FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GLORIA FLOYD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Todd Morrow

SAC Chair: Angelina Gul

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Todd Morrow	Masters of Science in Education with an emphasis in Reading Educational Leadership and Supervision Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education	1	11	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades C D C C A High Standards – Rdg 35% 55% 62% 63% 82% High Standards - Math 40% 51% 62% 59% 86% Lrng Gains-Rdg 70% 57% 53% 53% 74% Lrng Gains-Math 70% 48% 64% 64% 75% Gains-R-25 76% 47% 46% 46% 66% Gains-M-25 67% 50% 66% 66% 71%
Assis Principal	Maria Valerio	Elem. Ed, Gifted Ed Leadership	2	8	12 11 10 09 08 School Grades A B A D D High Standards – Rdg 69% 77% 69% 46% 47% High Standards - Math 72% 76% 67% 49% 47% Lrng Gains-Rdg 72% 62% 70% 58% 51% Lrng Gains-Math 68% 61% 57% 61% 47% Gains-R-25 79% 53% 66% 58% 53%

Gains-M-25 75% 60% 69% 54% 57%

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)
NA	NA	NA			

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	August 16, 2012, October 26, 2012, February 1, 2013	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	August 16, 2012	
3	3. Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	August 9, 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
4 teachers out of field 0 teachers less than effective	Assist teachers with obtaining Endorsement Courses through M-DCPS Office of Professional Development.

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
50	0.0%(0)	14.0%(7)	48.0%(24)	34.0%(17)	40.0%(20)	100.0%(50)	4.0%(2)	8.0%(4)	72.0%(36)

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
NA	NA	NA	NA

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS/RtI Leadership Team consists of the department chairperson and classroom teachers and will include additional personnel as resources to the team based on specific problems or concerns such as:

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Assistant Principals: Participate in interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.
Grade Level Chairs (Pre-K/K-5th): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, collaboration, and goal setting.
Reading Liaison, Mathematics and Science Liaisons:
Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Counselors/Psychologists: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, counselors continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. They monitor the RtI process, collaborate with teachers, and attend or conduct meetings with parents to review data and discuss educational strategies for intervention/remediation.

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 Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS Team will meet on a monthly basis to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring. The team will function to systematically examine available data with the goal of increasing student achievement.

The Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS/RtI Team will use increasingly more intense instruction and interventions in proportion to the student needs. Below are some of the levels of support:
• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavior supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instruction and/or behavioral support.
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 Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS Team will meet on a monthly basis to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring. The team will function to systematically examine available data with the goal of increasing student achievement.

The Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS/RtI Team will use increasingly more intense instruction and interventions in proportion to the student needs. Below are some of the levels of support:
• The first level of support is the core instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices, and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum.
• The second level of support consists of supplemental instruction and interventions that are provided in addition to and in alignment with effective core instruction and behavior supports to groups of targeted students who need additional instruction and/or behavioral support.
• The third level of support consists of intensive instructional and/or behavioral interventions provided in addition to and in

alignment with effective core instruction and the supplemental instruction and interventions with the goal of increasing an individual's rate of progress academically and/or behaviorally.

There will be an ongoing evaluation method established for services at each tier to monitor the effectiveness of meeting school goals and student growth as measured by benchmark and progress monitoring data.

Describe 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 Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic goals through data gathering and data analysis and provide feedback to the School Advisory Council during the development of the SIP. The Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention. The Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The Gloria Floyd Elementary MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will use data to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students in order to adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students, adjust the allocation of school-based resources, drive decisions regarding targeted professional development, and identify and implement interventions for targeted students.
Managed data will include:
Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FAIR, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FCAT 2.0 Simulation, District Interim Assessment, Monitor Behavior through SCM/Cognos, detentions, teacher referrals, attendance
Midyear: District mid-year assessment, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
End of year: FAIR, Interim Assessments, FCAT 2.0, CELLA

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff members of Gloria Floyd Elementary School have been strongly encouraged to enroll in and the online RtI course offered by the State of Florida, Department of Education, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (www.florida-rti.org) Follow up trainings will be offered to all staff members during the 2012-2013 school year at staff meetings and grade level meetings. Finally, the RtI team will evaluate additional staff PD needs during monthly RtI Leadership Team meetings.
The RtI Team will facilitate coordinate data analysis meetings with teachers on an individual and group basis, as needed, to review intervention placement and participation. Fidelity of intervention programs and student progress expectations will be reviewed. Weekly grade-level meetings will facilitate the discussion of student achievement, intervention progress and curriculum concerns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Monthly meetings with grade levels will facilitate discussion of student achievement on a regular, on-going basis. The Leadership Team will: monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis, monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention, and will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Gloria Floyd Elementary Literacy Leadership Team is composed of:
Todd Morrow, Principal
Maria Valerio, Assistant Principal
Angelina Gul, Primary Reading Liaison
Jackie Costa- Intermediate Reading Liaison
Nicole Gonzalez, Math Liaison
Jorge Manzur, Science Liaison

Brenda Williams, Media Specialist
Cornelius Hines, UTD Steward
Rosa Bendezu, SPED Teacher
Cornelius Hines, UTD Steward
Rosa Bendezu, SPED Teacher

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

The purpose of the Gloria Floyd Elementary LLT is to share best reading practices and build capacity of reading knowledge throughout the school. The LLT will meet on a monthly basis to address the school's literacy concerns. The The purpose of the Gloria Floyd Elementary LLT is to share best reading practices and build capacity of reading knowledge throughout the school. The LLT will meet on a monthly basis to address the school's literacy concerns. The team will analyze data and look for data trends. They will review student achievement and adjust curriculum and provide strategies for differentiated instruction. Furthermore, the LLT will drive decisions regarding targeted professional development and create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions. The focus will be on developing and implementing instructional routines that use complex text and incorporate text dependent questions. Multi-disciplinary teams will develop lessons that provide students with opportunities for research and incorporate writing throughout.

• Todd Morrow, Principal will monitor and assess data from monthly assessments.
• Maria Valerio, Assistant Principal, will monitor and assess data as well as conduct walk through visitations.
• Angelina Gul, Reading Liaison, will provide support as well as monitor intervention groups. The Reading Liaison will also conduct grade level collaborative planning sessions to assist teachers in differentiated instruction strategies.
• Nicole Gonzalez will analyze data, facilitate math professional development. Suggest writing strategies and resources.
• Brenda Williams, Media Specialist will provide literature and literacy resources to Language Arts teachers.
• Cornelius Hines, UTD Steward will insure instruction meets all requirements of the UTD contract.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will create a reading goal, specific objectives and strategies in the School Improvement Plan that will increase reading achievement in all subgroups in order to meet the goals of the Annual Measurable Objectives. The LLT will participate in the analysis of student data and interpret various reports that drive instructional implications across the curriculum. In addition, the LLT will encourage students to participate in several reading activities including: book clubs, literacy clubs, book fairs, Accelerated Reader, reading Plus and reading contests. The team will work collaboratively with teachers to identify and provide targeted, customized professional development in alignment with progress monitoring data. The reading coach (if assigned) will work with the Reading Leadership Team to guarantee fidelity of implementation of the K-12 CRRP.

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.

NA

*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.

NA

*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?

NA

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?

NA

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>

NA

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011 – 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicates that 33% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 38%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (95)	38% (108)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application Reporting Category 4: Informational Text / Research Process.	Utilize grade-level appropriate texts that include identifying author's purpose, making inferences, drawing conclusions, returning to text as support for answers, analyzing stated vs. implied main ideas, using graphic organizers to analyze text, interacting with text, understanding text structures and summarizing text.	Administrators, Reading Liaison, and the Literacy Leadership Team.	Following the FCIM, the reading Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The second area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Literary Analysis	Emphasize reading strategies that help students determine elements of story structure, and character development. Reading teachers will use story maps, narrative arch, and character charts to reinforce concepts.	Administrators, Reading Liaison , and the Literacy Leadership Team	Ongoing quarterly monitoring and assessments will be implemented focusing on story structure, and use of literacy devices and figurative language. Students will be grouped according targeted benchmarks and areas of need.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT Reading Test indicate that 18% of students scored at levels 4, 5, and 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 23%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

18% (2)		23% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment Reading test, students scoring level 4, 5, or 6 decreased from 23% to 18%, a decrease of 5 percentage points from the 2011 administration to the 2012 administration of the FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT. Exposure to appropriate resources and materials for Access Points is limited.	Utilize Unique Learning software to increase student awareness of Access Points by using Read-Alouds, tapes, and text readers to provide print with visuals and symbols.	Administration and SPED Department Chairperson	Department Chair will meet monthly with teachers to analyze current data reports generated through the Unique Learning program.	Formative: Teacher-made tests; monthly software progress report Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011 – 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 33% of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the by 2 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (95)	35% (100)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary	Provide enrichment in reading strategies that help students determine the meaning of words by using rich text. Reading teachers will reinforce concepts such as multiple meanings of words by using word arrays, and concept maps. Students will use sentence and word context to determine meaning through a variety of genres.	Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Following the FCIM model, the reading Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	FORMATIVE: In-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, FAIR/Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN) SUMMATIVE: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results.
2	2a.2. The second area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text /	The second area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text / Research Process.	Administration, Literacy Leadership Team	Following the FCIM model, the reading Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and	FORMATIVE: In-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, FAIR/Progress Monitoring Reporting Network

| | | | | make recommendations based on needs assessment | (PMRN)

SUMMATIVE: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results. |

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Reading Goal #2b: Based on the results of the 2012 Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading, 36% of students scored at or above Levels 7 in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (4)	39% (4)

<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	As noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment Reading test, students scoring level 7, 8, or 9 decreased from 54% to 36% , an 18% decrease from the 2011 administration to the 2012 administration of the FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT. Students' exposure to appropriate resources and materials for Access Points is limited.	Utilize Unique Learning software to increase student awareness of Access Points by improving comprehension via reading selections that are taught at a level that is high interest and low readability. Students will have continuous practice when learning reading concepts.	Administration and SPED Department Chairperson	Department Chair will meet monthly with teachers to analyze current data reports generated through the Unique Learning program.	Formative: Teacher-made tests; monthly software progress report Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 73% of students made learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading by 5 percentage points to 78%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (126)	78% (134)

<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
	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012	Using mentor text, provide opportunities for	Administration, Literacy Leadership	Following the FCIM model, the reading	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher

1	administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application	students to identify author's purpose in text, and determine how the author's perspective influences text. Help students understand the main idea or the message by using two column notes and main idea tables. Use common themes in literature to help students distinguish between theme and topic.	Team	Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

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

<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	Students are in need of additional interventions and basic materials in order to master Access Points at students' independent level.	Teacher will organize lessons according to student level and individual needs. Utilize Unique Learning software to increase student awareness of Access Points in order to increase learning gains.	SPED Chairperson and Administration	Department Chair will meet monthly with teachers to analyze current data reports generated through the Unique Learning program.	Formative: Teacher-made tests; monthly software progress report Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that -79% of the Lowest 25%tile students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Lowest 25%students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 84%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (36)	84% (38)

<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 area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application.	Implement differentiated instruction for individual students based on baseline and interim assessments. Utilize Success-Maker Reading 5 times per week to increase skills. The school will provide in-house tutoring for targeted students on a daily basis using the Voyager Intervention program.	Administration Literacy Leadership team	Following the FCIM model, the reading Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

---

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :	Following a data analysis of the AMO SIP Targets, our goal is to increase the proportion of students scoring at levels 3 and above thereby reducing the proportion of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 by 50% over six years using the

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71	73	76	79	81	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that ¬66% of the Hispanic subgroup ,65% of the Black subgroup and 82% of the Asian subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student performance by 7 percentage points to 73% for the Hispanic subgroup and 4 percentage points to 69% for the Black subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black:65% (36) Hispanic:66% (121) Asian:82% (9) American Indian: NA	White: NA Black:69% (38) Hispanic:73% (134) Asian:93% (10) American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application Hispanic: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis Asian: The area of deficiency as noted on	Black: Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that provide students with practice in identifying author's purpose and main idea. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts Hispanic/Asian: Teachers will provide a variety of	Administration Literacy Leadership team	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis	instructional strategies that provide students with practice in identifying and interpreting elements of story structure within a text, They will use mentor text to illustrate how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors and personification.			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that ¬¬60% of the English Language Learner subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student performance by 7 percentage points to 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (22)	67% (24)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 1: Vocabulary	Students will be homogenously grouped according to their ELL/ESOL levels. Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that will help students focus on key vocabulary by using word banks, vocabulary notebooks, and dictionaries.	RtI/MTSS Team	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 45% of the Students With Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student performance by 14 percentage points to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45%(17)	59% (22)

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 Administration of the FCAT 2.0 reading test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application	Instructional techniques will be aligned to each student's Individual Educational Plan. Targeted students will utilize the Voyager Intervention program. Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that provide students with practice in identifying author's purpose and main idea. Students must be familiar with text structures such as cause/effect, compare/contrast, and chronological order. Provide practice in identifying topics and themes within texts.	Administration Literacy Leadership team	Following the FCIM model, ongoing monitoring of data reports generated through Edusoft will be used to monitor student progress, and adjust intervention as needed.	Formative: FAIR, weekly teacher generated assessments, computer assisted reports from FCAT 2.0 Explorer, Success Maker, and District Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 64% of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student performance by 4 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (124)	68% (132)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2: Reading Application	Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that provide students with practice in identifying causal relationships embedded in text. They will be provided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions within and across texts.	Administration Literacy Leadership team	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	FORMATIVE: In-house assessments, reports generated from Successmaker and/or Reading Plus, Ellis Learning, District Interim Assessments, FAIR/Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN) SUMMATIVE: 2013 FCAT 2.0 results.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	3rd grade/ 4th grade	Dominguez/ Walker	3rd grade team/ 4th grade team	August 16, 2012 and October 2012	Monitor Lesson plans	Reading Liaison

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
In-house tutoring	Hourly Teachers for daily tutoring	EESAC	$750.00
			Subtotal: $750.00
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: $750.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	Results of the 2011-2012 CELLA indicate that 57% are proficient in Listening/Speaking. Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of proficient students by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
57% (91)	

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
	Following a data analysis of the 2011-	Using the Language Experience Approach	Administration ESOL Chairperson	ESOL grades, LEP Committee meetings.	FORMATIVE: In-house

					assessments, reports generated from Successmaker and/or Reading Plus, Ellis Learning, District Interim Assessments, FAIR/Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN)
1	2012 CELLA results, the students need meaningful language practice and modeling to become proficient in listening/speaking in English.	(LEA) teachers will have students produce language in response to first hand, multi sensorial experiences by using the 8-Step LEA approach in the classroom.			
					SUMMATIVE: 2013 CELLA results.

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:	Results of the 2011-2012 CELLA indicate that 31% are proficient in Reading. Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of proficient students by 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
31% (49)	

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	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 CELLA results, the students have difficulty comprehending due to limited vocabulary acquisition.	Emphasizing key vocabulary along with providing sufficient review and reinforcement of current vocabulary. In addition, strategies such as checking for synonyms, antonyms, as well as other context clues for word meanings.	ESOL Chairperson, Administration	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	FORMATIVE: In-house assessments, reports generated from Successmaker and/or Reading Plus, Ellis Learning, District Interim Assessments, FAIR/Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN) SUMMATIVE: 2013 CELLA results.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Results of the 2011-2012 CELLA indicate that 38% are proficient in Writing. Our goal for 2012-2013 is to increase the number of proficient students by 1 percentage point.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
38%(60)	

	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	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 CELLA results, the students need to increase their score in the Writing category because they need exposure to summarizing and grammar.	Writing prompts may will be used effectively by the teacher of ELLs to give students ideas that will motivate them into the process of writing. This in turn will allow students to see writing as an ongoing process involving several steps such as: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing.	ESOL Chairperson, Administration	ESOL/Reading grades, LEP Committee meetings.	Formative: Monthly writing prompts, Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 36% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 students proficiency by 3 percentage points to 39%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (102)	39% (111)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	According to the results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment, the area of greatest difficulty for students in grades 3 through 5 was Number Operations.	Teachers will plan differentiated instruction activities utilizing manipulatives to introduce concepts through discovery and demonstrate understanding of concepts taught. Determine instructional needs by reviewing assessment data and provide teacher training in analyzing data. Provide time during grade level & department meetings to share best practices and reflect on additional needs.	Administrators Math Liaison Grade level/department chairpersons	Following the FCIM model, Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	The results of the 2012 FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT Mathematics Test indicate that 18% of students scored level 4, 5, or 6. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 5 percentage points to 23%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (2)	23% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	As noted on the 2012	Chunk math lessons	SPED chairperson	Administration, along with	Formative:

1	administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment Math test, students scoring level 4, 5, or 6 decreased from 33% to 18%, a 15% decrease from the 2011 administration to the 2012 administration of the FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT. This is due to an inconsistent implementation of lessons based on student levels and needs.	based on student level to develop students' understanding of concepts. Use supporting resources such as manipulatives and hands-on activities during the 60 minute math block. Utilize Number Worlds software to customize instruction.	and Math Liaison	the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Teacher-made tests, Number Worlds progress reports Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 33% of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in reading by 2 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (95)	35% (100)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test in grades 3 through 5 was Geometry/ Measurement	Engage students in enrichment activities that use technology (Gizmos, River Deep) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of measurement and students' geometry and spatial sense. Utilize technology, calculators, and online resources to promote authentic and rigorous student achievement.	Administration, Math Liaison, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	The results of the 2012 FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT Mathematics Test indicate that 27% of students scored at or above level 7. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 30%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (3)	30% (3)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the 2012 administration of the Florida Alternate Assessment Math test, students scoring level 7, 8, or 9 decreased from 31% to 27% , a 4% decrease from the 2011 administration to the 2012 administration of the FLORIDA ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT. This is due to an inconsistent implementation of lessons based on student levels and needs.	Chunk math lessons based on student level to develop students' understanding of concepts. Use supporting resources such as manipulatives and hands-on activities during the 60 minute math block. Utilize Number Worlds software to customize instruction.	Administration, SPED chairperson and Math Liaison	Department Chair and Math Liaison will meet monthly to analyze lesson plans and teacher-made assessments used in the classroom.	Formative: Teacher-made tests, Number Worlds progress reports Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 69% of students made learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in reading by 5 percentage points to 74%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (118)	74% (127)

	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	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart, the reporting category and content focus that is in need of improvement is Reporting Category 2: Number/Fractions.	Identify lowest performing students in grades 3-5 based on instructional needs. Differentiate instruction based on results. Provide students the opportunity to develop an understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence. Infuse technology (Riverdeep, Success Maker Math)with instruction to assist students with organizing and visualizing mathematics concepts	Administrators, RtI team, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are in need of additional materials and basic skills in order to master Access Points at students' independent level.	Teacher will organize lessons according to student level and individual needs. Utilize Number Worlds software to increase student awareness of Access Points in order to increase learning gains.	SPED Chairperson, Administration, and Math Liaison	Department Chair will meet monthly with teachers to analyze current data reports generated through the Number Worlds program.	Formative: Teacher-made tests; monthly software progress report Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ¬-75% of the Lowest 25%tile students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the Lowest 25%students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
75% (36)	80% (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	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart, the reporting category and content focus that is in need of improvement is Number: Operations	Identify lowest performing students in grades 3 - 5 based on instructional needs. Differentiate instruction based on needs of targeted students. Utilize manipulatives to develop understanding of concepts. Provide students opportunities to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts. Infuse technology (SuccessMaker) with instruction to assist	Administrators, Math Liaison, RtI team, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

		students with organizing and visualizing mathematics concepts.				

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 : Based on 2012 FCAT 2.0 data, 30% of students were not proficient in Math. Our goal is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50% over a six year period, with less than 16% of students being non-proficient in 2017.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70	73	75	78	81	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 55% of the Black subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student performance by 14 percentage points to 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black:55%(30) Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	White: NA Black::69%(38) Hispanic::NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Black: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test in grades 3 and 4 was Reporting Category 1: Number/Operations	Provide opportunities for students to verify the reasonableness of number operation results. Provide instructional support for students to develop an understanding of decimals, including the connection between fractions and decimals.	Administrators, RtI team, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that ¬-81% of the English Language Learner subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase student performance by 2 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

81% (29)	83% (30)

<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>Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart, the reporting category and content focus that is in need of improvement is Reporting Category 3: Geometry and Measurement.</td><td>Teachers will provide a variety of instructional strategies that will help students focus on key vocabulary by using word banks, vocabulary notebooks, and dictionaries.</td><td>Administrators, RtI/MTSS team, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons</td><td>Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</td><td>Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments

Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 45% of the Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student performance by 13 percentage points to 58%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (17)	58% (21)

<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>Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart, the reporting category and content focus that is in need of improvement is Reporting Category 1: Numbers: Operations</td><td>Provide students with the opportunity to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts.
Utilize manipulatives to enhance student learning.
Engage students in activities that use technology to explore math concepts and for additional practice.</td><td>Administrators RtI/MTSS team Grade Level/Department Chairpersons</td><td>Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</td><td>Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments

Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 67% of the Economically Disadvantaged

Mathematics Goal #5E:			subgroup achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase student performance by 2 percentage points to 69%.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
67% (130)			69% (134)		

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	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart, the reporting category and content focus that is in need of improvement is Reporting Category 1: Numbers: Operations.	Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the use of manipulatives. Provide students with opportunities to develop quick recall of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts. Engage students in activities that use technology to explore math concepts and for additional practice.	Administrators, RtI/MTSS team, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Administration, along with the Mathematics Liaison and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed. The MTSS/RtI team will review data biweekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, Chapter Tests, District interim data reports, Student authentic work, District Interim Assessments

Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	3rd grade/4th grade	Dominguez/ Walker	3rd grade team/4th grade team	August 16, 2012 and November 6, 2012	Monitor Lesson plans	Math Liaison

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
In-House Tutoring	Hourly funds for in house tutoring	EESAC	$750.00
			Subtotal: $750.00
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: $750.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 31% of 5th Grade students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The goal for the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment is to increase 5th Grade students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) by 4 percentage points to 35%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (25)	35% (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 areas where students experienced the most difficulty are in Reporting Category1: The Nature of Science and Reporting Category 2: Earth & Space Science.	Provide students the opportunity to participate in hands on essential labs biweekly based on specific content objectives. Infuse the use of technology (FCAT Explorer, FCAT Focus & Gizmos), and increase opportunities for students to apply abstract scientific concepts in a variety of scenarios. Implement inquiry – based hands on activities / labs to address benchmarks where students demonstrate deficiencies. Provide time during grade level & department meetings to share best practices.	Administration, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons & Teachers	Data from school-based assessments and District Interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress towards the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as needed.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, District Baseline and Interim data reports. Teacher-generated assessments correlating to benchmarks/ standards. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

areas in need of improvement for the following group:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers lack materials and students are deficient in hands-on opportunities to achieve Access Points at independent levels.	Utilize SmartBoard to provide teacher demonstrations. Increase opportunities for hands-on scientific inquiry based on student needs.	SPED Chairperson, Science Liaison, Administration	Department Chair and Science Liaison will meet monthly to review lesson plans and analyze student participation in experiments and demonstrations.	Formative: Teacher made tests, lab sheets Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	On the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT 2.0 Test, 12 % of students achieved proficiency FCAT 2.0 Level 4 or 5. The expected performance for 2013 is 14% achieving proficiency at Level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% (10)	14% (11)

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 areas of most difficulty was Recording Category 2: Earth and Space Science, and Recording Category 3: Physical Science. Students need additional opportunities for inquiry – based and independent investigations.	Utilize technology to coordinate enrichment activities on a weekly basis to foster inquiry and critical thinking. Utilize Scott Foresman online resources to conduct virtual labs and to assist students in understanding abstract concepts. Implement real – work applications to encourage science investigations to extend beyond the classroom. Assign projects based on student interest, and use performance based tasks as alternate assessments.	Administration, Grade Level/Department Chairpersons	Data from school – based assessments and District interims will be analyzed monthly by administration and shared with teachers to determine if students are making adequate progress towards the goal. Adjustments to instructional focus will be made as needed.	Formative: Mini Benchmark Assessments, District Baseline and Interim data reports. Teacher-generated assessments correlating to benchmarks/ standards. Summative: Results from 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers lack materials and students are deficient in hands-on opportunities to achieve Access Points at independent levels.	Utilize SmartBoard to provide teacher demonstrations. Increase opportunities for hands-on scientific inquiry based on student needs.	SPED Chairperson, Science Liaison, Administration	Department Chair and Science Liaison will meet monthly to review lesson plans and analyze student participation in experiments and demonstrations.	Formative: Teacher made tests, lab sheets Summative: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

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

Other

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate that 85% of students scored level 3.0 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring level 4.0 or higher to 87%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (81)	87% (82)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" 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>During the 2012 FCAT Writing Test, fourth graders demonstrated difficulty in narrative writing.

The areas of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test were grammar and conventions. Students lack the necessary skills in English Grammar and punctuation. Students lack the necessary tools and vocabulary to create writing that will bring precision and interest through the vivid expression of ideas and the use of varied language techniques.</td><td>Infuse daily grammar skills lessons into the writing curriculum.

Emphasize apostrophes, commas, colons, and quotation marks in dialogue.

Use revising/editing chart and conferencing with teachers for capitalization and punctuation in simple and compound sentences.

Use literary examples to assist with using voice in a piece of writing.</td><td>Reading liaison, Administration</td><td>Teachers will meet with the Writing Liaison to review and score student writing samples on a monthly basis.</td><td>Formative: Monthly writing prompts, Interim Assessments

Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writes! assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring

	at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A			
	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	N/A		N/A		

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack necessary vocabulary and content to create sentences with appropriate grammar and conventions.	Design and implement lessons that allow students to engage in the writing process. Increase emphasis on vocabulary development and capitalization and punctuation.	SPED chairperson, Administration	Teachers will instruct students in the revision and editing process as evidenced in lesson plans which will be consistently reviewed by the administrators and the Reading coach. .	FORMATIVE: FCAT Writing Rubric, monthly writing assessments, District Pre and post Tests SUMMATIVE: 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Melissa Forney Writer's Institute	3rd Grade	Enriquez	Reading/Language Arts Teachers	August 16, 2012	Monitor lesson plans.	Reading Liaison

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our average attendance rate to 96.6% by decreasing the number of students with excessive absences & tardies (10 or more).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.14% (668)	96.64% (672)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
180	171
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
136	129

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	Some parents and students do not adhere to school policies regarding attendance and punctuality.	Identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of non attendance to the Attendance Review Committee/Social Worker for intervention strategies.	Assistant Principal Counselor Attendance Review Committee (ARC)	Weekly updates to the Administration by the Attendance Review Committee and to the faculty during monthly faculty meetings.	ARC logs, Attendance Truancy Report, COGNOS report

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance Reporting Procedures	K-5 Special Area	ARC	All Teachers	August 16, 2012	School administrators will monitor attendance reports to ensure that all procedures are being followed.	Administrators

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:	The total number of outdoor suspensions was 15 during the 2011-2012 school year. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2	2
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2	2

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
9	8
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
8	7

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of early identification of possible incidents and time it takes to review/revise Behavior Intervention Plans.	Implement a progressive discipline plan that adheres to Miami-Dade County Public Schools Code of Student Conduct.	Assistant Principal Counselor	Weekly number of student case management forms submitted to administration.	Detention Logs Student Case Management Forms Suspensions COGNOS report
2	Increase exposure to character education modules would decrease the suspension rate.	Implement Character Education Modules and Student of the Month, recognition to promote and acknowledge positive school behaviors.	Assistant Principal Counselor	Student of the Month teacher recommendation forms.	Student of the Month Certificates

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Student Code of Conduct Policies and procedures	PK-5 Discipline	Administrator	All staff	October 24, 2012	Review data for students who have been placed on outdoor and indoor suspension.	Leadership Team

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.*	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year, is to increase parent participation in school wide activities by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
40%	45%

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 parental participation for in-school functions such as monthly Parent Academy workshops.	The school will offer meetings/workshops before, during and after School. Furthermore, incentives will be used to enhance attendance at these workshops.	Administrators Dade Partner Liaison	School administrators will review attendance logs for meetings as well as sign in sheets for school based workshops and monitor daily parent volunteer logs.	Effectiveness will be measured by parent workshop attendance sign in sheets as well as daily parent volunteer logs
2	Decreased participation in PTA.	Solicit PTA memberships earlier in the school year.	PTA President, Administration	PTA Board will report number of members enrolled by end of school year.	End-of-Year PTA report

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NA						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of students participating in enrichment Mathematics and Science clubs and programs.

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
	Most of the enrichment programs are offered either before or after school; transportation issues are of concern in keeping students after school for clubs/programs.	Provide an enrichment program to the top 40% of students in Science and math in 5th grade. Encourage school wide participation in the school Science Fair to emphasize critical thinking and problem solving skills. Provide opportunities	Administration, Science Liaison	Progress monitoring of data for students enrolled in clubs or enrichment programs.	Interim Assessments (quarterly) Spring 2013 FCAT 2.0 data

1		for teachers to integrate literacy in the science classroom in order for students to enhance scientific meaning through writing, talking, and reading science. Instruction in grades K-5 adheres to the depth and rigor of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards as delineated in the District Pacing Guides.			
2	Lack of lab space for hands-on experimentation.	Utilize available SmartBoards for virtual science lab experiments and concept exploration.	Science Liaison, Administration	Monitor lab journal entries and observation sheets.	Number of labs completed via Gizmos and Discovery Learning.

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
Discovery Education	Grades 3-5 Math and Science	Discovery Education Company facilitator	ALL Math and Science Teachers	September 2012 ongoing	Sign in sheets, Professional Development registration forms	Administrators PD Liaison
GIZMOS Training	Grades 3-5 Math and Science	Mario Junco	ALL Math and Science Teachers	September 2012 ongoing	Sign in sheets, Professional Development registration forms	Administrators PD Liaison

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

Additional Goal(s)

NA Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of NA Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	In-house tutoring	Hourly Teachers for daily tutoring	EESAC	$750.00
Mathematics	In-House Tutoring	Hourly funds for in house tutoring	EESAC	$750.00
				Subtotal: $1,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $1,500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Hire Hourly teachers for tutoring. Provide Incentives	$1,500.00

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

School Advisory Council (EESAC) will meet on a regular basis to develop, revise and monitor the progress of School Improvement

Plan goals. In addition, the council will determine the most appropriate use of SAC funds to support the School Improvement Plan goals.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District
GLORIA FLOYD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	85%	89%	55%	312	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	61%	53%			114	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?	57% (YES)	57% (YES)			114	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					540	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District
GLORIA FLOYD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	83%	90%	46%	302	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	77%	68%			145	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?	82% (YES)	82% (YES)			164	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					611	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested