

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SILVER BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Maria C. Mason.

SAC Chair: Anailene Marban

Superintendent: Alberto M. Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: TBA

Last Modified on: 10/8/2012

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)
					Performance Record: 2011-2012 (Loc: 5041) School Grade: B AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 49%, Math: 55%, Writing: 89%, Science: 23% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 73%, Math: 78% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 78%, Math: 70% Performance Record: 2010-2011 (Loc: 6521) School Grade: B AMO: No

Principal	Maria C. Mason	<p>Bachelors: Elementary Education Masters: Technology Education Specialists: Educational Leadership Certification: Education, ESOL, Educational Leadership</p>	2	14	<p>% Meeting High Standards Reading: 62%, Math: 57%, Writing: 78%, Science: 43% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 62%, Math: 61% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 68%, Math: 68%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2006-2010 (Loc: 7055) School Grade: A AMO: N % Meeting High Standards Reading: 85%, Math: 89%, Writing: 90%, Science: 49% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 78%, Math: 81% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 78%, Math: 83%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2004-2005 (Loc: 4401) School Grade: B AMO: % Meeting High Standards Reading: 49%, Math: 61%, Writing: 80%, Science: 11% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 72%, Math: 68% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 83%, Math: 73%</p>
Assis Principal	Zuyin Companioni	<p>Bachelors: Education, Spanish Language & Literature Masters: Exceptional Student Education Certification: Spanish, ESOL, Ed. Leadership</p>	7	7	<p>Performance Record: 2011-2012 (Loc: 5041) School Grade: B AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 49%, Math: 55%, Writing: 89%, Science: 23% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 73%, Math: 78% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 78%, Math: 70%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2010-11 School Grade: C AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 68%, Math: 68%, Writing: 85%, Science: 54% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 51%, Math: 43% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 49%, Math: 54%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2009-10 School Grade: A AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 70%, Math: 78%, Writing: 84%, Science: 30% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 64%, Math: 66% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 64%, Math: 83%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2008-09 School Grade: A AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 69%, Math: 72%, Writing: 100%, Science: 23% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 61%, Math: 65% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 69%, Math: 73%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2007-08 School Grade: C AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 64%, Math: 62%, Writing: 89%, Science: 27% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 59%, Math: 68% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 63%, Math: 74%</p> <p>Performance Record: 2006-07 School Grade: A AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 69%, Math: 63%, Writing: 87%, Science: 21%</p>

					% Making Learning Gains Reading: 72%, Math: 57% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 73%, Math: 75%
Assis Principal	Nancy Sapiro		3	16	Performance Record: 2011-2012 (Loc: 5041) School Grade: B AMO: TBA % Meeting High Standards Reading: 49%, Math: 55%, Writing: 89%, Science: 23% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 73%, Math: 78% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 78%, Math: 70% Performance Record: 2010-11 School Grade: C AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 68%, Math: 68%, Writing: 85%, Science: 54% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 51%, Math: 43% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 49%, Math: 54% Performance Record: 2009-10 School Grade: A AMO: No % Meeting High Standards Reading: 70%, Math: 78%, Writing: 84%, Science: 30% % Making Learning Gains Reading: 64%, Math: 66% Adequate Progress of Lowest 25%: Reading: 64%, Math: 83%

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Anailene Marban	Bachelors: Education Masters: ESOL Doctorate: Leadership Endorsement: Reading Certification: Library Media	15	1	N/A

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Ensure all teachers meet the HOUSSE requirements as stated under the NCLB Act.	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Participate in District-hosted recruitment events with onsite hiring of highly qualified candidates.	Principal	Ongoing	
3	Implement a teacher mentoring program that provides support and collegial collaborative learning opportunities that assist new faculty members in their professional development.	Principal, Assistant Principal	06/01/2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Five teachers are currently teaching out-of-field and zero teachers received less than an effective rating	Teachers were issued waivers and are currently awaiting completion of ESOL endorsement.

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
44	0.0%(0)	15.9%(7)	38.6%(17)	45.5%(20)	43.2%(19)	100.0%(44)	11.4%(5)	0.0%(0)	59.1%(26)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
No data submitted			

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Silver Bluff Elementary School coordinates with the district to allocate support services and resources that enhance the overall educational environment. Title I services and resource have included offering extended day tutorial services, purchasing instructional resources, and hiring of instructional support personnel. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Support services are provided to students. The Reading Coach develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Supplemental Educational Services; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

There are currently no migrant students at the school.

Title I, Part D

Silver Bluff Elementary School coordinates with the District to use supplemental funds for improving basic education including: training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program; and, training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title II

Silver Bluff Elementary School coordinates with the District to use supplemental funds for improving basic education including: training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program; training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

Silver Bluff Elementary School utilizes Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learner (ELL) and immigrant students by providing funds to implement and/or provide:

- Tutorial programs
- Parent outreach activities
- Professional development on best practices for ESOL and content area teachers
- Coaching and mentoring for ESOL and content area teachers
- Reading and supplementary instructional materials
- Hardware and software for the development and language and literacy skills in reading, mathematics and science, is purchased for selected schools to be used by ELL and immigrant students

Title X- Homeless

Silver Bluff Elementary School participates in Project Upstart: Homeless Children & Youth Program which assists schools with the identification, enrollment, attendance, and transportation of homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

Violence Prevention Programs

Silver Bluff Elementary School has partnered with the Youth Crime Watch of Miami-Dade County to provide prevention presentations, safety projects, club meetings, assemblies, rallies and special events to address school safety and violence.

Nutrition Programs

- 1) Silver Bluff Elementary School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
- 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
- 3) Silver Bluff Elementary School's Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

Not Applicable

Head Start

Not Applicable

Adult Education

Not Applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not Applicable

Job Training

Not Applicable

Other

Silver Bluff Elementary School participates in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extends an open invitation to our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs and their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services. Additionally, we aim to increase parental engagement/involvement

through developing (with on-going parental input) our school's Title I School-Parent Compact; our school's Title I Parental Involvement Plan; scheduling the Title I Annual Meeting; and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements. The school conducts informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents, and schedule workshops, Parent Academy Courses, etc., with flexible times to accommodate our parents. This impacts our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Assistant Principal
Reading Coach
School Psychologist
School Guidance Counselor
Social Worker

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 MTSS/RtI team at Silver Bluff Elementary School is comprised of teachers, administrator, and support personnel who meet monthly to discuss school-wide data and recommend strategies that promote school improvement which includes student achievement, attendance, literacy, and safety. The MTSS/RtI leadership team works to support instruction, curriculum, and interventions of all students and targeted subgroups of Students with Disabilities (SWD), Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and English Language Learners (ELL). The MTSS/RtI team monitors school progress towards meeting goals, utilizing benchmark and progress monitoring data including district interim assessments, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0), and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT).

The primary function of the MTSS/RtI team at Silver Bluff Elementary School is to assist in identifying and addressing areas of student need and monitoring the effectiveness of school improvement initiatives being implemented. Members of the MTSS/RtI team report findings to the School Advisory Council (SAC), grade levels, departments, student services, and faculty during their meetings. The MTSS/RtI team also addresses issues identified by other committees within the school in an effort to assist in monitoring the effectiveness school improvement initiatives such as intervention and enrichment programs. The input and feedback from the MTSS/RtI team assists in problem-solving, providing differentiated assistance, and supports data analysis and collection.

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

The MTSS/RtI Team assists in analyzing data from district interim assessments, site-developed benchmark assessments, content cluster FCAT 2.0 data, and FAIR. Members of the MTSS/RtI Team share their findings with the SAC as well as address concerns highlighted by other committees and departments (SAC, grade level articulations, student support, etc).

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 data sources utilized to guide instructional decisions and the allocations of school-based resources include FAIR, interim assessments, FCAT 2.0, and district interim assessment. The data sources used to monitor student services and support include student case management system, IEP's, referrals, suspensions, attendance, and school climate survey.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Members of the school's RtI leadership team participate in site-sponsored and district sponsored trainings involved with RtI problem -solving and data analysis support. A technology orientation is offered to assist the RtI team in utilizing software to disaggregate data and generate reports such as Edusoft and Microsoft Excel Spreadsheets.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Members of the school's MTSS/RtI team participate in site-sponsored and district sponsored trainings involved with MTSS/RtI problem -solving and data analysis support. A technology orientation is offered to assist the MTSS/RtI team in utilizing

software to disaggregate data and generate reports such as Edusoft and Microsoft Excel Spreadsheets.

Describe plan to support MTSS/RtI.

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

1. Use Tier-1 problem solving process to set Tier 1 goals, monitor data evaluating data at least three times per year.
2. Gather student data and hold monthly meetings to discuss and monitor data
3. Ongoing progress monitoring (OPM) of interventions and analyze that data using Tier 2 problem solving after each OPM.
4. Maintain/support communication with staff regarding procedures and process
5. Provide clear indicators of student need and progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery
6. Assist in monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Maria Mason, Principal
Zuyin Companioni, Assistant Principal
Anailene Marban, Reading Coach
Sylvia Tamargo, SPED Teacher
Indira Gomez, Third Grade Teacher
Erika Pflucker, Second Grade Teacher
Miriam Castillo-Vazquez, Kindergarten Teacher
Leila Germroth, Fifth Grade Teacher
Aimee Sanz, Fourth Grade Teacher
Esther Martinez, Gifted Teacher
Lionita Coleman, School Counselor

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is composed of the instructional reading coach, administrator, and Reading teachers who evaluate the school's Reading curriculum and programs and identifies intervention and early interventions for students to be considered "at risk". This team is led by the Instructional Reading Coach who provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection and analysis, and provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning.

The LLT meets to discuss and plan for the implementation of strategies to assist students to meet district, state, and national standards in Reading. Monthly meetings engage members in data analysis to identify individual and targeted students' strength and weaknesses. In addition, the LLT assists in instructional refinement through the recommendations of professional development, sharing of effective practices, and through the evaluation of intervention programs. Members of the LLT report findings to the School Advisory Council (SAC), grade levels, departments, student services, and faculty during meetings.

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

The LLT will focus on addressing the needs of the lowest performing subgroups in Reading (SWD, ELL, ED, H). The team will monitor data from district interim assessments, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0), and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT).

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/2/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Silver Bluff Elementary School offers a full-day Title I Voluntary Pre-kindergarten class and two special Education Pre-kindergarten classes. In order to assist preschool children and their parents' transition from early childhood to elementary school programs, a kindergarten orientation is held before the opening of schools. The orientation provides an overview on the programs and assessment tools used to screen student readiness such as the Early Screening Inventory-Kindergarten (ESI-K). The Learning Accomplishment Profile-Diagnostic (LAPD), the Phonological and Early Literacy (PELI) and the Devereaux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) are all administered to preschoolers for diagnostic and summative assessments as they prepare for kindergarten. During the orientation meeting, parents and students learn about the kindergarten program and are given a guided tour of the school.

In addition, students are tested to see if they qualify for ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages). The effectiveness of the preschool transition program is evaluated by articulation amongst primary grade teachers. Title I funds are used to allocate resources and personnel, such as Waterford's Early Literacy and Math programs are implemented in select pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classes to target students with low readiness rates. Ongoing parental involvement is encouraged through monthly calendars and newsletters which highlight important topics regarding school programs and upcoming events.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 26% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) by 3 percentage points to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(68)	29%(76)

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 grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. Limited student exposure to grade level appropriate texts that include identifiable author's purpose for writing, including informing, telling a story, conveying a mood, entertaining or explaining.	Increase curriculum focus and explicit instruction on identifying author's purpose across grade level appropriate texts.	MTSS/RtI Team	Following the FCIM, teachers will monitor assessment data and adjust instruction as needed. (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments) The MTSS/RtI team will review data bi-weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Unify classroom instruction and routines through common planning, departmentalization, and data planning sessions.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments) addressing Literary Analysis skills.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 22% of students achieved proficiency Levels 4-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency Levels 4-5 by 1 percentage point to 23%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22%(57)	23%(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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	Departmentalization and homogenous grouping of students in grades 3-5 to support higher levels of instruction and subject-based acceleration.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	Offer academic enrichment and extracurricular activities/events such as math club and site-sponsored math competitions.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments) addressing Reading Application skills.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Implement Accelerated Reader in grades 1-5 to promote enrichment through independent reading.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 73% of students achieved proficiency Levels 4-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%(113)	78%(121)

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 grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	Provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk by commencing implementation of intervention programs within the first two weeks of school to ensure instruction of all reading benchmarks is achieved prior to testing.	MTSS/RtI Team	Identify and allocate available resources and support to at-risk students that increase opportunities for small-group and differentiated instruction. Monitor lesson plans and instructional delivery for effective teaching strategies.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Hold monthly data planning sessions for teachers to target categories in need of instruction and further develop differentiated instructional groups based on regularly scheduled district	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments) addressing Reading Application skills.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 78% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78%(33)	83%(35)

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	Review of 2012 assessment data reveals that there has been a decline in the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains. It is important to provide intensive support to the lowest performing students in the school.	Implement a computer rotation schedule for SuccessMaker and Reading Plus to delineate equal and adequate time for routine use.	MTSS/RtI Team	Identify and allocate available resources and support to at-risk students that increase opportunities for small-group and differentiated instruction. Monitor lesson plans and instructional delivery for effective teaching strategies.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 –	Provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk by commencing implementation of intervention programs within the first two	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments) addressing Reading	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the

	Reading Application and Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary in grade 5.	weeks of school to ensure instruction of all reading benchmarks is achieved prior to testing.		Application skills.	Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	At-risk students benefit from differentiated skills practice and reinforcement in targeted areas. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application and Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary in grade 5.	Incorporate rigorous mini-lessons during content area instruction to address instructional focus target areas	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of 2017 FCAT 2.0.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51	55	60	64	69	

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 49% of Hispanic students achieved proficiency Levels 3-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of Hispanic students achieving proficiency Levels 3-5 by 5 percentage points to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(120)	54%(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 grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application and Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary in grade 5.	Provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk by commencing implementation of intervention programs within the first two weeks of school to ensure instruction of all reading benchmarks is achieved prior to testing.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
	A large number of parents have limited English language	Provide parents with training on available resources and strategies	MTSS/RtI Team	Maintain documentation of trainings held throughout the year	Formative: District Interim Assessments,

2	proficiency and have difficulties assisting their child with home learning.	to assist their child with at home practice of skills.	including schedules, agendas, flyers, and sign-in sheets.	Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
---	---	--	---	--

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Results of the 2012-13 FCAT Reading Assessment indicate that 38% of ELL made AYP in Reading. Our goal for 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students making learning gains by 7 percentage points to 45%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38%(29)	45%(34)

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 grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Continue implementation of Imagine Learning with ELL students to enhance their English language skills.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from software reports and other documentation of program usage.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary.	Strengthen vocabulary instruction across grade levels to increase student exposure to more challenging vocabulary.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) 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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicate that 13% of SWD students achieved proficiency Levels 3-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students achieving proficiency Levels 3-5 by 14 percentage points to 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%(7)	27%(15)

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	At-risk students benefit from differentiated skills practice and reinforcement in targeted areas. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application and Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary in grade 5.	Intensify implementation of Reading Plus with SWD students to build reading proficiency of students who are not responding to core interventions and are struggling readers.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3-4 FCAT 2.0 Reading test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application and Reporting Category 1 – Vocabulary in grade 5.	Evaluate Individual Education Plans (IEP's) to ensure best possible placement setting and instructional delivery methods of SWD. (inclusion, resource, mainstream)	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
3	SWD students benefit from differentiated skills practice and reinforcement in targeted areas.	Incorporate rigorous mini-lessons during content area instruction to address instructional focus target areas	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) 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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers to attend Common Core workshops held onsite and throughout the district	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal	All Teachers	August 18-19, 2012	Monitoring lesson plans and collection of site-developed benchmark results.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
On-Campus Summer Institute PLC for teachers to participate in vertical and horizontal planning.	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal	Grades K -5 Teachers	June 17-28, 2013	Compilation of ready-made resources and plan of action for upcoming school year.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
Effective Implementation of Instructional Technology	K5	Reading Coach/Technology Facilitator	School-wide	August – June 2013 (Once each semester)	Monitoring of software usage reports and evidence of implementation.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
3.a.1	Purchase benchmark practice and test-prep workbooks for students to provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk in all reading benchmarks.	Target Literacy Grant, Title I	\$1,500.00
3.a.1	Purchase exemplar titles for Common Core State Standards to supplement core textbook series.	Target Literacy Grant, PTA	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$4,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.a.1	Purchase SmartBoards for classrooms in grades 4-5 to enrich instruction.	Comcast Grant	\$20,000.00
2.a.3	Upgrade to Accelerated Reader program to the web-based enterprise edition.	Target Literacy Grant	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$22,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$26,500.00

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:		The results of the 2012 CELLA assessment indicate that 32% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency in Listening/Speaking. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students demonstrating proficiency in Listening/Speaking by 3 percentage points to 35%.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
32%(71)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The grade level with the least number of students scoring at proficiency in Listening/Speaking was third grade.	To improve Listening skills, students will participate in numerous activities such as doing, choosing, answering, condensing, extending, duplicating, modeling, and conversing. The listening component will be built into ELL lessons based on these activities/response types.	MTSS/RtI Team, ESOL Teacher	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment
2	The grade level with the least number of students scoring at proficiency in Listening/Speaking was third grade.	To improve Speaking skills, students will concentrate on their pronunciation and intonation as well as speaking skills. Students will study and practice the essential aspects of speaking and listening in English and develop proficiency in conversation, group discussion, meetings, and classroom activities.	MTSS/RTI Team, ESOL Teacher	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
The results of the 2012 CELLA assessment					

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	indicate that 15% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students demonstrating proficiency in Reading by 3 percentage points to 18%.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

15%(33)

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 grade level with the least number of students scoring at proficiency in Reading was third grade.	Delineate equal and adequate time for routine use of SuccessMaker Reading among ELL population in grade K-1.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA assessment indicate that 17% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency in Writing. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students demonstrating proficiency in Writing by 3 percentage points to 20%.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

17%(37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The grade level with the least number of students scoring at proficiency in Reading was kindergarten.	Increase opportunities for students to express themselves in writing across content areas.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Florida Assessment for the Instruction of Reading (FAIR) Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 24% of students achieved proficiency Levels 3-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency Levels 3-5 by 1 percentage point to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25%(65)	26%(69)

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 2012-13 Expected Improvement for SIP Goal Chart, there was a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.	Departmentalization and homogenous grouping of students in grades 3-5 to support differentiated instruction.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Operations.	Provide engaging opportunities for mathematical exploration and practice through increased use of physical and virtual manipulatives. (Gizmos, manipulatives)	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Operations.	Promote memorization and quick recall of grade level math facts through focused practice and quarterly assessments.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 27% of students achieved proficiency Levels 4-5. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to maintain the percentage of students achieving proficiency Levels 4-5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(71)	27%(71)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 3 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Fractions.	Departmentalization and homogenous grouping of students in grades 3-5 to support higher levels of instruction and subject-based acceleration.	MTSS/RTI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 4 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Geometry and Measurement.	Offer academic enrichment and extracurricular activities/events such as math club and site-sponsored math competitions.	MTSS/RTI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	Fifth grade students scored at 50% in all three reporting categories on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment.	Provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk by commencing implementation of intervention programs within the first two weeks of school to ensure instruction of all reading benchmarks is achieved prior to testing.	MTSS/RTI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 78% of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 83%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%(113)	78%(121)

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 grade 3 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Fractions.	Implementation of Florida Achieves mini-benchmark assessments to provide targeted benchmark practice in grades 3-5.	RTI Leadership Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 4 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Geometry and Measurement.	Compile ready-made benchmark resource packets per grade level to provide differentiated targeted practice for areas of need.	MTSS/RTI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 70% of students achieved learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(30)	75%(32)

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 grade 4 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Geometry and Measurement.	Emphasize math vocabulary instructional activities including vocabulary journals and site-sponsored math activities/competitions.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Operations.	Provide supplemental practice in the memorization of basic math facts.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Number Operations.	Build math skills through the implementation of Houghton Mifflin Go Math online resources.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Our goal is to decrease by 50% the non-proficient students from the Baseline of 2011 to the administration of the 2017 FCAT 2.0.

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	52	57	61	65	70	

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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 38% of White students are making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of White students making satisfactory progress in mathematics by 12 percentage points to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 38%(6)	White: 50%(6)

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	Results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test demonstrate a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.	Emphasize math vocabulary instructional activities including vocabulary journals and site-sponsored math activities/competitions.	MTSS/Rti Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the grade 4 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics was Geometry and Measurement. Parents are not informed of free resources available to their child to assist them with at home practice of skills.	Provide parents with training on available resources and strategies to assist their child with at home practice of skills.	MTSS/Rti Team	Maintain documentation of trainings held throughout the year including schedules, agendas, flyers, and sign-in sheets.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicate that 19% of SWD students making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students making satisfactory progress in mathematics by 14 percentage points to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(10)	33%(14)

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	Availability of resources to assist students working below grade level who need additional skills practice, review, and reinforcement.	Provide at-risk students with extra skills practice in basic math skills by incorporating intensive and remedial resources.	MTSS/RtI Team	Monitor documentation supporting the incorporation of ThinkCentral Math resources in classroom instruction.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers to attend Common Core workshops held onsite and throughout the district	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal	All Teachers	August 18-19, 2012	Monitoring lesson plans and collection of site-developed benchmark results.	Principal, Assistant Principal
On-Campus Summer Institute PLC for teachers to participate in vertical and horizontal planning.	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal	Grades K -5 Teachers	June 17-28, 2013	Compilation of ready-made resources and plan of action for upcoming school year.	Principal, Assistant Principal
Effective Implementation of Instructional Technology	K-5	Technology Teacher	School-wide	August – June 2013 (Once each semester)	Monitoring of software usage reports and evidence of implementation.	Principal, Assistant Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

* 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 19% of students achieved proficiency Levels 3. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at proficiency Levels 3 by 5 percentage points to 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(15)	32%(29)

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 Science test was Physical Science and Nature of Science.	Implementation of Florida Achieves mini-benchmark assessments to provide targeted benchmark practice in grades 5	RtI Leadership Team	Monitor lesson plans, student work folders, and instructional delivery for the incorporation of weekly science labs.	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicate that 5% of students achieved proficiency Levels 4-5.
--	---

Science Goal #2a:		Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at proficiency Levels 4-5 by 2 percentage points to 7%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
5%(4)		7%(6)			
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	<p>Following a data analysis of the 2012 FCAT Science test , there was a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.</p> <p>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science test was Physical Science and Nature of Science.</p>	Extend enrichment opportunities for students in science utilizing Gizmos and Discovery Education in grades 4-5.	MTSS/Rtl Team, Science Teachers	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.					
Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Discovery Learning	Grade 3-5 Science	Lilly Orozco	Grade 3-5 Math/Science Teachers	September 26, 2012	Classroom Observations	Principal, Assistant Principal
Effective Teaching Strategies to Enhance Student Achievement in Science	Grade 3-5 Science	Science Teachers	Grade 3-5 Math/Science Teachers	August – June 2013	Classroom Observations	Principal, Assistant Principal
Using the SmartBoard to Enhance Science Instruction	Grade 3-5 Science	Anailene Marban	Grade 3-5 Math/Science Teachers	February 2013	Classroom Observations	Principal, Assistant Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			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 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing assessment indicate that 86% of students achieved proficiency Levels 3.0 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring at proficiency Levels 3.0 or higher by 2 percentage points to 88%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

86%(69)		88%(70)			
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 FCAT 2.0 Writing test, there was a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.	Writing workshops incorporated into instructional routine in fourth grade to develop creative writing skills and target areas of need based on monthly writing prompt data developed by teacher.	MTSS Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment Summative: 2011 FCAT Writing Assessment
2	Following a data analysis of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing test, there was a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.	Use a variety of graphic organizers, outlines, and charts to create a plan for writing that identifies the main idea, supporting details, and helps keep writing organized.	MTSS Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment
3	Following a data analysis of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing test, there was a decline in the percentage of students maintaining high standards over previous year test administrations.	Improve drafts by using word lists/categories, and teacher review, checklists, rubrics, and anchor papers.	MTSS Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Narrative Writing Best Practices	Gr 3-4 Reading/Language Arts	Reading Coach	Gr 3-4 Reading / Language Arts Teachers	Monthly September 2012 - March 2013	Classroom observations of the writing process through lesson plans, writing journals, and student work.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
Expository Writing Best Practices	Gr 3-4 Reading/Language Arts	Reading Coach	Gr 3-4 Reading / Language Arts Teachers	Monthly September 2012 - March 2013	Classroom observations of the writing process through lesson plans, writing journals, and student work.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach

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 attendance to 95.98%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.48%(581)	95.98%(585)

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
204	194
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
141	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	Some parents are not informed of the district's attendance policy and the impact absences and tardiness may have on achievement.	Provide a parent orientation at the beginning of the year to inform them of attendance policies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, Title I Community Involvement Specialist	Monitor Student Tardy Log Daily Attendance Bulletin	Student Tardy Log Daily Attendance Bulletin
2		Highlight the importance of attending school on time by contacting the parents of students with excessive tardies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, Title I Community Involvement Specialist	Monitor Student Tardy Log Daily Attendance Bulletin	Student Tardy Log Daily Attendance Bulletin

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
Title I Parent Orientation	PK-5	Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, Community Involvement Specialist	School-wide	September 6, 2012	Monitoring of attendance and tardy logs.	Administrators, Community Involvement Specialist, Wellness Council

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:		In 2011-2012, there were 2 out of school suspensions. Our goal for 2012-2013 is to not exceed the current number of total suspensions.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
0(0)		0(0)			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
0(0)		0(0)			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2		2			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
2		2			
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
	Students lack familiarity with the Student Code of Conduct.	Utilize student code of conduct by providing incentives for compliance (Student of the Month Program).	Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor	Monitoring of documentation involving Student Case Management forms sent to administration.	Student Case Management Forms Student Referral Log COGNOS

1				Ongoing review of teacher discipline referrals (SCMS). Suspension Logs Teacher Referrals	Attendance Reports Participation log for students receiving recognition
---	--	--	--	--	--

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
Title I Parent Orientation	PK-5	Administrators, Community Involvement Specialist	School-wide	September 6, 2012	Maintain documentation of student behavioral referrals and ongoing communication with parents.	Administrators, Community Involvement Specialist, School Guidance Counselor

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		Title I - See PIP		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
n/a		n/a		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			Our goal for the 2012-13 school year is to extend project-based enrichment opportunities for students in the areas of math and science to increase the percentage of students scoring at proficiency.		
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	Increase student involvement in the mathematics and science extracurricular activities such as math competitions and science fair.	Provide professional development for teachers in the area of teaching with rigor.	MTSS Team	Monitoring data from ongoing classroom assessments (bi-weekly quizzes, quarterly interim assessments)	Formative: District Interim Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Quizzes, Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science 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						

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	3.a.1	Purchase benchmark practice and test-prep workbooks for students to provide intensive support to students identified as at-risk in all reading benchmarks.	Target Literacy Grant, Title I	\$1,500.00
Reading	3.a.1	Purchase exemplar titles for Common Core State Standards to supplement core textbook series.	Target Literacy Grant, PTA	\$2,500.00
				Subtotal: \$4,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1.a.1	Purchase SmartBoards for classrooms in grades 4-5 to enrich instruction.	Comcast Grant	\$20,000.00
Reading	2.a.3	Upgrade to Accelerated Reader program to the web-based enterprise edition.	Target Literacy Grant	\$2,500.00
				Subtotal: \$22,500.00
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: \$26,500.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

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
Purchase benchmark practice and test-prep workbooks for students to provide at-risk students with extra skills practice in basic skills by incorporating intensive and remedial resources.	\$2,000.00

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

The EESAC at Silver Bluff Elementary School functions as an integral part of the school community. The following activities are planned for the 2012-13 school year:

- Assist in the development and monitoring of the implementation of the School Improvement Plan
- Monitoring of quarterly student achievement data
- Organize Parent Night Workshops/Trainings
- Assist the school in purchasing educational resources for students
- Reach out to parents and the community to obtain more business partners

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District SILVER BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	68%	85%	54%	275	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	51%	43%			94	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?	49% (NO)	54% (YES)			103	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					472	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District SILVER BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	78%	84%	30%	262	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	64%	66%			130	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	64% (YES)	83% (YES)			147	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					539	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested