest 25%
Writing- 82% HS Science- 60% HS
09- 10- School Grade B 90% of AYP criteria satisfied. Reading- 83% HS, 67% LG, 64% LG lowest 25%
Math- 86% HS, 60% LG, 47% LG lowest 25%
Writing- 88% HS, Science- 62% HS
08-09- School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied.
Reading- 82% HS, 71% LG, 71% LG lowest 25%
Math- 82% HS, 75% LG, 77% LG lowest 25%
Writing- 93% HS Science- 52% HS
07-08- School Grade A 95% of AYP criteria satisfied.
Reading- 81% HS, 74% LG, 65% LG lowest 25%
Math- 75% LG, 83% LG, 61% LG lowest 25%
Writing- 77% Science- 50% HS
06-07- School Grade A 95% of AYP criteria satisfied.
Reading- 78% HS, 69% LG, 55% LG lowest 25%
Math- 70% HS, 65% LG, 65% LG lowest 25%
Writing- 93% HS Science- 44% HS

Rock Springs Elementary
05-06- School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied
Reading- 90% HS, 70% LG, 72% LG lowest 25%
Math- 84% HS, 66% LG,
Writing- 86% HS
04-05- School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied
Reading- 84% HS, 72% LG, 57% LG lowest 25%
Math- 77% HS, 64% LG
Writing- 88% HS
03-04- School Grade B 100% of AYP criteria satisfied
Reading- 82% HS, 68% LG, 47% LG lowest 25%
Math- 75% HS, 61% LG
Writing- 91% HS
02-03- School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied
Reading- 73% HS, 71% LG, 69% LG lowest 25%
Math- 71% HS, 63% LG
Writing- 88% HS
01-02- School Grade B
Reading- 66% HS, 65% LG, 68% LG lowest 25%
Math- 70% HS, 72% LG
Writing- 67% HS |

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)
		M.S. in Education Leadership			Wolf Lake Elementary 11-12- School Grade A Reading- 70% HS, 71% LG, 69% LG lowest 25% Math- 75% HS, 75% LG, 61% LG Lowest

Reading Coach	Mr. Nathan Hay	B.S. in Elementary Education National Board Certified Teacher, Middle Childhood Generalist	2	2	25% Writing- 87% HS Science- 53% HS Spring Lake Elementary 10-11 School Grade A 100% of AYP criteria satisfied. Reading- 89% HS, 74% LG, 62% LG lowest 25% Math- 89% HS, 83% LG, 77% LG Lowest 25% Writing- 90% HS Science- 59% HS
Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Jamie Dozier	M.S. in Elementary Education, B.S. in Elementary Education, Certified in Elementary Education, National Board Certified Teacher	6		Wolf Lake Elementary 11-12- School Grade A Reading- 70% HS, 71% LG, 69% LG lowest 25% Math- 75% HS, 75% LG, 61% LG Lowest 25% Writing- 87% HS Science- 53% HS

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	Teachers are recruited and hired following OCPS guidelines and protocol.	Administration, PLC team members	June 2012	
2	All teachers are members of grade level teams called Professional Learning Communities. This structure helps with collaboration, sharing of best practices and most importantly, provides peer-to-peer support.	PLC leaders	June 2012	
3	Faculty and staff are coached, mentored, monitored and provided with constant professional feedback regularly.	Administration, Colleagues, CRT, RtI/Reading Coach	June 2012	
4	Faculty participates in ongoing professional development throughout the year including Response to Intervention, Marzano Strategies and Differentiating Instruction.	Administration, CRT, District Personnel, RtI Coach	June 2012	

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
N/A- None	

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
79	11.4%(9)	12.7%(10)	39.2%(31)	39.2%(31)	38.0%(30)	100.0%(79)	11.4%(9)	12.7%(10)	82.3%(65)

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
Erin Barwikowski	Tracey Hough	Ms. Hough is a veteran intermediate teacher with peer coaching experience. Ms. Hough worked with Ms. Barwikowski during her internship.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Edna Springer	Stacy Rupe	Mrs. Rupe is the Teacher of the Year and mentored Mrs. Springer last year, when she was an ESE paraprofessional.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Amanda Barnard	Susan Morrissey	Ms. Morrissey is an experienced teacher in the same grade as Mrs. Barnard.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Ashley Waldron	Natalie Ussrey	Mrs. Ussrey is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience. Ms. Ussrey worked with Mrs. Waldron during her internship.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Amber Beard	Carla Tolone	Ms. Tolone is a veteran teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Bailee Bruehl	Dawn Barlow	Ms. Barlow is a veteran intermediateteacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Dayna Sheikh	Paulette Schultz	Mrs. Schultz is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Catherine Buckley	Heather Nguyen	Ms. Nguyen is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Shannon Carter	Linda White	Mrs. White is a veteran intermediate teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Demond Wiltz	Monique Morris	Mrs. Peters is a veteran intermediate teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...

Jenna Proctor	Amy Jernigan	Ms. Jernigan is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Linnea Cariveau	Vicki Somwaru	Ms. Somwaru is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Louise Weeks	Leigh Hazelgrove	Ms. Hazelgrove is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...
Amy Chandler	Melissa Lay	Ms. Lay is a veteran primary teacher with peer coaching experience.	Attending training for novice teachers with Instructional Coach, lesson planning and collaboration with mentoring teacher, PLC activities with team, etc...

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

n/a

Title I, Part C- Migrant

n/a

Title I, Part D

n/a

Title II

n/a

Title III

n/a

Title X- Homeless

n/a

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

n/a

Violence Prevention Programs

n/a

Nutrition Programs

n/a

Housing Programs

n/a

Head Start

n/a

Adult Education

n/a

Career and Technical Education

n/a

Job Training

n/a

Other

n/a

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

School Psychologist/RtI Coordinator- Ms. Kathy Frey

Reading Coach- Mr. Nathan Hay

Administration- Mrs. Caroll Grimando and Mrs. Patricia Ius

CRT- Mrs. Jamie Dozier

Staffing Specialist- Mrs. Jennifer Dickmyer, Mrs. Tammy Bird
Dean- Mrs. Melody Tennis

ESE Teachers- Mrs. Sheila Kewley

General Education Teachers- Mrs. Yvonne Cleare and Mrs. Mary Block

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 role of the RtI Leadership Team is to ensure that high quality instruction and interventions are matched to students' needs. We will do this by frequent progress monitoring of data to assist with making decisions for appropriate instruction and intervention. The RtI Coordinator will attend district RtI meetings monthly and then share information with the RtI Leadership Team and WLE instructional staff. The RtI Leadership team is responsible for overseeing the school-wide Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 curriculum, materials, resources and interventions. They review both formative and summative assessment data to progress monitor all students involved in the RtI process. Each grade meets at least four times a month in their grade level PLC to discuss student achievement, the tiered interventions and researched based resources that are utilized to implement the RtI process with fidelity.

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 WLE Leadership Team and RtI Team are intertwined and assisted with the development of the SIP. The SIP incorporates the core principles of RtI, which include early intervention, using scientific, research-based materials and resources, using data to make decisions, and monitoring student progress to inform instruction.

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 is collected from the following sources: FAIR for reading; Edusoft Benchmark for reading, math and science; Write Score for science; FCAT for reading, math, writing and science; computer based programs (FASTT Math, Study Island) for reading, math, and science; formative assessments for the core curriculum in reading, math and science; results from school-wide writing prompts. Data management systems include: PMRN; EDW; Study Island; Edusoft; FLDOE-FCAT and formative and summative assessments.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

WLE Elementary faculty and staff were introduced to the RtI process during the 2010-2011 school year. District resources and personnel came to train and review WLE faculty and staff on the RtI process. The WLE RtI Coordinator will attend district meetings and share information monthly with the instructional staff. The RtI team will also evaluate professional development needs during their meetings throughout the course of the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Administration- Mrs. Caroll Grimando and Mrs. Patricia Ius
Reading Coach- Mr. Nathan Hay
CRT- Mrs. Jamie Dozier
Media Specialist- Mr. Kevin Johnson
Kindergarten Teacher- Mrs. Rebeca Skok
First Grade Teacher- Mrs. Amy Jernigan
Second Grade Teacher- Mrs. Yvonne Hodges-Cleare
Third Grade Teacher- Mrs. Carla Tolone
Fourth Grade Teacher- Mrs. Diana Carguill
Fifth Grade Teacher- Ms. Nikki Hunter
ESE Teacher- Mrs. Joan Little

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

The Literacy Team meets at least once a month to discuss data, professional development, student achievement and other school literacy items. The LLT also oversees school wide intervention and enrichment efforts, works collaboratively with PTA and the Parental Involvement Committee to provide parent literacy activities. The LLT works to monitor Study Island to ensure successful implementation of this instructional support program. Administration and designees conduct classroom observations and give regular professional feedback to faculty and staff.

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

A major initiative will be the successful implementation of Reading Eggs and Accelerated Reader as instructional support programs. Another major initiative will be the introduction of a Reading Resource Teacher/ Intervention Specialist who will model lessons, work collaboratively with teachers and guide PLC Teams in data driven instruction through data analysis.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

applicable.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2012 27% (142)of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Reading. Our school goal for the current year is to increase this by three percent to 32% (159).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (142)of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Reading.	30% (147) of eligible students will score Level 3 on FCAT Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The total percentage of students scoring at level three and higher on FCAT has declined in reading, science, and math since 2010-2011.	Facilitate instruction specifically designed to increase performance of children projected to score at level 3 or higher through Lesson Study the Wolf Lake Way.	Administration, CRT, Team Leaders	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor academic progress of children projected to score at level 3 or higher to ensure FCAT learning gains.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	Struggling readers make progress, but at a slower rate than their successful peers, hence widening their achievement gap.	Refine tiered intervention through the RtI process which will afford the students more time in reading instruction.	RTI Coach, Administration, Classroom Teachers and School Psychologist.	Progress monitoring, weekly and monthly, of at risk students; Administration, RTI Coach and Intervention Specialist participation in PLC Data Meetings, Data Analysis and Classroom Observations.	Benchmark and FCAT Data
3	There is a lack of consistency in utilizing reading incentive programs throughout 2- 5 classrooms.	Establish consistent, school-wide implementation of Accelerated Reader Program.	Administration and Media Specialist	Monitor AR reports and reading achievement data	AR, Benchmark,and FCAT Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 41% (202) of Wolf Lake Elementary 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (202) of Wolf Lake Elementary 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading Test.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is for 44% (208) of 3rd through 5th grade students to score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading Test.

		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 total percentage of students scoring at levels four and higher on FCAT has declined in reading, science, and math since 2010-2011.	Use Instructional Management System's technology to specifically target students projected to score at level four and higher on FCAT for enrichment activities.	Administration, Technology Coordinator, IMS Champions	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor the academic progress of children projected to score at level four or higher to ensure FCAT learning gains.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	Students scoring at or above achievement level four need enhanced awareness of college and career options.	Have college awareness days and emphasize college credentials of guests speakers at Teach In.	Administration, Teach In Coordinator.	Track Teach In participation.	Sign In Sheet
3	There is a lack of time for enrichment activities.	Implement a schoolwide reading intervention/ enrichment plan where more capable students are strategically placed into enrichment groups and carefully monitored.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT, Enrichment Teacher, ESE Teachers, Paraprofessionals and Reading Coach.	Review of benchmark data, project rubrics and FAIR Data.	Benchmark, FAIR, and FCAT Data
4	There is a lack of motivation among some high achieving students limiting them from reaching their fullest potential.	Utilize individual goal setting with students and set high expectations for participation in schoolwide reading incentive programs.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Enrichment Teacher and Media Specialist.	Review of reading incentive program participation charts and monitoring progress of individual goals.	Benchmark and FCAT Data
5	Students projected to score at levels four and above on FCAT reading need to be academically challenged.	Reevaluate reading books for enhanced text complexity.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT, and Reading Coach.	Review of Accelerated Reader reports, Benchmark data and FCAT Data	Benchmark and FCAT Data, AR Reports

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.	not applicable

Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	During the 2011-2012 school year 71% (354)of students at Wolf Lake Elementary made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (354) of students made learning gains in reading according to the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test.	74% (369) of students will make learning gains based on the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading results.

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 total percentage of students making learning gains on FCAT reading has not risen since 2010-2011.	Facilitate instruction specifically designed to address the academic needs of children projected not to show gains on FCAT Reading with Differentiated Instruction staff development.	Administration, CRT, Reading Coach	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor academic progress of children unlikely to show gains on FCAT reading.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	High achieving students have difficulty maintaining a level 4 or 5.	Create enrichment groups, differentiation of instruction, and use the data to determine whether a student is or is not maintaining his/her high achievement.	Classroom Teacher, Reading Coach, Administration	Edusoft benchmark assessments, Houghton Mifflin Assessments, Study Island Reading Data	FCAT and Benchmark Data
3	Fewer classes are teaming up to "ability group" their students for reading, increasing the need for skilled differentiation.	Teachers will be trained in how to differentiate instruction and enrichment activities will be brainstormed with PLC groups.	RtI coordinator, Administrators, PLC leaders	Classroom observations, benckmark data, FAIR data, and Study Island Data	FCAT, FAIR data, Study Island reports, and Benchmark Data.
4	Struggling readers lack the comprehension strategies necessary for attainment of Level 3 on FCAT.	Enhance Study Island, K-5, as an academic support tool, which will utilize technology assisted instruction to increase reading comprehension strategies.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach	Review Study Island Data Reports monthly and comparative Benchmark and FAIR assessments.	Benchmark FAIR data, Study Island reports, and FCAT Data.

5	Struggling students have limited exposure to non-fiction reading.	Incorporate additional non-fiction reading into curriculum.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach	Edusoft benchmark assessments, Houghton Mifflin Assessments, Study Island Reading Data	FCAT, HM data , Study Island reports, and Benchmark Data

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 69% (86) of the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (86) of the Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading according to the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading Test.	72% (90) of the Lowest 25% will make learning gains based on the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading results.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading decreased since 2010-2011.	Staff will be trained in RtI and related data tracking methods to enable students in the lowest 25% in reading to receive diagnostic interventions.	RTI Coach, Administration, School Psychologist, CRT, Reading Coach	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor academic progress of children projected to be in the lowest 25% in FCAT reading for learning gains.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	Below level readers often just lack sufficient reading practice.	Enhance Study Island Reading to promote the love of reading. Provide students with more library books, so they will have a variety of reading materials to	Media Specialist, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Study Island data, Edusoft Benchmark results, FAIR Results	FCAT and Benchmark Data

		chose from.			
3	There is a lack of time and resources for tiered interventions.	Grade Level PLCs will work together to discuss intervention methods and collaborate to "share" strategies for those students for targeted skills groups.	Team Leaders and RtI Coach	Study Island data, Edusoft Benchmark results, FAIR Results	FCAT and Benchmark Data
4	Students in the lowest 25% need individualized activities.	Launch Reading Eggs to provide learning activities tailored to student needs.	Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Edusoft Benchmark results,FCAT scores	FCAT and Benchmark Data

---

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 # The percentage of SWD students achieving proficiency on FCAT reading will increase from 30% in 2011 to 65% in 2017. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	23%	42%	48%	53%	59%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black/African American students scoring at level three on above on FCAT reading will increase from 57% in 2012 to 65% in 2013. The percentage of White students scoring at level three on above on FCAT reading will increase from 75% in 2012 to 78% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 57% of Black/African American students scored at level three or above on FCAT reading. In 2012, 75% of White students scored at level three or above on FCAT reading.	In 2013, 65% of Black/African American students will score at level three or above on FCAT reading. In 2013, 78% of White students will score at level three or above on FCAT reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Struggling students have limited exposure to non-fiction reading.	Incorporate additional non-fiction reading into curriculum.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach	EDUsoft benchmark assessments, Houghton Mifflin Assessments, Study Island Reading Data	FCAT and Benchmark Data

---

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading will increase from 46% in 2012 to 54% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, the percentage of ELL students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT reading was 46%.	In 2013, the percentage of ELL students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT reading will be 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	The percentage of ELL students scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading and math has declined since 2010-2011.	Staff development on Common Lesson Planning will enable teachers to exchange ideas and strategies that help ELL students be successful.	Administration, CCT	Survey Staff Development Participants,Monitor academic achievement of ELL children	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of SWD students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT reading will increase from 23% in 2012 to 42% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 23% of SWD students scored at level three or above on FCAT reading.	In 2013, 42% of SWD students will score at level three or above on FCAT reading.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with disabilities need well planned curricula to ensure compliance with IEP goals.	PLC meetings will be refocused to emphasize long-range lesson plans and CCSS.	Administration, Team Leaders	Monitor PLC Meeting, Monitor students' academic progress	PLC Meeting minutes, FCAT and Benchmark results
2	Students are disproportionally classified as SWD.	Provide training on Response to Intervention to assist teachers in helping all students be academically successful.	CRT, Staffing Coordinators	Monitor staffing into ESE.	IEP's and Consent for Evaluations

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading will increase from 59% in 2012 to 63% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 59% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at level three or higher on the FCAT reading test.	In 2013, 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students will score at level three or higher on the FCAT reading test.

	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
	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students	New second grade Blackbelt Teachers will facilitate implementation	Administration, CRT	Monitor academic progress of economically disadvantaged students,	Lesson Plans,IObservation, FCAT Scores,

1	scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading and math has declined since 2010-2011.	of Common Core Standards to ensure that the academic needs of economically disadvantaged students are met.		Monitor lesson plans for CCSS implementation, Classroom Observations	Benchmark Scores

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
Differentiated instruction	K-5	Jamie Dozier	School-wide	Released pre-planning, follow-up in PLC meetings	Review lesson plans and observe classrooms	Administration, Teachers
Instructional Management System	K-5	Nathan Hay, Jayme Losch, Jamie Dozier	School-wide	Released pre-planning, follow-up in monthly PLC data meetings	Review analysis of student data	IMS Champions, Team Leaders
RtI and data tracking methods	K-5	Jennifer Dickmyer	School-wide	Monthly PLC data meetings	Review RtI documentation and student achievement data	Administration, Staffing Specialists
Study Island and Reading Eggs	K-5	Nathan Hay	School-wide	Released pre-planning, follow-up in PLC meetings	Review Study Island and Reading Eggs reports and student achievement data	Reading Coach, Technology Specialist
Including more non-fiction literature	K-5	Kevin Johnson, Stacy Yildiz, Jamie Dozier	School-wide	Monthly PLC data meetings	Review lesson plans and observe classrooms	Administration, Teachers
Offering more literature with increased text complexity	K-5	Nathan Hay, Jamie Dozier	School-wide	Monthly PLC data meetings	Review lesson plans and observe classrooms	Administration, Teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Accelerated Reader	This is a reading program that will be used to support children at all performance levels in grades 2-5	school budget	$7,486.65
Florida Ready (Reading portion)	This is a reading program that will be used to support children at all performance levels in grades 3-5	school budget	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $12,486.65
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading Eggs	This is a research-based reading program that will support students in all grades	school budget	$3,520.00
			Subtotal: $3,520.00
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: $16,006.65

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	For the 2012-2013 school year, 43% (49)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students will score proficient on the listening and speaking section of CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 40% (41)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students scored proficient on the listening and speaking section of CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students fail to perceive the ramifications of the CELLA test, and therefore underperform.	Have a conference with each student to discuss the importance of CELLA and help them to set goals.	Classroom Teacher and CCT	Monitor the goals set by the students	CELLA 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:	During the 2012-2013 school year, 34% (39)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students will score proficient on the reading section of CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 31% (32)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students scored proficient on the reading section of CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students fail to perceive the ramifications of the CELLA test, and	Have a conference with each student to discuss the importance of CELLA and help them to	Classroom Teacher and CCT	Monitor the goals set by the students	CELLA Test

therefore underperform.	set goals.			

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	For the 2012-2013 school year, 33% (39)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students will score proficient on the writing section of CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

During the 2011-2012 school year, 30% (31)of our kindergarten through fifth grade students scored proficient on the writing section of CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students fail to perceive the ramifications of the CELLA test, and therefore underperform.	Have a conference with each student to discuss the importance of CELLA and help them to set goals.	Classroom Teacher and CCT	Monitor the goals set by the students	CELLA Test

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	During the 2011- 2012, 30% (142)of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Math. Our school goal for the current year is to increase this by three percent to 33% (152) by utilizing our core program, EnVision, with fidelity, refining Study Island K-5 as a math supplement and providing tiered interventions to below level math students with continuous progress monitoring.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (142) of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Math.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase this by three percent to 33% (149) of 3rd through 5th grade students to score a level 3 on the FCAT Math Test.

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 total percentage of students scoring at level three and higher on FCAT has declined in reading, science, and math since 2010-2011.	Facilitate instruction specifically designed to increase performance of children projected to score at level 3 or higher through Lesson Study the Wolf Lake Way.	Administration, CRT, Team Leaders	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor academic progress of children projected to score at level 3 or higher to ensure FCAT learning gains.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	There is a lack of targeted small group instruction in math.	PLC's will conduct brainstorming sessions regarding enrichment activities. Implement tiered intervention through the RtI process, which will afford the students more time in math instruction.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT and Instructional Coach	Classroom Observations, PLC Meetings, Professional Development and Progress Monitoring	Benchmark and FCAT Data
3	The successful integration of Study Island will be a challenge due to lack of instructional time and computer resources.	Grade Level Teams will make use of the mobile lab and classroom computers and professional development in Study Island will be provided to the teachers.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT and Instructional Coach	Classroom observations, PLC Meetings and Professional Development	Benchmark and FCAT Data
4	The successful integration of new design questions from Dr. Marzano's The Art and Science of Teaching will be a challenge as these are new to our teachers and they will experience a learning curve.	Administration and District Personnel will provide information through professional development to the WLE faculty and staff on an on-going basis. Further, they will provide feedback on the integration of learning scales as an instructional tool.	Administration and District Personnel	Classroom observations using I-Observation from the Marzano Assessment System and progress monitoring	Benchmark, FCAT Data and teacher assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	

Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
not applicable	not applicable

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 44% (211) of Wolf Lake Elementary 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
44% (211) of Wolf Lake Elementary 3rd through 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math Test.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is for 47% (221) of 3rd through 5th grade students to score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math Test.

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 total percentage of students scoring at levels four and higher on FCAT has declined in reading, science, and math since 2010-2011.	Use Instructional Management System's technology to specifically target students projected to score at level four and higher on FCAT for enrichment activities.	Administration, Technology Coordinator, IMS Champions	Survey Staff Development Participants, Monitor the academic progress of children projected to score at level four or higher to ensure FCAT learning gains.	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	Students scoring at or above achievement level four need enhanced awareness of college and career options.	Have college awareness days and emphasize college credentials of guests speakers at Teach In.	Administration, Teach In Coordinator.	Track Teach In participation.	Sign In Sheet
3	There is a lack of focus on high achieving students.	Provide staff with professional development regarding Differentiated Instruction.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT and Instructional Coach	Classroom Observations, PLC Meetings and Professional Development.	Benchmark and FCAT Data
4	Some of our high ability students display a lack of motivation for maintaining their high scores.	Have students participate in individual goal setting activities, provide real world application of math skills and increase opportunities for individual practice on Study Island.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT, Enrichment Teacher, ESE Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Classroom Observations, PLC Meetings and progress monitoring tools.	Benchmark and FCAT Data

5	There is a lack of time and attention given to high achieving students in math.	Increase enrichment and maintenance opportunities for Level 4 and 5 students.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT, Enrichment Teacher, ESE Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Classroom Observations, PLC Meetings and progress monitoring tools	Benchmark and FCAT Data
6	High achieving math students need challenging enrichment activities.	Provide staff development in planning and implementing open-ended math activities.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT and Instructional Coach	Classroom Observations, PLC Meetings and progress monitoring tools	Benchmark and FCAT Data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 75% (228) of Wolf Lake Elementary students made learning gains on the FCAT Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (228) of Wolf Lake Elementary students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math Test.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is for 78% (237) of students to make learning gains on the FCAT Math Test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>There is a lack of time and resources for tiered interventions.</td><td>Grade Level PLCs will work together to discuss intervention methods and collaborate to provide extra support.</td><td>Administration, RtI Coach and Team Leaders</td><td>Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark results and Study Island data</td><td>Benchmark and FCAT Data</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>There is a lack of differentiated instruction occurring within classes for math.</td><td>Professional Development needs to occur for the area of math differentiation.</td><td>Administration and CRT</td><td>Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results, and Study Island Data</td><td>Benchmark and FCAT Data</td></tr>
</table>

| 3 | Students need additional organizational support to be successful in math | Professional development and materials will be provided for interactive math notebooks | Administration and CRT | Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results, and Study Island Data | Benchmark and FCAT Data |

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	During the 2011-2012 school year 61% (68) of Wolf Lake students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (68) of Wolf Lake Elementary students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math Test.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is for 64% (71) of students in the Lowest 25% to make learning gains on the FCAT Math Test.

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	There is a lack of differentiated instruction.	Provide professional development in differentiated instruction.	Administration and CRT	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results, and Study Island Data	Benchmark and FCAT Data
2	There is a shortage of time and resources for tiered interventions	Grade Level PLCs will work together to discuss intervention methods and collaborate to provide extra support.	Administration, RtI Coach and Team Leaders	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results and Study Island data	Benchmark and FCAT Data
3	Not enough time is spent on remedial math activities	Provide a math intervention specialist to provide diagnostic interventions for struggling math students	Administration and Intervention Specialist	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results and Study Island data	Benchmark and FCAT Data

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : The percentage of Black/African American students achieving proficiency in FCAT math has remained at 56% from 2011 to 2012. The percentage of students scoring at proficiency on FCAT math will increase to 78% by 2017.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black/ African American students scoring at level three or above on the FCAT math test will increase from 56% in 2012 to 63% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 56% of Black/African American students scored at level three or above on FCAT math.	In 2013, 63% of Black/African American students will score at level three or above on FCAT math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The percentage of Black students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT math has declined since 2010-2011.	Use more consistent vertical alignment of the curriculum to ensure that no gaps in content prevent students with disabilities from being successful.	Administration, Staffing Coordinators, CRT	Monitor academic progress of students.	FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores.
2	Not enough time is spent in remedial math activities.	An intervention specialist will work with targeted students in math intervention groups several times per week.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Intervention Specialist	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results, and Study Island Data	Benchmark and FCAT Data
3	There is a lack of time and resources for tiered interventions in math.	Grade Level PLCs will work together to discuss intervention methods.	Administration, RtI Coach and Team Leaders	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results and Study Island	Benchmark and FCAT Data
4	There is a lack of differentiated instruction occurring in math.	Conduct professional development in the area of differentiated instruction.	Administration and CRT	Classroom Observations, Edusoft Benchmark Results, and Study Island Data	Benchmark and FCAT Data

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 61% (25) of ELL students at Wolf Lake Elementary scored at level three or above in FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (25) of ELL students at Wolf Lake Elementary scored at level three or above on FCAT math.	For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of ELL students at Wolf Lake Elementary scoring at level three or above will increase to 64% (28).

	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 percentage of ELL students scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading and math has declined since 2010-2011.	Staff development on Common Lesson Planning will enable teachers to exchange ideas and strategies that help ELL students be successful.	Administration, CCT	Survey Staff Development Participants,Monitor academic achievement of ELL children	Staff Development Survey, FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The percentage of SWD students scoring at level three or above on FCAT math will increase from 26% in 2012 to 38% in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, the percentage of SWD students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT math was 26%.	In 2013, the percentage of SWD students scoring at level three or higher on FCAT math will be 38%.

	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 with disabilities need well planned curricula to ensure compliance with IEP goals.	PLC meetings will be refocused to emphasize long-range lesson plans and CCSS.	Administration, Team Leaders	Monitor PLC Meeting, Monitor students' academic progress	PLC Meeting minutes, FCAT and Benchmark results
2	Students are disproportionally classified as SWD.	Provide training on Response to Intervention to assist teachers in helping all students be academically successful.	CRT, Staffing Coordinators	Monitor staffing into ESE.	IEP's and Consent for Evaluations

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 63% of economically disadvantaged students scored at level three or above at Wolf Lake Elementary on FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% of economically disadvantaged students at Wolf Lake Elementary scored at level three or higher on FCAT math in 2011-2012.	For the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring at level three or higher will increase to 64%.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students	New second grade Blackbelt Teachers will facilitate implementation	Administration, CRT	Monitor academic progress of economically disadvantaged students,	Lesson Plans,IObservation, FCAT Scores,

1	scoring at level three or above on FCAT reading and math has declined since 2010-2011.	of Common Core Standards to ensure that the academic needs of economically disadvantaged students are met.		Monitor lesson plans for CCSS implementation, Classroom Observations	Benchmark Scores

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
Interactive math notebooks	K-5, Math	CRT, Math Lab Teacher	All teachers grade K-5	Introduce in preplanning and refine in monthly PLC meetings	Monitor lesson plans, Classroom observations, Student achievement data	Administration, CRT, Math Coach
Math Common Core	K-2, Math	CRT, Math Lab Teacher, CC Black Belts	All teachers grade K-2	Introduce in preplanning and refine in monthly PLC meetings	Monitor lesson plans, Classroom observations, Student achievement data	Administration, CRT, Math Coach
Differentiated Instruction	K-5, Math	CRT, Math Lab Teacher	All teachers grade K-5	Introduce in preplanning and refine in monthly PLC meetings	Monitor lesson plans, Classroom observations, Student achievement data	Administration, CRT, Math Coach
Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching	K-5, Math	Administration and district personnel	All teachers grade K-5	Introduce in preplanning and refine in monthly staff meetings	Monitor lesson plans, Classroom observations, Student achievement data	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Florida Ready	Research-based materials to assist students in achieving and exceeding math proficiency	School Budget	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Study Island	Research-based materials to assist students in achieving and exceeding math proficiency	School Budget	$1,700.00
			Subtotal: $1,700.00
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: $6,700.00

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2012, 33% (58)of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Science. Our school goal for the current year is to increase this by six percent to 36% (63). We will accomplish this by intensifying our focus on science terminology, incorporating the use of interactive science notebooks for reflection, and providing opportunities for on-going hands-on science lessons.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (58)of eligible students scored Level 3 on FCAT Science during the 2011-2012 school year.	36% (63) of eligible students will score Level 3 on FCAT Science during the 2012-2013 school year.

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	Children lack exposure to science terminology and are often unfamiliar with scientific terms referenced on the FCAT.	All classroom teachers will incorporate an interactive science notebook with a vocabulary component.	Classroom teachers, Administration, Curriculum Resource Teacher	Administrative observation, review of student achievement data.	FCAT Data
2	Children lack exposure to informational text which impedes their success on FCAT science.	There will be a concentrated effort to increase exposure to informational text across curriculum areas.	Classroom Teachers, Administration, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Reading Coach	Administrative observations, checking of lesson plans, PLC visits for team planning, and Unit Tests	FCAT Data
3	Due to increased time spent on reading and math instruction, along with layered intervention time, teachers often have science take a "back seat" and time spent on this curriculum area is insufficient.	There will be a concentrated effort to ensure that science instruction is complete and thorough, and 5th grade will also incorporate the use of Study Island Science to support their instruction and provide more time in this content area.	Classroom Teachers, Adminstration, Curriculum Resource Techer, Reading Coach	Administrative observations, lab visits, review of Study Island usage reports, and Unit Tests	FCAT Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	not applicable
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	During the 2011-12 school year, 20%(35)of eligible students scored Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science. We will increase this percentage to 23% (40) this school year by providing more time for students to spend in reflective activities after hands-on sessions, integrating science into other subject areas, increasing exposure to science terminology and utilizing Study Island Science with our fifth grade students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (35) of eligible students scored level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science during the 2011-2012 school year.	23% (40) of eligible students will score level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science during the 2012-2013 school year.

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	Children lack exposure to science terminology and are often unfamiliar with scientific terms referenced on the FCAT. Further, they often struggle with articulating their learning after a hands-on learning opportunity.	All classroom teachers will incorporate an interactive science notebook with a vocabulary component to develop scientfic vocabulary in students. Students will reflect on their learning after hands-on lessons.	Classroom teachers, Administration, Curriculum Resource Teacher	Administrative observation of classroom word walls and notebooks.	FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores
2	Due to increased time spent on reading and math instruction, along with layered intervention time, teachers often have science take a "back seat" and time spent on this curriculum area is insufficient.	There will be a concentrated effort to ensure that science instruction is complete and thorough, and integrated into other subject areas, such as Reading and Math. 5th grade will also incorporate the use of Study Island Science to support their instruction and provide more time in this content area.	Classroom Teachers, Adminstration, Curriculum Resource Techer, Reading Coach	Administrative observations, lab visits, review of Study Island usage reports	FCAT Scores, Benchmark Scores

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.	not applicable

Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not applicable	not applicable

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
Study Island	K-5, Science	Study Island Lead Teacher	K-5 teachers	Monthly PLC Meetings	Review Study Island usage reports, Science benchmark scores	Administration, Reading Coach
Interactive notebooks	K-5, Science	Science Lab Teacher	K-5 teachers	Initiate in preplanning, refine in quarterly PLC meetings	Science benchmark and FCAT scores	Administration

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
Study Island	Online program that teaches and quizzes science skills and standards	School budget	$1,700.00
		Subtotal: $1,700.00	
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: $1,700.00

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In 2012, 87% (138) of eligible students taking the FCAT Writing Assessment scored level 3 or higher. During the 2013 school year, we would like to increase this to 90% (142) by focusing on elaboration and supporting details, providing writing feedback to students and facilitating collaboration of teachers to merge best practices and strategies from the many trainings they have attended.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 87% (138) of eligible students scored level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing assessment.	In 2013, 90% (142) of eligible students will score level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing assessment.

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 may lack the writing skills necessary to elaborate on their thoughts and edit their writing.	Teacher will provide numerous opportunities for students to view high-scoring sample pieces, critique their work and the work of others, and be provided with feedback on their writing.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	Classroom Observations, lesson plan review, PLC meeting attendance, practice writing prompts	Classroom writing prompts and FCAT Data
2	Some teachers have participated in numerous writing workshops and have many successful strategies in their toolbox. Other teachers have had limited writing workshops and need to expand their strategies.	PLC's will be used for teacher sharing of best practices so that the highest yield strategies from all trainings can be merged successfully.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	PLC Collaboration, classroom observations, lesson plan review, Practice Writing Prompts	Classroom writing prompts and FCAT Data
3	Students may lack the writing skills necessary to elaborate on their thoughts and edit their writing.	Investigate the possible implementation of the Empowering Writers program.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	PLC Collaboration, classroom observations, lesson plan review, Practice Writing Prompts	Classroom writing prompts and FCAT Data
4	Integration of writing into the content area will enable students to become better writers.	Use critical thinking to integrate the writing process into other content areas.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	PLC Collaboration, classroom observations, lesson plan review, Practice Writing Prompts	Classroom writing prompts and FCAT Data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Not applicable

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not applicable	Not applicable

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
Writing in the content area	K-5, Writing	CRT	Teachers grades K-5	Begin in September, continue each semester	Observation conference, Classroom observations	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	By June 2013, the average daily attendance rate will increase by .35%. We will accomplish this by proactively addressing attendance issues in their early stages.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
In June 2012,the average daily attendance rate at Wolf Lake Elementary was 96.15% (1150).	By June 2013, the expected average daily attendance rate at Wolf Lake Elementary will be 96.5% (1054) or higher.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In June 2012, 24% of students (288) had excessive absences (10 or more) at Wolf Lake Elementary.	By June 2013, the expected number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) will be 19% (218) or lower at Wolf Lake ES.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In June 2012,10% of students (117) had excessive tardies (10 or more) at Wolf Lake Elementary.	By June 2013, the expected number of students with excessive tardies (ten or more) will be 5% (75) or lower at Wolf Lake Elementary.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of connnection with the academic and social environment.	Students will participate in a peer mentoring program. Junior Addition Mentors will be assigned to each of the students.	Administration, Classroom Teachers and Registrar.	Attendance monitoring by Classroom Teachers, Registrar, Dean and Adminstration.	Educational Data Warehouse attendance data for school year 2012-2013.
2	Students have not ascertained the value of a quality education.	Students will receive extrinsic incentives to bolster their motivation to attend school regularly.	Administration, Classroom Teachers and Registrar.	Attendance monitoring by Classroom Teachers, Registrar, Dean and Adminstration.	Educational Data Warehouse attendance data for school year 2012-2013.

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 Policy Review,					Monthly	

Attendance Child Study Team Meeting Procedures.	Classroom Teachers	Dean and Administration	PLC's grades K-5	September 2012	attendance data review by Dean and Registrar.	Dean, Registrar

---

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year, Wolf fLake Elementary will reduce its total suspension rate by 1%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
During the 2011-2012 at Wolf Lake ES, there were 98 in-school suspensions.	Wolf Lake staff will reduce the number of in-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year to 80.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
During the 2011-2012 at Wolf Lake ES, 54 students served in-school suspensions.	Wolf Lake staff will reduce the number of students serving in-school suspension for the 2012-2013 school year to 47 students.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
During the 2011-2012 at Wolf Lake ES, there were 34 out-of-school suspensions.	Wolf Lake staff will reduce the number of out-of-school suspensions during the 2012-2013 school year to 31.

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
During the 2011-2012 at Wolf Lake ES, 34 students served out-of-school suspensions.	Wolf Lake staff will reduce the number of students serving out-of-school suspension for the 2012-2013 school year to 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	Novice teachers are not incorporating de-escalation techniques into their classroom managment plan.	RTI leadership team will provide mentoring and coaching of behavioral techniques in the classroom, as well as "RtI for Behavioral Concerns" Staff Development.	RTI Behavioral Leadership Team, Administration, Teachers and Dean	Administrative walk throughs,classroom observations and monitoring the number of referrals written per teacher.	Educational Data Warehouse Suspension Data-End of Year Summary.
2	"Repeat Offenders" aren't learning from their mistakes and are often referred over and over again.	The "Repeat Offenders" will be referred to the Starfish Mentoring Program so they can build a one-on-one relationship with an adult mentor who will guide them toward more appropriate behaviors.	RTI Behavioral Leadership Team, Administration, Teachers and Dean	The Discipline Referrals will be monitored throughout the year.	Educational Data Warehouse Suspension Data-End of Year Summary.
3	Alternatives to suspensions are needed to reduce loss of instructional time.	Utilize an Alternative Class Assignment, Work Detail, and in some cases an Individualized Behavior Plan in lieu of suspensions.	RTI Behavioral Leadership Team, Administration, Teachers and Dean	Provide monitoring of referrals and ISS log.	Educational Data Warehouse Suspension Data-End of Year Summary.
4	Parents need education in the area of managing their children's character conduct at home and supporting the school's efforts.	Provide a Parent Night using Becky Bailey strategies for organizing discipline strategies.	Administration and Selected Teachers	The Discipline Referrals will be monitored throughout the year.	Educational Data Warehouse Suspension Data-End of Year Summary.

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
Conduct Behavioral Response to Intervention Training for all staff.	All teachers and Classroom Paras	Behavioral Leadership Team	All Teachers and Classroom Paras	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs, Observation, Meetings with Mentors, Monitoring of referrals	Administration, Dean

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement **Parent Involvement Goal #1:** **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	During the 2011-2012 school year, 92.8% (1020)of Wolf Lake Elementary School parents/guardians participated in at least one school event. The goal for this year is to increase this number to 95% (1041).
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	**2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:**
During the 2011-2012 school year, 92.8% (1020)of parents/guardians participated in at least one school event.	During the 2012-2013 school year, the percentage of parents/guardians participating in one school event or more will increase to 95% (1041).

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	A small number of our families are disconnected to school and are disinterested in participating in school activities and conferences.	All teachers and the administration will make a concentrated effort to ensure that every child's parent attends and participates in at least one school event (Meet the Teacher, Open House, Report Card Conference Night, PTA events, etc...) Teachers will email, send newsletters and personally call those who are typically	Classroom Teachers, Administration.	Parent Contact Notebooks will be used to track parental participation. Adminstration will collect and review periodically.	End of year Parent Participation Survey with teachers.

		uninvolved to request their participation.			
2	As measured by the FLKRS Kindergarten readiness test, 56% (96) of children enter Wolf Lake Ready for school.	Parent will attend training to learn how to best prepare their children for Kindergarten.	Pre-K teachers.	The percentage of children ready to enter Kindergarten will increase to 59% (101).	FLKRS

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM	Students will become well-rounded 21st century learners

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

STEM Goal #1: through increased problem-based learning in all content areas using STEM projects monthly.

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 struggle with their problem solving abilities.	1. Professional Development (offered here at school by Shannon Blake) and in depth Professional Development for kindergarten teachers in the North Learning Community organized by Mariel Milano, the district's STEM teacher. 2. Teachers will implement the monthly design challenges and meet the criteria and constraints given in the challenge	1. Administration 2. CRT 3. Teachers-monitoring students' progress	Assess at the end of each project through observation	1. Individual Design Challenge Scales 2. Abridged Developmental Block Play Scale

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
Science, Technology, Engineering and Math lessons and activities.	Kindergarten	Ms. Blake, Ms. Schultz, Ms. Ussrey	Kindergarten Professional Learning Committee	District Inservice during Preplanning	Monthly follow up in PLC Meetings	Administration, Team Leaders

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)

Our 5th graders will become fluent in math operations.

Goal:

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:	
1. Our 5th graders will become fluent in math operations. Goal Our 5th graders will become fluent in math operations. Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year, 70% (122)of 5th grade students scored a Level 3 and above on FCAT Math. Our school goal for the current year is to increase this by three percent by utilizing our core program, EnVision with fidelity, refining Study Island K-5 as a math supplement and providing tiered interventions to below level math students with continuous progress monitoring.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
During the 2011-2012 school year, 70% (122) of 5th grade students scored a Level 3 and above on FCAT Math.	During the 2012-2013 school year, 73% of 5th grade students will score a Level 3 and above on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to improve their basic math skills to master 5th grade student benchmarks.	Teachers will differentiate classroom instruction to meet individual student needs. Teachers will be trained to use Study Island into their classroom curriculum.	Classroom Teachers and Administration	Edusoft Benchmark results and Envision Math Assessments	FCAT Math Test
2	There is a lack of targeted small group instruction in math.	Teachers will receive on going professional development in differentiated instruction.	Classroom Teachers and CRT	Classroom observations and walkthroughs	Formal Observations
3	The successful integration of Study Island will be a challenge due to lack of instructional time and computer resources.	Grade Level Teams will make use of the mobile lab and classroom computers and professional development in Study Island will be provided to the teachers.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, CRT and Instructional Coach	Classroom observations, PLC Meetings and Professional Development	Benchmark and FCAT Data
4	There is a lack of targeted small group instruction in math.	Math intervention groups will be provided in grades 3, 4, and 5.	Classroom Teachers and Administration	Edusoft Benchmark results and Envision Math Assessments	FCAT Math Test

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated instruction	5, Math	Math Coordinator	Fifth grade PLC	Quarterly at PLC meetings	Monitor student progress with benchmark and FCAT scores	Administration, classroom teachers

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 Our 5th graders will become fluent in math operations.

Goal(s)

Read on grade level by age nine Goal:

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:	
1. Read on grade level by age nine Goal Read on grade level by age nine Goal #1:	In 2012 67% (117)of eligible 3rd grade students scored Level 3 and above on FCAT Reading. Our school goal for the current year is to increase this by three percent by utilizing our core program, Houghton Mifflin with fidelity, refining Study Island K-5 as a reading supplement and providing tiered interventions to below level readers with continuous progress monitoring.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
67% (117)of 3rd grade students scored Level 3 or above on FCAT Reading.	70% (122) of 3rd grade students will score Level 3 or above on FCAT Reading.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

1	Struggling readers lack the comprehension strategies necessary for attainment of Level 3 on FCAT.	Implement Study Island, K-5, as an academic support tool, which will utilize technology assisted instruction to increase reading comprehension strategies.	Administration, Classroom Teachers and Reading Coach	Review Study Island Data Reports monthly and comparative Benchmark and FAIR assessments.	Benchmark and FCAT Data
2	Struggling readers make progress, but at a slower rate than their successful peers, hence widening their achievement gap.	Implement tiered intervention through the RtI process which will afford the students more time in reading instruction.	Administration, Classroom Teachers and Instruction Coach.	Progress monitoring, weekly and monthly, of at risk students; Administration and Intervention Specialist participation in PLC Data Meetings, Data Analysis and Classroom Observations.	Benchmark and FCAT Data
3	Struggling readers need targeted interventions to help them become successful.	Provide reading intervention groups for tier three children in grades three and four.	Administration and Reading Coach	Review Benchmark results	Benchmark and FCAT Data

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
Accelerated Reader	2-4 Reading	Reading Coach, Media Specialist	PLC's in grades 2-4	Begin training in preplanning, refine quarterly	Review student achievement data	AR, benchmark and FCAT assessments
Reading Eggs	K-4, Reading	Reading Coach	PLC's in grades K-4	Begin training in preplanning, refine quarterly	Review student achievement data	Fair, benchmark and FCAT assessments

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

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Accelerated Reader	This is a reading program that will be used to support children at all performance levels in grades 2-5	school budget	$7,486.65
Reading	Florida Ready (Reading portion)	This is a reading program that will be used to support children at all performance levels in grades 3-5	school budget	$5,000.00
CELLA	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
Mathematics	Florida Ready	Research-based materials to assist students in achieving and exceeding math proficiency	School Budget	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $17,486.65

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading Eggs	This is a research-based reading program that will support students in all grades	school budget	$3,520.00
CELLA	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
Mathematics	Study Island	Research-based materials to assist students in achieving and exceeding math proficiency	School Budget	$1,700.00
Science	Study Island	Online program that teaches and quizzes science skills and standards	School budget	$1,700.00
				Subtotal: $6,920.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $24,406.65

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j□ Priority	j□ Focus	j□ Prevent	j□ NA

Are you a reward school: j□ Yes j□ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

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
Ninety percent will be used for staff bonuses and 10% will be used for student programs.	$80,000.00

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

The SAC will develop and implement a survey to establish the degree of school effectiveness perceived by the stakeholders of Wolf Lake Elementary School. The SAC will also review and suggest changes for the 2013-14 School Improvement Plan by examining each section of the plan and adjusting according to student data and input from staff, parents, and the community.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Orange School District
WOLF LAKE ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	85%	82%	60%	315	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	71%	63%			134	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	70% (YES)	53% (YES)			123	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					572	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Orange School District
WOLF LAKE ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	86%	88%	62%	319	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	67%	60%			127	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	47% (NO)			111	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					557	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested